

Report of the Twenty-second SPREP Meeting

13 – 15 September 2011

Apia
Samoa



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



SPREP Library/IRC Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

SPREP Meeting (22nd : 2011 : Apia, Samoa)

Report of the twenty second SPREP Meeting, 13 – 15
September 2011, Apia, Samoa. – Apia, Samoa : SPREP, 2011.

p. cm.

ISBN : 978-982-04-0437-3 (print)
978-982-04-0438-0 (online)

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 22nd SPREP Meeting

13-15 September 2011
Apia, Samoa



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



Table of Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Agenda Item 1: Official Opening | 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 Twenty First SPREP Meeting | 1 |
| Agenda Item 5: 2010 Overview | 2 |
| 5.1 Presentation of Annual Report for 2010 and Director's Overview of Progress since the Twenty-first SPREP Meeting..... | 2 |
| 5.2 Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the 2010 Annual Work Programme & Budget..... | 5 |
| 5.3 Audited Annual Accounts for 2010..... | 5 |
| Agenda Item 6: Institutional Reform and Strategic Issues | 5 |
| 6.1 Study on options for establishing a Sub-Regional Presence for SPREP | 5 |
| 6.2 SPREP Secretariat New Organisational Structure | 7 |
| Agenda Item 7: Strategic Financial Issues | 8 |
| 7.1 Report on Members' Contributions..... | 8 |
| 7.2 Nauru's Membership Contribution Arrears | 8 |
| Agenda Item 8: 2012 Work Programme and Budget | 13 |
| 8.1 Island Ecosystems Programme..... | 13 |
| 8.1.1 <i>2011 Pacific Year of the Dugong campaign and CMS collaboration</i> | 13 |
| 8.1.2 <i>Oceania Humpback Whale recovery plan</i> | 14 |
| 8.1.3 <i>Status of Coral Reefs in the Pacific (ICRI/Samoa)</i> | 16 |
| 8.1.4 <i>Pacific Mangroves Initiatives (SPREP/IUCN)</i> | 17 |
| 8.2 Pacific Futures Programme | 17 |
| 8.2.1 <i>Launch of revised PIFACC and Road Map for 2016</i> | 17 |
| 8.2.2 <i>Climate Finance – Global Environment Facility, Kyoto Adaptation Fund,</i> <i>Green Climate Fund, FEMM 2011 Outcomes</i> | 18 |
| 8.2.3 <i>Regional Mechanism to Address Loss and Damage from Climate Change</i> | 20 |
| 8.2.4 <i>Outcomes of 2011 Niue Pacific Climate Change Round Table (PCCR)</i> | 21 |
| 8.2.5 <i>Pacific Meteorological Council's Meeting Outcomes</i> | 22 |
| 8.2.6 <i>Rio + 20 Regional Process – Update</i> | 23 |
| 8.2.7 <i>UNFCCC COP 17 in Durban</i> | 24 |
| 8.2.8 <i>Draft Regional Asbestos Strategy</i> | 25 |
| 8.2.9 <i>Draft E-waste Strategy</i> | 27 |
| 8.2.10 <i>SPREP as Implementing Agency/Project Agency for GEF</i> | 27 |
| 8.3 Consideration and Approval of Proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2012 | 28 |
| Agenda Item 9: Corporate Services | 10 |
| 9.1 Annual Market Data..... | 10 |
| 9.2 SDR Stabilisation Mechanism..... | 11 |
| 9.3 Review of local staff terms and conditions..... | 12 |
| 9.4 Amendment to staff regulations..... | 30 |
| 9.5 SPREP Director's Salary Banding | 31 |
| 9.6 Report by the Director on Staff Appointment Beyond 6 years..... | 31 |

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 9.5 | SPREP Director's Salary Banding | 31 |
| 9.6 | Report by the Director on Staff Appointment Beyond 6 years | 31 |
| 9.7 | SPREP Building Proposal | 32 |
| 9.8 | Risk Management Plan | 33 |
| Agenda Item 10: Items Proposed by Members | | 33 |
| 10.1 | Country Profiles – Exchange of Information by Members on Year of Dugong | 33 |
| 10.2 | E-waste (Cook Islands) | 34 |
| Agenda Item 11: Regional Cooperation | | 34 |
| 11.1 | CROP Executives Meeting Report, including the Climate Change Task Force | 34 |
| 11.2 | Clean Pacific Campaign | 35 |
| Agenda Item 12: Statements by Observers | | 35 |
| Agenda Item 13: Other Business | | 35 |
| Agenda Item 14: Date and Venue of Twenty-Third SPREP Meeting | | 36 |
| Agenda Item 15: Adoption of Report of the Twenty-Second SPREP Meeting | | 36 |
| Agenda Item 16: Close | | 36 |

Annexes

| | | |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Annex 1: | List of Participants | 37 |
| Annex 2: | Opening Remarks | 49 |
| Annex 3: | Agenda | 56 |
| Annex 4: | Consultants Report: Establishing a Subregional Presence in the Pacific region | 58 |
| Annex 5: | Friends of the Chairs Report: Establishing a Subregional Presence in the Pacific region ... | 93 |
| Annex 6: | Observer Statements | 94 |

Introduction

1. The 22nd SPREP Meeting (22SM) was convened in Apia, Samoa from 13 to 15 September 2011. Representatives of the following SPREP countries and territories attended: American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, France, French Polynesia, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, United States of America and Vanuatu. Ministers from French Polynesia, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu were present. Observers from a range of regional, international and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) also attended. A list of participants is attached as Annex 1.

Agenda Item 1: Official Opening

2. The 22nd SPREP Meeting was officially opened by the Honorable Prime Minister of Samoa, Afioga Tuilaepa Sailele Malielegaoi, who gave the keynote address at a special ceremony held at the Tanoa Tusitala Hotel in Apia, Samoa, on Monday 12 September at 6.30pm. Father Benjamin Tapelu gave the opening prayer. The Director of SPREP, Mr David Sheppard, welcomed delegates and provided a brief overview of the expectations of this year's Meeting.

3. The Prime Minister's address and the SPREP Director's address are contained in Annex 2.

Agenda Item 2: Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair

4. The current Chair of the SPREP Meeting, Papua New Guinea, represented by Dr Wari Iamo, called the Meeting to order and recalled that the last meeting was held in Madang, Papua New Guinea and that substantial achievements had been made since

that Meeting. Dr Iamo thanked the Secretariat, in particular, the Director and Deputy Director for providing support and assistance in getting this work done. He acknowledged and welcomed all delegates and officials and recognised Ministerial delegates.

5. The Meeting, in accordance with the SPREP Meeting Rules of Procedures, **confirmed** Marshall Islands, represented by Ms Yumiko Chrisostomo, as Chair and, in the absence of representation from Tuvalu, the United States, represented by Mr Norman Barth, as Vice-Chair.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures

6. The draft agenda was modified, noting the direction from the 21SM that budgetary matters be discussed prior to discussion and formal adoption of the work programme and budget.

7. The Meeting **adopted** the Revised Agenda and its proposed hours and programme of work (Annex 3).

8. The Meeting also **appointed** an open-ended Drafting Committee on the SPREP Meeting Report comprising of a core group of Australia, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, New Zealand and United States, with the Vice-Chair (USA) chairing the Committee.

Agenda Item 4: Action Taken on Matters Arising from Twenty-first SPREP Meeting

9. The Director reported on actions taken on decisions of the 21st SPREP Meeting (21SM). In addressing this paper, he noted that good progress had been made on all the items and explained that a number of items in the

report would be further addressed in separate agenda items.

10. The Meeting *noted* the paper and actions taken by the Secretariat on the decisions of the 21SM.

Agenda Item 5: 2010 Overview

5.1: Presentation of Annual Report for 2010 and Director's Overview of Progress since the Twenty-first SPREP Meeting

11. The Director introduced the Annual Report for 2010, advising that copies in English were being distributed to delegates and noting the French copies would arrive by the next day.

12. Delegates thanked and commended the Secretariat on the Report.

13. France reaffirmed support for SPREP's programmes and expressed its pleasure to work with the Secretariat on issues of importance to the region's countries. In particular, France highlighted their wish to actively participate in the Secretariat's work and discussions, particularly during the preparations for the Durban and Rio +20 conferences. The representative also expressed appreciation to the Secretariat for consistently providing documents in the French language.

14. Niue also thanked the Secretariat for support to events in Niue including the Climate Change Roundtable and noted support in implementing specific projects. Niue also noted the increase in funds to SPREP and its application to the Adaptation Fund board for accreditation as an implementing agency. They welcomed successful efforts to increase SPREP staff morale, in achieving a positive EU audit and in improving collaboration with SPC, the latter being important given that SPC and PIFS

are building up their climate change programme, potentially creating confusion for PICTs.

15. The Chair pointed out that SPREP is the main CROP agency charged with climate change matters but that all contributions were welcome.

16. The Director advised that climate change has many dimensions and that all major regional agencies have climate change programmes, reflecting the importance attached to addressing the issue in the region. He explained that SPREP was working with regional agencies to better coordinate these regional efforts through mechanisms such as the CROP CEO sub-committee on climate change.

17. American Samoa noted the challenges of climate change and biodiversity loss and suggested that green energy, including energy efficiency, could be added as a priority area of concern, in addition to efforts to reduce dependency on fossil fuels. The Secretariat advised that this was a key area discussed during the Environment Forum, that SPREP's PIGGAREP programme focuses on this area, and that this would be discussed further in the meeting.

18. Samoa noted increased assistance from SPREP staff at international meetings and expressed appreciation of the increased level of funds raised for support to PICTs. The representative suggested that staff morale might be further improved by considering the reasons for the residual low morale.

19. Tonga expressed pleasure at SPREP's recent performance, acknowledged the SPREP Director's recent visit to Tonga, and noted increased support from the Secretariat for Tonga. Tonga expressed reservations at cost-cutting measures which could affect performance, including *per diems*. The

representative drew attention to the mangrove initiative (MESCAL - joint with IUCN) and suggested that increased delivery results from increased spending. The Director clarified that two strategies were being used to deliver better services to Members – the first is to raise additional funds and the second is to reduce costs where feasible. He explained that *per diems* were reduced following a comparison with other agencies and this policy was due for review after its first 6 months.

20. The representative of French Polynesia drew the attention of the Meeting to the painful realities faced by French Polynesia, which cannot be ignored by an environmental organisation. He pointed to the nuclear tests carried out in Moruroa and Fangataufa and their environmental and human health impacts. He expressed deep concern about the future of the nuclear waste produced by the French tests, not only for Polynesia but also for the whole of the Pacific, as sea level rise even further increases the risk of radioactive elements being released from those two atolls. Furthermore, there is now a risk of tsunami in Moruroa as the coral structure of the atoll has been weakened by the tests and could collapse at any time. Human health is also at stake and it is unfortunate that the “loi Morin” (Morin Act) on compensation of nuclear test victims does not recognise the whole range of negative health impacts. The whole Pacific region is concerned and will be subjected to the same legacy as French Polynesia. It is therefore appropriate for SPREP to take up the matter of nuclear tests in French Polynesia and its impacts on the Pacific environment.

21. France acknowledged the comments by the French Polynesia Minister and recognized that this was an issue close to his heart. The representative of France made two points of clarification:

- the nuclear tests stopped in 1996: since then, both atolls mentioned by

the Minister have been closely monitored to survey their geological evolution as well as the quality of their water. France is fulfilling its responsibilities to ensure that impacts are minimal and there have been none to this day. All reports are available to the public and distributed to IAEA and none have led to any dispute.

- the issue of indemnification of people whose health might have been affected has been discussed regularly with successive French Polynesian governments. The “loi Morin” (Morin Act) is in force and France will continue to assume responsibility for this issue.

22. The Meeting:

- **commended** the Secretariat and **adopted** the 2010 Annual Report.

5.2: Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the 2010 Annual Work Programme and Budget

23. In accordance with the SPREP Meeting Rules of Procedure, the Secretariat presented its internal Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report (PMER) for 2010.

24. The PMER provides a tool for the Secretariat to identify emerging issues and challenges and make necessary adjustments in its work programme.

25. The Secretariat noted that there had been increases in activity in areas of waste and pollution and in species and ecosystem management, reflecting Member needs. Activities in climate change and environmental governance had decreased slightly mainly due to the lack of requests from Members.

26. The Secretariat drew attention to SPREP's lower level of activities in the territories, which was indicative of the fact that territories were not eligible for some types of funding. Additionally it was suggested that territories do not make requests to SPREP because they are entitled to additional funding support from their metropolitan counterparts.

27. The Secretariat also highlighted the institutional and corporate activities achieved in 2010. Some of these were the adoption of the new Strategic Plan for 2011-2015 and the various institutional standards and internal management systems achieved. The Secretariat had also developed new organisational values and a code of ethics, which aimed to strengthen leadership within the Secretariat. A new performance development system (PDS) had also been adopted for evaluating the performance of staff.

28. The Secretariat acknowledged the various donors to the work of SPREP in 2010 and outlined the disbursements to Members in 2010. The Secretariat highlighted that whilst funding for projects had increased, there had been no increase in the core funds to the organisation in the past year. The many fundraising efforts of the Secretariat and specific proposals were also outlined.

29. The Secretariat highlighted that in general it had increased and strengthened work with partners, increased donor project funding, increased country disbursements, increased activities in waste/pollution and increased programmatic and project work in climate change as well as strengthening the organisation's institutional arrangements to reform the Secretariat.

30. The Secretariat noted that it needed to address both financial and human resources to reform the Secretariat structure to deliver the Strategic Plan priorities and meet Member

needs. It encouraged core funding by Members and donors to balance reliance on project funding.

31. Members commended the presentation and acknowledged the work of the Secretariat and its efforts over the past year.

32. Niue noted the dramatic increase in the disbursement of funds to countries in particular to Niue, which had received the second highest disbursement. The representative suggested that this could be attributed to the PACC project and also referenced future PACC activities and the upcoming Oceanscape programme, which may increase future disbursements. The representative inquired whether the proposed structure could absorb incoming GEF projects and, with regard to GEF5 funding, recommended that a lead coordinating agency be identified to assist countries, particularly small island states.

33. New Zealand noted the importance of strengthening the Secretariat's monitoring and evaluation process and advised that New Zealand was pleased to assist SPREP with this through the provision of technical assistance.

34. Samoa requested the Secretariat to report on direct impacts from activities, noting that while this may not be possible for the immediate previous year, the cumulative impact of work done in earlier years could be reported on.

35. Samoa acknowledged the generous direct receipt of Secretariat funding. Samoa also observed that all sub-outputs had expenditure less than budget, which could be attributed to delayed recruitment processes. The representative supported the need for increases in the core funding, especially in the area of pollution and waste management, noting the limitations of GEF funding in this

area. Samoa also raised the issue of a climate change focal point, observing that other organisations were also beginning to implement CC programmes and requested the Secretariat to clarify roles of agencies in CC.

36. American Samoa noted the disbursement of Secretariat funding and noted the need to increase Member contributions to increase support and services to countries.

37. United States highlighted the MOU between SPREP and SPC on climate change, noting that it would take more than one organisation to address this issue in the Pacific. The representative stressed the need to engage many actors with appropriate skills to be able to address the significant issue of climate change.

38. The Secretariat advised that it attempts to accommodate the increases in projects with increases in resources and stressed that projects are coordinated through the strategic plan. The Secretariat advised that the issue of a lead coordinating agency for GEF would be addressed under a separate agenda item and sought the support of the Meeting in considering SPREP as a GEF implementing agency.

39. The Secretariat further advised that the PMER was a work in progress and welcomed comments to improve it. The Secretariat acknowledged the assistance from New Zealand in improving the performance monitoring and evaluation process.

40. The Meeting **noted** the report of the Secretariat.

5.3: Audited Annual Accounts for 2010

41. The Secretariat advised that the auditor's report for the year ended 31

December 2010 had been prepared in accordance with International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS), changing from previous years, as directed by the 21SM. This had resulted in some one-off retrospective readjustments to the 2009 figures to ensure that the 2010 financial statements could be reported in accordance with the IFRS. The Secretariat outlined a summary of these changes and advised Members that the auditors' report on the Secretariat's operations in 2010 provided a "clean and unqualified opinion" that the accounts give a true and fair view of the Secretariat's financial position.

42. The Meeting **adopted** the audited Financial Statements and Auditors' Report for 2010.

Agenda Item 6: Institutional Reform and Strategic Issues

6.1 Study on options for establishing a Regional Presence for SPREP

43. The Secretariat advised that, in response to direction from the 21SM, it had selected a consultant with the relevant expertise to consider all relevant options for establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP, including co-locating staff at other CROP agencies. A preliminary report had been circulated to the Meeting.

44. The consultant, Mr David Gowty, detailed the preliminary activities and the field visits undertaken and advised that a questionnaire had been sent to all Members, donors and stakeholders. SPREP focal points and stakeholders were interviewed in Marshall Island, Palau, Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Fiji and Vanuatu, as well as other CROP and regional agencies and NGOs. The consultant advised that during the visits, there had been support

from those interviewed for a sub-regional presence in Melanesia and Micronesia. The report noted that the possibility of co-location with other existing sub-regional offices was one of the options discussed. The consultant advised that although actual costing estimates were not readily available for the purposes of the report, there were potential cost-savings in co-locating. The report suggested that for Micronesia, SPREP could explore with Federated States of Micronesia and SPC to co-locate in Pohnpei, noting the plans for a Micronesian Village. For Melanesia, the report similarly recommended considering co-locating with SPC in Port Vila where the Government was also allocating building space.

45. Niue, American Samoa, New Zealand, French Polynesia, Australia, Samoa, United States, New Caledonia and France requested information on the budget implications for the proposed options and advised that it would not be possible to make progress on the discussions without the benefit of this information. Solomon Islands was in favor of the sub-regional presence but also requested information on the costs involved. Issues raised included staffing costs, how these options would enhance project delivery and effectiveness and whether this would impact on Member contributions. Members advised that further exploration of the issue and of possible options would be necessary before any decision was possible.

46. On this issue, the Secretariat advised that cost implications would be studied if the Members considered the options presented feasible.

47. American Samoa queried whether this issue was consistent with the Strategic Plan.

48. Papua New Guinea acknowledged the report and its capture of sub-regional concerns, noting that this approach could improve national implementation in these sub-

regions. The representative also acknowledged that cost issues need to be considered and was of the opinion that this should be moved forward.

49. French Polynesia advised that they had not received the questionnaire and had not had a chance to contribute to the report, which he considered as a partial report. French Polynesia did not consider that SPC and SPREP were comparable in terms of their structure and staff numbers. The representative further noted that other options could also be considered such as sending staff to Members for extended periods to assist with projects. Establishing a new office would automatically involve an increase in operation costs. The representative advised that the issue was not sufficiently well understood by Members for a decision to be taken until all the questions by Members were responded to.

50. Australia agreed on the need to spread the reach of SPREP, and noted that while the report addressed some options, there was a need to fully understand the implications and the manner in which this would be operationalised.

51. Samoa was also not in a position to adopt options at this stage and added that they had not received the questionnaire. The representative also noted that the issue had not been captured in the report on actions taken since the 21st SPREP Meeting.

52. United States noted that Members were not being asked to approve the establishment of a sub-regional office but rather to continue the exploration. There was likely to be some savings in terms of travel costs, but there would be other benefits from co-locating with SPC. If service delivery could be enhanced to Members at a reasonable cost, United States could support it. However, there was a cost at which United States could not support this.

53. The Secretariat noted that the directive to proceed on this issue had come from Members at the last meeting, and there was no need to take an immediate decision; rather, more information should be gathered if Members agreed to proceed further. The Secretariat called for further guidance from Members on how to proceed.

54. Solomon Islands noted that the best co-location would be with the Melanesian Spearhead Group office and also suggested the option of locating a SPREP presence within a government office.

55. New Caledonia advised that they had not received the questionnaire and couldn't contribute to the discussion as the consultant had not visited their country. The representative raised the issue of risks of fragmenting the region into sub-regional units, which would be detrimental to the Pacific region and stressed that New Caledonia was not in a position to make a concrete decision at this stage and that further study was required.

56. France shared the concerns and doubts expressed regarding the costs and effectiveness of the proposal.

57. American Samoa emphasised the importance of formulating guidelines, rules and responsibilities for the proposed regional office. This is in addition to required budget support and a clarification of the relationship between SPREP headquarters and the sub-regional one (delegation of authority and operations).

58. Samoa noted that it was critical that focus be on the process in addition to the cost implications and was of the view that the consultation component of the process had not been completed.

59. Tonga proposed that four major points be addressed in a redesigned process – effectiveness, efficiency, affordability and added value. This final package of recommendations must then be comprehensively consulted among members.

60. The Meeting:

- **noted** the Draft Report (attached as Annex 4) and Presentation given by Mr. Gowty on the establishment of a Sub regional Presence for SPREP; and
- **endorsed** further work on strengthening regional linkages and tasked the Secretariat to prepare a paper for consideration at the 23rd SPREP Meeting, consistent with the elements identified in the Report of the Friends of the Chair (attached as Annex 5).

6.2 Organisation Restructuring

61. The Secretariat presented its proposed new organisational structure and advised that, following the adoption of the Strategic Plan at SM21, the Secretariat had been engaged in a process of review and reform. The new organisational structure would enable effective delivery of services to Members and meet the targets in the Strategic Plan.

62. The Director advised that the proposed restructure would not adversely affect existing staff; that position titles were consistent with other CROP agencies; that the new positions reflected strategic directions of SPREP; and that funding has been secured or is under discussion to support the new positions.

63. Concerns about increased costs associated with the restructure were expressed by Members. The Director indicated

that the two new Director positions would be filled internally by promotion and that funding had been identified or was under discussion for the other new positions.

64. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the proposed restructure of the Secretariat;
- **noted** the measures that the Secretariat is taking to ensure minimal impact on existing staff yet meet Strategic Plan objectives; and
- **endorsed** the concept of Member and partner direct support of staff positions in the Secretariat either through secondments or extra budgetary support.

Agenda Item 7: Strategic Financial Issues

7.1 Report on Members' Contributions

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

66. The Secretariat reported on the receipt of Members contributions and advised that there were substantial arrears for some countries although it was noted that the amounts due were relatively modest, especially when considering the cost – value ratio of deliverables.

67. United States, Tonga, Niue and the Marshall Islands noted that payments for this year would be made soon. The United States government fiscal year ends in September and due to this there are two annual payments made to SPREP, and a second payment for this calendar year would be forthcoming.

68. United States noted that the one-off 2009 voluntary contributions should not be referred to as arrears due to their voluntary nature.

69. Cook Islands thanked the Secretariat for providing the list of contributions, and encouraged Members with outstanding contributions to work with SPREP to strengthen the Secretariat.

70. Australia recognised the challenging circumstances which make it hard to pay dues, but noted the enormous value the region reaped from the Secretariat's services, which are dependent on contributions. Australia urged Members to make payments so that SPREP could continue its important programme of work.

71. The Meeting:

- **noted** the report and the substantial problems relating to outstanding Member contributions; and
- **committed** itself collectively and individually to paying current contributions and arrears in full in 2011.

7.2 Nauru's Membership Contribution Arrears

72. Nauru presented a proposal to address its membership contribution arrears based on discussions since the 21SM.

73. A Friends of the Chair committee consisting of Tuvalu, Fiji, Samoa and Nauru was established during 21SM to consider the request from Nauru. The group directed Nauru to discuss the matter with the Secretariat. Following consultations with the Secretariat, Nauru presented this paper to the 22SM.

74. Nauru advised that due to the severe economic crisis that Nauru had been through, the country had inherited a huge amount of debt, from which it was still recovering.

75. Nauru advised that it was committed to meeting its current and future annual membership contributions to SPREP, as reflected in the payments already made for the 2010 and 2011 contributions. A provision for the 2012 contribution had also been approved in its National Budget for 2011-12. Nauru proposed that it will pay its arrears to SPREP for the years 2007, 2008 and 2009 and that these payments be made by installment spread across the next three years from 2012, 2013 and 2014. These payments would be in addition to the annual membership contributions for those years. Nauru proposed that the balance of its outstanding arrears to SPREP that pre-date 2007, be completely written off, and be reflected as such in SPREP accounts.

76. The United States requested clarification as to whether Nauru had paid any membership payments and the Secretariat advised that since SPREP's inception in 1992, Nauru had made no member payments until 2010.

77. French Polynesia, Samoa, Solomon Islands, American Samoa, Cook Islands, Papua New Guinea expressed sympathy to Nauru and congratulated the nation on its economic recovery so far. However, concern was expressed that writing off a sovereign debt would be setting a dangerous precedent. It was noted that many other Members were also facing the impacts of the global economic crisis and were challenged to meet their payments. They further noted that the Financial Regulations make no mention of writing off debts and that these may need to be revised to cover this.

78. French Polynesia observed that writing off a sovereign debt contradicted the conclusion of the positive EU audit and would send the wrong message to donors.

79. Samoa and Papua New Guinea proposed that Nauru pay off the entire debt by instalments over a long period of time.

80. Cook Islands proposed endorsement of the first two recommendations in the working paper but not the third recommendation regarding writing off the pre-2007 debts.

81. The Chair proposed a text for consideration by the Nauru delegation and requested that the representative of Nauru consult with capital to seek their views: **request Nauru to make instalment payments over a period of 10 years for the balance of its outstanding membership contributions that pre-date 2007.**

82. This text was supported by French Polynesia, United States, Samoa, New Caledonia, New Zealand, American Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia, Niue and Cook Islands, noting the need for accountability and for Members to demonstrate good governance.

83. Nauru stated that precedents had been set with SOPAC and PIFS. It was noted, however, by the Chair, that SPC had never followed suit. It was also noted that the precedent had to be considered in light of existing practice within each organisation involved and with regard to SPREP, no precedent had been set.

84. Alternatives were suggested by Federated States of Micronesia and Tonga, for developed country members to consider assisting Nauru with payment of the debt and Papua New Guinea proposed that SPREP seek alternative forms of repayment.

85. Tonga supported writing off the arrears noting that Members could not be forced to pay arrears if they did not have the funds. This was supported by Niue.

86. Subsequently, during the Meeting, the representative of Nauru advised that the proposal relating to the payment of arrears in instalments had been approved by his government

87. The Meeting

- **noted** Nauru's commitment to pay its annual current and future membership contributions to SPREP, as reflected in the payments already made for the 2010 and 2011 contributions, and that a provision for the 2012 contribution has been approved in its National Budget for 2011-12;
- **approved** that Nauru pays its arrears to SPREP for the years 2007, 2008 and 2009 and that these payments be made by instalment spread across the next three years from 2012, 2013 and 2014. These payments will be in addition to the annual membership contributions for those years; and
- **noted**, with appreciation, that the government of Nauru had agreed to make instalment payments over a period of 10 years for the balance of its outstanding membership contributions that pre-date 2007.

Agenda Item 9: Corporate Services

9.1 Annual Market Data

88. The Secretariat presented the outcomes of the Annual Market Data Review and advised that the Review was a joint CROP

project carried out on an annual basis to obtain and analyse comprehensive remuneration data from identified reference markets (median of the Australian and New Zealand markets and upper quartile of the Fiji market) to provide a report on relevant market movements in the CROP pay structure. The market data were benchmarked using the new CROP salary scales, which had been in effect since 1st of January 2011.

89. The review (conducted by Consultants) indicated that CROP salaries were below the average of the three reference markets. Market increases were highlighted in the working paper and discussed. This was the combined effect of salary movements in those markets and of the diversity in exchange rate performance of the three currencies. CROP agencies have been left to reach their own decision on whether or not to adopt salary increases.

90. \$US 235 000 was needed to cover these increases which is accounted for in the 2012 budget. The Secretariat advised the Meeting that payment of increased salary scales was sustainable for at least the next 3 years. The Secretariat stressed the importance of keeping up with market movements for the professional staff salary scale, specifically to ensure the recruitment and retention of the best possible staff at SPREP.

91. Certain delegations such as Australia, New Zealand, French Polynesia and Samoa sought clarification concerning a number of points, for example, non-funded positions at the Secretariat, the overall volume of the payroll, and the average salary of supervisory staff. The need for visibility regarding what was being requested was stressed by French Polynesia in order to assist with determining whether such a system would be sustainable in the long term.

92. Cook Islands noted the link between the revised structure and the increased salary scale.

93. French Polynesia noted that all of this would cost an additional US\$510,000.

94. New Zealand sought clarification on the number of unfunded Secretariat positions for 2012. The Secretariat advised there were three but that discussions were underway with agencies to potentially fund these positions.

95. The Meeting:

- **noted** the outcomes of the 2010 Professional Annual Market Data Review; and
- **approved** the following salary scale to be effective from 1 January 2012.

| Band | Indicative Scale Proposed Model SDRs | Minimum 80% | Maximum 120% | % Difference from 2010 Market Midpoint |
|------|--------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------------------------------|
| 8 | 27,432 | 21,946 | 32,918 | 7.80% |
| 9 | 30,677 | 24,542 | 36,812 | 7.90% |
| 10 | 34,611 | 27,689 | 41,533 | 8.20% |
| 11 | 41,699 | 33,359 | 50,039 | 8.90% |
| 12 | 48,136 | 38,509 | 57,763 | 9.20% |
| 13 | 55,182 | 44,146 | 66,218 | 9.20% |
| 14 | 64,550 | 51,640 | 77,460 | 9.20% |
| 15 | 75,836 | 60,669 | 91,003 | 8.20% |
| 16 | 88,145 | 70,516 | 105,774 | 8.40% |
| 17 | 101,331 | 81,065 | 121,597 | 11.10% |
| 18 | 119,729 | 95,783 | 143,675 | 13.10% |

9.2 SDR Stabilisation Mechanism

96. The Secretariat provided an explanation of the use of the International Monetary Fund Special Drawing Rights (SDRs) for remuneration of professional staff positions in all CROP agencies and highlighted the negative impacts on salaries as a result of recent changes in the global market, in particular, the significant weakening of the US dollar. Staff retention, morale and recruitment

issues were stressed as significant potential negative impacts.

97. Professional staff salaries are delineated by the SDR which fluctuates based on relative international currency values. The SDR calculation is based on average values for the past 12 months. The Secretariat advised that the salary increases approved for 2012 (under 22SM Item 9.1) would potentially be partly negated by the drop in the SDR without intervention.

98. The Secretariat proposed that an interim measure be put in place whilst awaiting the 2012 Triennial Review for professional staff, where a number of remuneration issues such as the SDR will be thoroughly reviewed. The interim measure would set the reference points for SDR in 2012 at the average for the last 3 years rather than the last 12 months as currently calculated.

99. The costs of moving from current floor rate to the proposed floor of the interim measure were estimated to be approximately USD\$82,000. The Secretariat advised Members that this cost was not included in the budget for 2012 but that subject to funding availability, this could be catered for from savings by the end of 2011.

100. Australia requested confirmation that SPREP was not departing from the harmonized CROP approach to determination of salary levels. The Secretariat confirmed that the organisation was taking a pro-active approach by bringing the issue to the attention of the SPREP meeting and that it was only to be considered an interim solution until the CROP review was completed. The Secretariat also noted that other CROP agencies had taken a variable approach to the issue, including maintaining the SDR at 2010 levels or adjusting SDR rates at the commencement of new staff contracts.

101. The Secretariat emphasised that this proposal was an interim measure that might be replaced by an alternative to the use of the SDR in the future following the CROP review to be commenced at the end of 2011.

102. In response to a query from New Zealand, the Secretariat confirmed that without this interim measure, based on its forecast of currency trends, professional staff would continue to be paid at the current floor rate, which is 5% below the annual reference rate. This is the limit to which professional staff salaries could be reduced. The Secretariat confirmed that with pending salary increases, regardless of the SDR issue, there would be an overall net increase in salaries in 2012.

103. The Meeting:

- **approved in principle**, the adoption of the average of the last 3 years as an interim measure for setting the reference points for SDR for 2012; and
- noted that implementation will be subject to funding availability at the end of the 2011 financial year.

| Floor | Mid-Point | Ceiling |
|--------|-----------|---------|
| 3.8703 | 4.0740 | 4.2777 |

9.3 Review of Local Staff Terms and Conditions

104. The Secretariat presented the outcomes of the joint CROP Review of terms and conditions for positions advertised locally (support staff), and advised that the Review was carried out as part of the standard triennial review of staff terms and conditions. The purpose of the 2011 Review was to examine existing policies and practices governing remuneration arrangements for support staff, including the benchmarking of terms and conditions based on the local

market, and to make recommendations for improvement and further harmonisation between organisations and locations as appropriate.

105. The Secretariat responded to questions from American Samoa, New Zealand and Vanuatu and clarified that it was proposing a one-off payment for support staff upon their departure from the Secretariat (in addition to an increase in their leave entitlement) to bring entitlements on par with local Samoan government conditions. It also advised that currently support staff did not receive any retirement or other long-service benefits and that Secretariat terms and conditions for support staff were governed under the SPREP Agreement and not covered by Samoa employment legislation.

106. French Polynesia requested that information be better put into context perhaps by the use of flow charts to demonstrate the fairness and readability of the points made. This would help the delegates understand what was being requested now and its implications to long-term budget arrangements. The representative added that this would help delegates to convince and rally support in their respective governments as well as funding partners.

107. The Meeting:

- **noted** the outcomes of the 2011 CROP Review of Support staff terms and conditions and the consultants' findings that generally indicate most of the terms and conditions for support staff as currently relevant and appropriate;
- **approved** the following changes to existing terms and conditions for support staff:
 - Payment of 2 weeks for staff who have served at least 2 consecutive 3-year contracts

upon non-renewal of contract or upon resignation;

- o Amendments to leave entitlements as follows:

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------|---------|
| Less than 6 years of service | 15 days |
| More than 6 and less than 12 years of service | 18 days |
| More than 12 years | 21 days |

Agenda Item 8: 2012 Work Programme and Budget

8.1 Island Ecosystems Programme

8.1.1 2011 Pacific Year of the Dugong campaign and CMS collaboration

108. The Secretariat presented an overview of the activities and achievements to date of the 2011 Pacific Year of the Dugong campaign and on the status of collaboration on the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS).

109. The Secretariat advised that the Year of the Dugong was one of the priority actions in the 2011 work plan. A Memorandum of Collaboration between CMS and SPREP was signed in 2005, under which several ventures were initiated. These included partnership with CMS in the Year of the Dugong campaign and establishment of the CMS Pacific Islands Officer at SPREP with one year funding. Various other initiatives were outlined by the Secretariat, including activities under the Year of the Dugong campaign and the development of a proposal on dugongs and adaptation to Climate Change, funded by Australia. Pacific range state dugong profiles had also been prepared, with Australian funding. Currently six SPREP members are signatories to the CMS, and 13 members are signed onto the Pacific Island Cetacean MOU; all dugong range states have signed the dugong MOU.

110. Australia stated that it was pleased to take an active role in developing the programme, as a significant range state for dugongs, with the capacity to provide support to this important work. Australia had supported the Year of the Dugong campaign with USD25,000 and noted that dugongs have a low profile but are an important part of our ecosystems. Australia also noted that cyclone Yasi had a significant impact on seagrass and had also led to an increase in stranding of dugongs, a sign of the pressures on populations from extreme weather, which would be exacerbated by climate change. Australia is working on ways to improve dugong management, focusing on community based initiatives, notably projects in the Torres Strait and Daru in Papua New Guinea.

111. Australia supported all recommendations relating to the Secretariat's work on marine mammals and in this respect, urged Members who had not signed up to the Cetacean MOU to do so.

112. New Caledonia advised that it hosts the second largest population of dugongs in the region. The 2010 – 2014 action plan goal is for local communities to develop conservation plans for dugongs in their waters with a priority on knowledge, including research on habitat mapping and genetic and economic surveys. New Caledonia acknowledged collaboration with James Cook University in Australia in this work.

113. New Zealand noted that the CMS is an important convention for the region and supported endorsement of it. The representative noted that support for SPREP's regional marine species programme was a priority. New Zealand also advised it has had a concept proposal approved to support funding of NZD600,000 for turtle monitoring and associated ecotourism initiatives over the next four years in Tonga, Kiribati, Solomon Islands and Fiji.

114. The Meeting:

- **noted** the new position of CMS Pacific Islands Officer at SPREP and **directed** the Secretariat to collaborate with partners to seek funding to extend the position including consideration to incorporate CITES;
- **noted** the progress of the Pacific Year of the Dugong campaign, and acknowledged:
 - the support of the Government of Palau, private sector and NGOs towards the regional launch,
 - financial support from UNEP/CMS and the Australian Government (through the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities) towards the campaign,
 - permission by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (Australia) and others, for the use of dugong images for the PYOD poster, fact sheets and webpage.
- **called** on the Pacific Islands Dugong Range States to maintain the interest and momentum to establish long-term programmes, through active collaboration, participation and support in regional initiatives on dugongs and their habitats. These include the Dugong MOU Secretariats' initiative to develop the GEF project concept/PIF with the working title "Catalyzing robust dugong and habitat conservation across the Indian and Pacific Oceans through community-led stewardship and economic development" through formal allocation of their respective GEF

STAR allocation, where appropriate;

- **called** on other partners and donors to continue to provide assistance to build the capacity of the Pacific Island Dugong Range States to undertake other dugong and seagrass conservation and management actions and for the continuation of the CMSPO position at SPREP;
- **encouraged** Members that have not signed the Pacific Islands Cetacean MoU to sign and members that are not parties to CMS to join.

8.1.2 Oceania Humpback Whale Recovery Plan

115. The Secretariat presented for the Meeting's endorsement, the Oceania Humpback Whale Recovery Plan developed jointly by the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium (SPWRC) and SPREP with a regional Recovery Team representing Pacific Island countries.

116. New Zealand, Australia, Tonga, France, French Polynesia, Niue, Samoa, USA, Cook Islands, French and Vanuatu expressed support for the Oceania Humpback Whale Recovery Plan. Australia, United States and New Zealand emphasized the scope for further improvement of the Plan and recommended that it be viewed as a living document.

117. The United States also noted that it could be possible to draw on the extensive knowledge of the International Whaling Commission Scientific Committee and the Meeting may wish to include the IWC Scientific Committee as a consulting body on the document.

118. In response to a comment from Niue on the non-inclusion of New Zealand in the marine mammal sanctuary map, New Zealand explained that all marine mammals were protected within New Zealand territorial waters under Marine Mammal Legislation. Niue proposed that the map be amended beyond sanctuaries to include countries (such as NZ) which have domestic marine or fishing regulations that protect humpback whales in the region.

119. Samoa noted that for the Plan to be effective in communities it needed to be translated to languages of the Pacific and funding needed to continue to enable future implementation.

120. France presented the *Census of Marine Mammals and other Pelagic Megafauna by Aerial Survey* project, which will be implemented by the Agency for Marine Protected Areas in the waters under the jurisdiction of New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna. This census, to be carried out late 2012, early 2013, will complement the survey conducted in French Polynesia between January and May 2011. For obvious reasons of scientific relevance, the Agency for Marine Protected Areas was more than willing to extend the survey area to other parties of the Western Pacific in cooperation with other interested Coral Sea coastal States, subject to availability of additional funds for this purpose. The French representative advised that it would be possible to take advantage of the logistical and human resources allocated to this project to extend the geographical scope of the census, provided additional funds could be raised. France urged Members to express interest in this initiative, in order to facilitate the mobilisation of additional resources from bilateral and multilateral donors, so that the survey could be extended to the waters under the jurisdiction of States wishing to be associated with this initiative.

121. French Polynesia stated that it had declared its EEZ as a sanctuary for marine mammals in 2002 and said that the government had adopted several regulations to regulate whale watching. The Minister took this opportunity to present the Secretariat with a book on a study of marine mammals in French Polynesia.

122. Responding to a query by American Samoa regarding the focus on humpback whales, the Secretariat advised that humpback whales had been reclassified in Oceania as endangered under the IUCN Threatened Species Red List, and that most research in the region has been on humpbacks, however, he stated that other whale species were included in the Regional Whales and Dolphins Action Plan.

123. Vanuatu commended the Plan but noted the challenges in implementing the Recovery Plan, including providing regular assistance to its numerous islands that are geographically distant from each other. Vanuatu also noted the concept paper submitted by the French government, however advised that this needed formalization by countries and proper consultation with national agencies if it was to progress further.

124. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the Oceania Humpback Whale Recovery Plan, while noting that it should be viewed as a 'living document';
- **directed** the Secretariat to collaborate with SPWRC and other partners, such as CMS, to seek assistance to implement the Oceania Humpback Whale Recovery Plan;
- **called** on Members to fully participate and provide support and assistance where necessary

for in-country activities under the recovery plan;

- **called** on partners and donor agencies to provide assistance where possible to ensure the successful implementation of the Oceania Humpback Whale Recovery Plan; and
- **welcomed** the marine mammal survey initiative carried out by the French agency for marine protected areas, in partnership with the French Pacific communities (New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna), and invited all interested partners to contribute to the extension of the surveyed area in the South Western Pacific.

125. Conservation International made a statement on behalf of the South Pacific Whale Research Consortium (SPWRC) and expressed gratitude for the activities carried out by SPREP. SPWRC considered the Pacific to be a leader in the creation of marine mammal sanctuaries and congratulated both SPREP and Members on the quality of training activities implemented. SPWRC also commended the whale watching mechanisms in place and recommended to the Members that they apply the same model as that in New Caledonia in the area of whale watching. The need for training of managers in this area was also highlighted. The representative reiterated the commitment of the SPWRC to working with SPREP and Members on matters relating to whale conservation.

8.1.3 Status of Coral Reefs in the Pacific (ICRI/Samoa)

126. Samoa presented the work of the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) in collaboration with France as co-chairs of ICRI for the past two years. The representative

advised that this co-Chair arrangement would end at the end of 2011 and noted that SPREP and Australia were very active Members for the region.

127. A number of reports were outlined and highlighted, including: 17 case studies on good coastal management practices from many PICs (Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji, Cook Islands, Yap - State of Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Samoa, Marshall Islands, Palau and French Polynesia) and the report on the status of coral reefs of the world that highlighted many key points and concluded by re-affirming that threats to the coral reefs decades ago will be magnified with the increase in population growth. The Report recommended the promotion of existing management actions to improve the resilience of coral reefs and maintaining the ecological goods and services that they can provide the region.

128. France warmly thanked the Government of Samoa for its very active co-chairing of ICRI. It also extended its thanks to the SPREP Secretariat for its invaluable support. France confirmed that the next General Assembly will be held in Reunion Island from 12 to 16 December 2011.

129. Members acknowledged and thanked France and Samoa for their work and input.

130. Australia was honored to take up the ICRI Chair (2012-2014) and looked forward to hosting ICRI Members in North Queensland, Australia in July 2012. Australia's co-chair would be announced shortly.

131. American Samoa advised that it was a member of the Coral Reef Advisory Council (CRAC) and had several initiatives to conserve and protect coral reefs in its jurisdiction.

132. Papua New Guinea advised on the relevance of the State of the Coral Triangle reports and requested that the information from Samoa be shared. The representative further requested that the Secretariat coordinate information-sharing amongst Members on coral reef management activities.

133. The Meeting:

- **noted** the report.

8.1.4 Pacific Mangroves Initiatives (SPREP/IUCN)

134. The Secretariat provided an overview of the Pacific Mangroves Initiative and advised the Meeting of efforts so far by SPREP and IUCN Oceania with regional partners to move this initiative forward. The Secretariat advised that the Mangroves Initiative was first developed in 2007 by SPREP and IUCN and is an umbrella initiative which aims to build regional partnerships of regional organisations, experts and stakeholders. The Secretariat outlined the goal, purpose and objectives of the initiative and advised that the inaugural meeting of the Pacific Mangrove steering committee was convened with 5 PICs.

135. New Caledonia, Samoa, American Samoa, Papua New Guinea, United States and Vanuatu noted the importance of mangroves in providing ecosystem services, adaptation function for climate change, livelihoods, and natural disaster mitigation.

136. New Caledonia advised on its current work on mangroves, which includes mapping of, and studies on quality of, mangrove ecosystems; new regulations that require environmental impact assessments for all new projects; declaration of mangrove ecosystems as protected heritage ecosystems, which involve a complete ban on logging of mangroves; rehabilitation of degraded areas; and education and awareness and

development of learning tools. New Caledonia offered its expertise and experience to other Members.

137. New Zealand stated that although it was not currently part of this initiative, it may look to join in future. New Zealand was particularly interested in seeing the results of the initiative to build the case for the protection of mangroves and coastal ecosystems to provide ecosystem services and to enhance resilience to climate change and extreme weather events. New Zealand advised that it would keep a close watch on the MESCAL project with a view to adding value to enhance outcomes in the future.

138. United States noted some concerns with directing the Secretariat to allocate funds to the Pacific Mangrove Initiative given that Members had not evaluated the priority of the initiative in relation to other priorities. However, United States would welcome assistance from SPREP or other partners when it is in line with the priorities already identified.

139. The Secretariat clarified that the assistance it offers to Members is mostly technical, with opportunity for joint proposals for activities in the future.

140. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the Pacific Mangrove Initiative;
- **encouraged** SPREP Members with mangroves to formally join the Initiative;
- **called** on partners and donor agencies to provide assistance and support where possible for the Initiative and consistent with current funding; and
- **directed** the Secretariat, in conjunction with partners, to provide assistance to Members,

where needed, in the implementation of the Pacific Mangrove Initiative and its associated activities.

8.2 Pacific Futures Programme

8.2.1 Launch of PIFACC (second edition)

141. The Secretariat presented the 2nd Edition of the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change, 2006-2015 (PIFACC - 2nd Edition) and proposed to the Meeting a roadmap for developing PIFACC beyond 2015. The PIFACC - 2nd Edition was formally launched by the representative of Papua New Guinea.

142. The Secretariat advised that the roadmap was a joint SPREP and SPC proposal (supported by other partners) to develop an integrated regional climate change and disaster risk management (DRM) framework to replace both the PIFACC and the DRM Framework for Action in 2016.

143. Following requests for clarification from Australia and the United States, the Secretariat clarified that the PIFACC - 2nd Edition was the revised PIFACC document for the remaining period of the strategy (2011-2015) while the Roadmap document outlined the process to be followed for the development of a post 2015 strategy. The Roadmap document did not attempt to detail actions for post-2015.

144. New Zealand and New Caledonia welcomed the completion of the mid-term review of PIFACC and New Zealand suggested that planning elements be kept to a minimum to avoid diverting funds away from on-ground actions.

145. French Polynesia stated that man-made disasters should be an integral

component of the post-2015 planning to allow considerations of risks posed by (for example) nuclear waste.

146. United States stated it would endorse the start of a process to develop a post PIFACC strategy (i.e. post-2015). United States stated it could not endorse the Roadmap document as presented until further consideration.

147. Following a question from Federated States of Micronesia on the consultation process for the Roadmap (post-2015) document, the Secretariat responded that this was first tabled at the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable (PCCR) in March 2011, in response to discussions at the 21SM in Madang. The Secretariat emphasised that the “roadmap” as it stood was simply an outline for a process to revise PIFACC in preparation for its expiry in 2015.

148. The Meeting:

- **approved** the Second Edition PIFACC for 2011-2015 as a guiding policy framework and, where applicable, to national situations and priorities;
- **called** on development partners and donors to support the implementation and advocacy of PIFACC and its monitoring and evaluation in order to provide timely lessons learned to Members, partners and for the development of a post-2015 strategy;
- **reaffirmed** the principle of an integrated regional framework for Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation and Disaster Risk Management by 2015; and
- **requested** the Secretariat, working with Members and partners, to develop a strategy for post-second

edition PIFACC and for when the DRM Framework for Action ends in 2015, as quickly as possible through a consultative process.

8.2.2 Climate Finance – Global Environment Facility, Kyoto Adaptation Fund, Green Climate Fund, FEMM --2011 Outcomes

149. The Secretariat presented an overview of recent key developments to strengthen climate financing for Pacific Island States' climate change programmes under the Global Environment Facility 5th replenishment cycle, the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund, and the Cancun Green Climate Fund and the outcomes of the Forum Economic Ministers' Meeting (FEMM).

150. These developments included a study by SPREP to explore the feasibility of a Pacific Climate Change Financing Mechanism and a related stand-alone Technical Backstopping Mechanism endorsed by the 21st SPREP meeting. The Meeting was also apprised of the Forum Leaders' endorsement of the need for effective regional coordination and management of climate change resources and response efforts particularly at the national level and the need for Pacific Island Countries to drive the prioritisation of climate change resources and activities through their national sector plans and systems.

151. The Secretariat also highlighted the securing of funding for country projects under GEF-PAS; initial efforts taken to access funds under GEF-5; initial country projects under the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund; continuing efforts to secure funding under the Cancun Green Climate Fund; and the outcomes of the Forum Economic Ministers Meetings in 2011. It also advised on the options paper and work in progress and its recommendations, that direct

budgetary support be seen as the most effective modality for the delivery of climate change resources, noting also that national, sub-regional and regional trust funds could be explored as options if direct budgetary support is not yet feasible.

152. Niue commended the Secretariat for the paper and the comprehensive information relating to funding sources in areas of climate change and recommended the continuation of the GEFSa position with possible additional staff to increase valuable work by the Secretariat in the past in assisting Pacific Island Countries in dealing with issues related to accessing and managing GEF resources for climate change programmes.

153. New Caledonia reported on sources of climate change adaptation and mitigation financing that it and other French territories were able to access, including local projects on improving access to clean and safe drinking water, forestry and disaster management; training of Pacific Island technicians and specialists on improving biodiversity/ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change; research under IPCC on climate and health in the region; climate proofing and achieving sustainability in mining activities; tax incentives for stimulating renewable energy initiatives; renewable energy EU funded in French Polynesia; and development of other sources of renewable energy in the territories. New Caledonia added that French territories would appreciate better access to the climate financing sources elaborately described in the paper.

154. The Secretariat clarified that the SPREP GEFSa position was funded by Australia and New Zealand up to March 2012, and noted the clear message from the Pacific Island Countries for continuing support for countries' capacities for accessing and managing GEF-funding. The Secretariat advised that it would continue to

seek support from donors and partners for further funding for the SPREP GEFS position.

155. The Meeting:

- **noted** the developments outlined concerning climate change finance; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to undertake any related tasks or provide assistance to Members in matters relating to emerging climate change financing issues.

8.2.3 Regional Mechanism to Address Loss and Damage from Climate Change

156. The Secretariat updated Members on the proposal by Pacific Island Countries and the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) for an international mechanism to address loss and damage from the adverse impacts of climate change. It advised that the objective of the international mechanism is to assist particularly vulnerable developing countries to address unavoidable and residual loss and damage from the impacts of climate change.

157. The Secretariat advised that this issue was initially tabled by Tuvalu in light of the fact that natural disasters and climate change related events are quite costly for Member countries in the region. Issues raised to be considered were: Insurance Component with a dedicated facility in PICs; and a Rehabilitation Component. This had been previously discussed at the Climate Change Roundtable held in Niue with aspirations to be followed up at the Durban COP.

158. New Zealand expressed appreciation for Pacific SIDS consideration of the issue but queried whether the loss and damage workstream was necessarily a priority for the Secretariat's work programmes. There was

concern regarding the perceived diversion of limited resources to address this issue. In this context clarification was sought from the Secretariat on how this initiative fits into the strategic framework and how high it rates on the Secretariat's priorities.

159. The Secretariat advised that this matter was addressed as part of ongoing adaptation work. It was conducted in the same manner as all other areas of the SPREP work programme in response to Member requirements with continuation of technical and policy advice. The proposal in this context was to convene a regional meeting in September 2011 to cover climate change adaptation issues which would include loss and damage.

160. Australia was supportive of the regional discussion, and noted the importance of recognising that in the context of the UNFCCC, the issue of loss and damage is a work programme with a number of dimensions. The representative noted that loss and damage was about understanding and managing risk, and stressed that for the many different types of impact, there is unlikely to be a single solution. Different approaches include proactive adaptation planning, bottom up approaches, selection of appropriate tools, and identifying who is best placed to manage risks. There was a need to not narrow focus on particular issues but to recognise these issues as interrelated, and insurance in this context was only one component of a risk management strategy.

161. United States supported Australia's comments and noted that the UNFCCC negotiations was the right forum for this discussion.

162. Samoa and Papua New Guinea noted that it was crucial to not ignore the fact that PICTs still need to deal with very extreme natural events. SPREP in this context could act

as a technical advisor to the region in global discussions but there was a need to look at meaningful initiatives and a medium whereby this initiative could be appropriately carried out. The question posed therefore, was not on whether to have insurance or not, but whether SPREP should be involved.

163. French Polynesia advised that the approach must target the entire community. Insurance must not operate in isolation from other initiatives and at the highest level. PICTs have access to insurance that is extremely costly. Additionally, insurance in this region operates from branch offices; thus the discussion must go beyond the region in order to reach the global head offices. PICT's in this context would be excluded from the debate, but could be represented by the Secretariat.

164. The Meeting:

- **called** on partners and donor agencies to identify opportunities for assisting Members to provide further input into the UNFCCC work plan on Loss and Damage; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to provide assistance to Members in the further development of the work programme on loss and damage where possible, including convening a regional meeting on Loss and Damage in 2011 or 2012 and assisting countries to provide input into the September 2011 submissions to the UNFCCC.

8.2.4 Outcomes of 2011 Niue Pacific Climate Change Round Table (PCCR)

165. The Pacific Climate Change Roundtable (PCCR) biennial meeting was held in March 2011, hosted by the Government and people

of Niue. The Secretariat presented the outcomes of the 2011 PCCR and provided a brief summary of the key outcomes.

166. United States reinforced the importance of the PCCR as a forum for individuals to express unrestrained opinion, but emphasised that the PCCR should not direct SPREP's activities. The representative added that SPREP responses to PCCR recommendations should only occur when these were consistent with SPREP's Strategic Plan.

167. New Caledonia applauded the formation of working groups in the PCCR and asked whether there was a summary of recommendations from the groups and whether there was a governance structure that moderated their work.

168. The Secretariat advised that the PCCR was indeed an open and inclusive process and that the PCCR working groups should follow the terms of reference set by the PCCR, however, they should also feed into other relevant processes such as the SPREP Meeting.

169. French Polynesia asked what was the follow up to the report on funds mobilization and asked what had been achieved.

170. The Secretariat responded that a process had been undertaken to study climate change finance by contracting a consultant who reported at the Niue meeting. This report provided input into a PIFS report, which had been considered at the recent Pacific Forum Leaders' meeting.

171. The Secretariat responded that some of the results had just been presented, and that the relevant reports were available on the internet. Important points included the need for adequate funding and the need to adapt approaches to local needs.

172. Upon request by the Chair, the PIFs representative briefly outlined some of the action items that were contained in the PIFs report.

173. French Polynesia expressed concern about finance mechanisms, particularly the need for and constraints on national co-finance for such initiatives.

174. New Caledonia drew attention to the outcomes of the meeting of the Climate Change Alliance in Port Vila co-organised by the EU and the PIF, and asked if the action plan, which is part of the agreement between the Forum and the European Commission had been approved. The PIFS representative assured delegates that documents would be circulated for input before future meetings with the EU (next meeting November). PIFS will consolidate input prior to the November meeting.

175. Samoa recalled that the PCCR was in its 3rd or 4th year, and that what emerges from the PCCR is supposed to be consistent with both the SPREP Strategic Plan and the PIFACC, and that this should be reflected in the recommendations.

176. The Meeting:

- **noted** the outcomes of the 2011 PCCR;
- **endorsed** the working arrangements of the PCCR and the Secretariat role; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to respond to the tasks recommended for the Secretariat from the PCCR, where consistent with the SPREP Strategic Plan and PIFACC.

8.2.5 *Pacific Meteorological Council's Meeting Outcomes*

177. The Secretariat provided an overview of the outcomes of the 14th Regional Meteorological Services Directors (14RMSD) Meeting and the inaugural meeting of the Pacific Meteorological Council (PMC). It also provided updates on the Review of Meteorological Services, in particular the development of the Pacific Meteorological Desk Partnership (PMDP). The key outcomes of the 14RMSD includes the endorsement of the Terms of Reference of the PMC and the outcomes of its first meeting; the establishment of the PMDP and the governing arrangements defining the relationships between the PMC and PMDP and their key national, regional and international partners and donors.

178. Australia conveyed its full support of the recommendations from the paper and welcomed the establishment of the PMC and the support provided to it by the PMDP, stating it gives SPREP better awareness of the weather and climate needs of PICTs. Australia asked for further clarification on the sustainability of the PMDP partnership.

179. United States agreed with Australia's endorsement and noted the need to address potential limitations in human and financial resources within SPREP to support and sustain the work of the PMC and PMDP.

180. The Secretariat expressed deep appreciation of the support from Australia and United States and informed Members of funding support from the Commonwealth Secretariat for the Meteorology and Climatology Services Adviser post and other new posts added to provide the necessary SPREP support for these two new initiatives. The Secretariat also noted funding support from the Finnish and United States governments for these new and current

related posts and acknowledged the continuing generosity of partners and donors in this respect.

181. Vanuatu acknowledged and supported the paper and, as vice chair of the PMC, noted the support of SPREP for the Meteorological Services Directors Meetings. Vanuatu emphasised the important roles of Meteorological Services Directors in PICs on monitoring, predictions and early warning, noting that this was key information required for sustainable development in all sectors for adaptation and mitigation. Vanuatu also strongly endorsed the PMDP, noting, with great satisfaction the achievement of these milestones that will add value to the work of PICs in achieving better adaptation and mitigation of climate change. The representative also requested the continuing roles of key meteorological services such as New Zealand NIWA and MetService, Australian Bureau of Meteorology, Météo France and Fiji Meteorological Service, to provide assistance to the region. Vanuatu also noted the important role of donors such as AusAID, NZAID, JICA, and USAID in providing additional support.

182. Samoa supported the intervention by Vanuatu noting that the PMC and PMDP is a stage of maturity in meteorological services in the region and acknowledged the support of New Zealand, Australia and United States for Samoa and other countries in the technical aspects of meteorological and climate change. The representative noted that Samoa has cultivated partnership in projects with new partners from the Asia-Pacific region such as with the governments of Japan and China, and suggested that these partners also be considered in this area of work as new opportunities.

183. France agreed with the points raised by the last speakers, in particular Vanuatu. The representative mentioned that the French

meteorological services (Météo France) based in French Pacific communities have an expertise that can be shared with interested neighbouring countries. The delegation will inform them of the content of our discussions.

184. The Meeting:

- **noted** the outcomes of the 2011 Pacific Meteorological Council (PMC);
- **endorsed** the working arrangements of the Secretariat role in support of the PMC and the Pacific Meteorological Desk Partnership; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to respond to those tasks recommended for the Secretariat from the PMC.

8.2.6 Rio + 20 Regional Process – Update

185. The Secretariat presented a summary of the Pacific preparations for the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) to be held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in June 2012. Members were informed that the Rio+20 Conference will review progress in respect of commitments made through Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs) during and since the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992.

186. A Pacific Preparatory Meeting for Rio+20 was held in Apia, Samoa on the 22nd July 2011 and a summary of the Outcomes Documents of that meeting was presented for consideration. The Secretariat also distributed a short outcome statement from the 1st Pacific Environment Forum, advising Members that this was for information only.

187. France reaffirmed its commitment to a world environmental organisation to be built from the existing organisation, UNEP. The time has now come and Rio+20 will be a unique opportunity to provide the multilateral system with an institution having the efficiency and legitimacy required to meet the global environmental challenges.

188. France also supported the recommendations on the blue economy outlined in the paper presented by the Secretariat. On this topic, it welcomed the “Friends of the Ocean” initiative led by Australia in partnership with Small Island Developing States in the UN.

189. France attached particular importance to the area of high seas biodiversity preservation and drew attention to the importance of an implementation agreement for the Montego Bay Convention for the protection of high seas biodiversity, including a component on the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilisation of marine genetic resources and a component on marine protected areas.

190. France noted that some positions on climate change outlined in working paper 8.2.6 “Rio+20 Regional Process – Update” could not be shared by all. France was therefore not able to approve the entire paper and proposed to replace, in the Meeting resolution, the word “approved” with “noted”.

191. United States agreed with France that certain elements within the Outcomes Document could not be agreed to.

192. The Secretariat responded that the SPREP Ministerial meeting held last year agreed to include an open forum during the SPREP meeting. Circulars were sent in March to focal points and Rio+20 had been discussed during the Open Forum. The Secretariat viewed this as useful input but noted that the

future of the forum was entirely up to Members.

193. Australia registered its concern that there may be thousands of contributions competing for attention in the Rio +20 process, which may make it challenging for this region to ensure its priorities are heard. Australia intends to continue to support the blue economy campaign of PICs, and encourage SPREP members to work together to present to the Rio +20 process a compelling message about the contribution of marine ecosystems to sustainable development and the well being of the people of our region.

194. New Zealand stated that it endorsed the recommendations and added that they were present at the preparatory meeting as a partner and looked forward to the Rio+20 as chair of PIF.

195. New Caledonia supported the recommendations of the Secretariat and noted its commitment to Rio+20. Concerning the green economy, the “One Tree, One Day, One Life” initiative aims to develop participatory management and promote economic benefits for communities. This covers reforestation, rehabilitation of degraded areas and control of invasive species. The blue economy is a reality materialised in 2008 with the inclusion on the UNESCO World Heritage register of a significant part of our lagoons, reefs and associated ecosystems and the development of participatory management plans. Finally, like France and Australia, New Caledonia is very interested in preserving the Coral Sea. This common interest is embodied in a letter of intent for the sustainable management of the Coral Sea signed in 2010 by those three partners.

196. The Meeting:

- **noted** the preparations for Rio+20;
- **noted** the outcomes of the Pacific Environment Forum held on 12th September, as part of the 22nd SPREP Meeting ; and
- **noted** the Outcomes of the Pacific Rio+20 Ministerial Preparatory Meeting held in Apia in July 2011.

8.2.7 UNFCCC COP 17 in Durban

197. The Secretariat advised the Meeting on recent developments relating to the UNFCCC negotiations and provided an overview of the Secretariat's initiatives to support Pacific Island Countries in preparation for and at the 17th Conference of the Parties (COP17) in Durban.

198. The Secretariat noted that there had been procedural issues relating to progress in the negotiations. Key issues include the 2nd commitment period under the Kyoto Protocol whereby some countries have rejected the commitments, while others have tempered their commitment until all parties have committed. PICT's have requested SPREP to support their negotiations at the COP 17 meeting in Durban.

199. Papua New Guinea, Tonga, France and United States indicated their support for the recommendations and made further comments.

200. Tonga noted that the recommendations were comprehensive in covering all issues at the negotiation level. Tonga stressed that it was important for SPREP to continue support for countries in the UNFCCC forum.

201. France outlined its position on the Durban Conference:

- France shares the objective of Pacific islands, which is to reach a far-reaching legally binding agreement under the Climate Convention;
- France considers that the Cancun agreements of December 2010 are a big step towards strengthening the multilateral system for combating climate change. One key aspect of the 17th Conference of the Parties (COP17) is therefore to consolidate those gains and operationalise the components of the Cancun agreements; and
- However, several key issues were not resolved in Cancun, such as far-reaching and binding commitments to reduce emissions and limit warming to 2°C, the future of the Kyoto Protocol and its overall legal format, and the mobilisation of long-term financing. It is therefore imperative for France that the Durban Conference goes beyond the implementation of Cancun and makes progress on those neglected issues. France supported the adoption of the recommendations.

202. United States associated itself with France's position and indicated the need for ongoing efforts to seek legally binding agreements to mitigate emissions by all major emitters.

203. The Meeting:

- **noted** the developments outlined concerning climate change negotiations;
- **directed** the Secretariat to undertake any related tasks or provide assistance to Members in matters relating to emerging climate change negotiations issues; and

- **endorsed the Secretariat's efforts in support of Members' participation in the UNFCCC negotiations at COP 17 in Durban and during the preparatory meetings.**

8.2.8 Draft Regional Asbestos Strategy

204. The Secretariat introduced the draft regional Asbestos Strategy and Action Plan for 2011-2015 which seeks to better manage and dispose of asbestos-containing materials. The asbestos regional strategy provides guidance and best management practices for countries to adopt or modify according to their national context.

205. United States and American Samoa agreed that asbestos is a health hazard and advised they would like to endorse the Strategy and Action Plan however, they both had profound reservations to dumping at sea. Furthermore, due to its international treaty obligations, the United States advised that it was not able to support the Strategy and Action Plan unless the option for dumping at sea was removed.

206. American Samoa encouraged the small island states to seek other options such as the transportation to and disposal of asbestos in bigger countries such as the United States, Australia and New Zealand.

207. France asked the Secretariat whether the dumping provisions of the strategy were consistent with the provisions of the Dumping Protocol of the SPREP/Noumea Convention.

208. Cook Islands and Tonga noted that asbestos is a long standing environmental and health concern and supported and endorsed all recommendations and stated that for it and other small island countries, dumping at sea

was the only viable option. Cook Islands had dumped asbestos at sea after exploring other options such as transportation to Australia and New Zealand. Cook Islands stressed the urgency of addressing the issue of asbestos and advised the Meeting that upgrades of six school buildings in the country had been placed on hold because there were currently no viable methods in-country to remove and safely dispose of asbestos. Tonga suggested that if the ocean disposal option was excluded, the United States might consider supporting alternative removal options.

209. New Caledonia offered to provide advice and share its experiences with the safe handling, treatment and disposal of environmental asbestos. Australia and New Zealand also offered technical assistance for the implementation of the Strategy. New Zealand noted the cost and environmental implications and advised that bilateral funding for asbestos removal and disposal could be made available provided recipient countries gave it high priority. Australia and New Zealand supported the recommendations and indicated that the final decision on appropriate handling and disposal methods was the responsibility of national governments.

210. The Secretariat indicated that ocean disposal was one of several options available, but that there were strict protocols for dumping at sea including embedding in concrete and enclosing in a sealed shipping container and dumping in deep water of 3,000 feet. The Secretariat suggested that, while not ideal, this option may be the only financially viable option for many countries. The Secretariat also indicated that it had sought advice from the International Maritime Organization (IMO) on the options under the Strategy and had been informed that they did not contravene any regional or international maritime conventions.

211. Federated States of Micronesia stated that while the issue of ocean dumping was a concern, the fact remained that the asbestos issue needed to be addressed with urgency and urged Members to find ways to address this issue with action.

212. The Chair established a Friends' of the Chair group consisting of American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Tonga, and United States to develop appropriate draft wording to accommodate the various concerns. The Group reported back on the discussions and advised that amendments would be made to the Strategy and Action Plan and this revised version would be what the Meeting would endorse.

213. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the Regional Asbestos Strategy and Action Plan (*An Asbestos Free Pacific: A Regional Strategy and Action Plan, 2011*);
- **called** on partners and donor agencies to provide assistance where possible to ensure completion of the action plan;
- **noted** the involvement of the World Health Organization in development of the Strategy and Action Plan; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to provide assistance to Members in the implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan where possible

8.2.9 Draft E-Waste Strategy

214. The Secretariat introduced the draft regional E-waste Strategy and Action Plan 2011-2015 which seeks to better manage and dispose of end-of-life electrical and electronic equipment. The Secretariat stressed that (E-waste) was becoming an increasingly

important issue for Pacific island countries with increasing quantities of electrical and electronic equipment.

215. New Zealand noted that it supported the recommendations and informed the Meeting that it had provided funding and technical support to the Cook Islands for the removal of 40 tons of e-waste.

216. France commended the Secretariat for the quality of the proposed strategy. It added that during consultations with SPREP prior to finalising this document, France had provided some additional text, none of which had been incorporated in the final document. In particular, France had suggested the introduction of the polluter pays principle under the "guiding principles" section and this important suggestion had not been taken into account. France requested that this be included in the Meeting report.

217. New Caledonia outlined the steps it was taking to address e-waste and indicated that it would be willing to share relevant experience and technical expertise.

218. French Polynesia recommended that the Strategy also addressed issues relating to finance including duty or tax to pay for the treatment and disposal of the waste in line with the user pays principle.

219. The Secretariat reiterated that this was a draft strategy and that the paper was only seeking endorsement for the finalisation of the strategy. The Secretariat encouraged France and other Members to provide recommendations for improvement of the Strategy.

220. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the finalisation of the Draft Regional E-waste Strategy and Action Plan (Pacific Ewaste: A

Regional Strategy and Action Plan, 2011);

- **called** on partners and donor agencies to provide assistance where possible to ensure completion of the Strategy and Action plan;
- **noted** the involvement of multiple partners (including SPC and the National Environment Service, Cook Islands) in development of the Draft Strategy and Action Plan; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to provide assistance to Members in the future implementation of the Strategy and Action Plan where possible.

8.2.10 SPREP as Implementing Agency/Project Agency for GEF

221. The Secretariat presented a paper outlining the rationale for SPREP applying for accreditation as a GEF Project Agency. It advised that, based on the criteria developed by the GEF for the process of accreditation, SPREP was well placed on all counts to be accredited. The fiduciary standards and financial management capacities required will be more expeditiously satisfied because of the major enhancements to SPREP's management systems implemented over the immediate past eighteen months. In addition the process that SPREP had been through in regards to the Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund accreditation had also provided valuable lessons learned for seeking GEF accreditation.

222. Australia supported the application, which it considered to be a helpful step for the region in terms of increasing PIC ownership of the GEF process. Australia noted the deadline for application was the end of the year and asked for more details on the process of

application. The representative also observed that once the application was put through, pending regional GEF projects would possibly be temporarily put on hold. He also asked whether other regional agencies were also applying for such accreditation, and suggested that the role of becoming a project agency for GEF should be linked to the priorities in the Strategic Plan in the recommendations.

223. The Secretariat advised that the deadline of 31 December 2011 would be met; and that discussions with other CROP agencies confirmed their approval of the SPREP application. The Secretariat also advised that the Secretary General of PIFS had given verbal approval on the application. The Secretariat also noted that accreditation as a GEF implementing agency would allow it to better serve Members in implementing the Strategic Plan.

224. Tonga, Cook Islands, United States and Vanuatu supported the recommendation, and Vanuatu stated that all were aware that there are a number of current implementing agencies active in the region, however, it would be important that there be at least one regional Pacific agency accredited.

225. Solomon Islands sought clarification on SPREP's comparative advantage with the existing implementing agencies. The Secretariat advised that the direct contact and knowledge of country concerns would better place SPREP to respond to country concerns. In addition, there were complementarities with other CROP agencies and good working relationships with the existing implementing agencies.

226. New Zealand agreed that there were potential merits in the Secretariat becoming a GEF implementing agency, but requested that if the application was successful, the Secretariat report on the cost implications and other relevant issues such as staffing levels required to service this new function.

227. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the proposal that the Secretariat apply for accreditation as a GEF Project Agency to provide Members with another choice of GEF Agency;
- **noted** the aim of this application is to more effectively implement the SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-15, to support the priorities of Pacific Island Countries and Territories; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to provide an update to the 2012 SPREP Meeting on the status of this application.

8.3: Consideration and Approval of Proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2012

228. The Secretariat presented its 2012 proposed Work Programme and Budget for approval by the Meeting. The Secretariat advised that the structure of the new Work Programme and Budget has been modified to reflect the new SPREP Strategic Plan. Each item outlines targets, indicators and activities in 2012 and a detailed budget for each item. This is a financially balanced budget. EU has noted SPREP financial practice as internationally acceptable.

229. Tonga, American Samoa, Cook Islands, Australia, New Zealand, New Caledonia, Federated States of Micronesia, Samoa, Papua New Guinea, United States and Vanuatu took the floor and congratulated the Secretariat on presenting a balanced budget for 2012.

230. Tonga noted that the budget ratio of operational costs to staff salary/personnel costs was an important indicator for a good work programme and budget and observed that the Secretariat's ratio of 75% operational

versus 25% personnel costs was well in excess of the allowable ratio used worldwide and made reference to Tonga's own national budgeting.

231. American Samoa noted the balance budget and that it aligned with the SPREP Strategic Plan.

232. Australia observed with appreciation that the unfunded positions were reflected in the proposed budget. The representative noted that the budget was becoming increasingly complex, and highlighted that his country was moving to multi-year funding with a view to a longer term strategic approach to engagement with SPREP. Australia suggested that there would be value in having a working group on finance matters to work through finance issues with the Secretariat.

233. New Zealand supported the comments of Australia and sought clarification from the Secretariat on the non-inclusion of the Island Climate Update in the work programme and budget and noted that New Zealand has provided two years worth of funding for this already. The representative also sought clarification on the status of the outgoing PI-GCOS Officer position and whether this would be transferred to the Pacific Meteorological Desk. He mentioned that due to the late submission of the work programme and budget, New Zealand could endorse the recommendation but was unable to confirm the exact level and nature of financial support to SPREP for 2012. New Zealand observed that income from the SPREP programme support fees had increased but was concerned that the relative increase may not adequately cover project administration costs. He highlighted concern that there was risk that Member contributions could be used as a subsidy for the implementation of ongoing projects.

234. New Caledonia congratulated the Director and the Secretariat for the clarity of the budget and for regaining the confidence of donors. The representative requested clarification regarding the discrepancy between increase in the activities of the Secretariat for waste management and that shown in the budget presentation (24% and 6% respectively).

235. The Secretariat clarified that the increase was in actual activities and not the budget. It noted that a number of partners were supporting the solid waste strategy, such as Japan (8 million dollars) and that these funds were going straight to countries and not SPREP. The Secretariat highlighted that there were also a number of pipeline proposals developed which would result in relative increases in this area.

236. United States requested clarification of an apparent 3-fold increase in NOAA contributions for 2011-2012 and requested information on where the additional funding would come from. The Secretariat agreed to meet with NOAA to clarify these issues.

237. France informed the parties that a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) had been signed between the French Agency for Marine Protected Areas and the Secretariat. Under this instrument, both institutions were working together to submit an application to a call for proposals from the European Commission: this project aims to develop a technical approach to decision-making to support the implementation of policies for the integrated management of marine areas and ecosystems. It was the hope of France that this proposal would be accepted and that the Secretariat would be able to add a new activity and new financial resources to the 2012 programme.

238. The Meeting:

- **approved** the proposed Work Programme and Budget of USD\$14,317,591 for 2012.

9.4 Amendment to Staff Regulations

239. The Secretariat presented the paper on the proposed amendments to Staff Regulations and its annexes. Following the decision of the 21st SPREP Meeting in Madang, the Secretariat had engaged in discussions with an open-ended working group comprising of Australia, Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia, United States and Tokelau to ensure a more effective means of approving any changes of purely operational and administrative matters rather than the higher level policy issues.

240. The Secretariat advised that the Staff Regulations had been identified as dated and becoming cumbersome and ineffective given the daily needs of the organisation. The overarching concern for the Secretariat was that the existing Staff Regulations contains some issues of a purely operational and administrative character and, to effect change to some of these procedural issues, approval has to be sought from Members at the annual SPREP Meeting.

241. Samoa, as chair of the open-ended working group, noted that the paper is self-explanatory, thanked the Members for their participation and called for other Members to volunteer to participate in the working group.

242. Australia and French Polynesia sought clarification on the costs of the consultant, and whether the costs were included in the 2012 budget. They also asked if the task could have been done in-house. The Secretariat was asked a question as to whether a one year cycle might be too long in terms of dealing effectively with changes to staff regulations.

243. The Secretariat advised that a consultancy was just one option but one that was fairly quick to implement, but it would be open to other suggestions. It was stressed, by the Secretariat, that there was a need to separate operational matters from policy matters, and that while both sets of issues would have to be brought to the SPREP Meeting, the Secretariat proposed that only policy issues should be addressed by the SPREP Meeting, while day to day operational matters should be handled by Director.

244. French Polynesia also asked about the need to distinguish between operational and policy matters, which had not been made entirely clear. The representative welcomed the fact that the allocation in the budget for consultancies was half of what had been originally suggested. He also requested information on the tendering process and whether this opportunity would be advertised in all Member states. The Secretariat responded that the working group had favored transparency and independence and had thus opted for the consultancy as the preferred option. In terms of an example of the distinction between operational and policy issues, the 21st SPREP Meeting adoption of an extension to the entitlement for container sizes for staff appointments was highlighted, and the Secretariat observed that this was an example of the sort of operational issues that need not come to the SPREP Meeting. It was noted that this was also an issue under consideration and review in the CROP harmonization process. In response to the estimated costs of the consultancy, the Secretariat advised that an estimate of US\$20,000 had been included in the budget.

245. New Zealand sought clarification on whether decisions in the working group would be brought to the SPREP meeting. The Secretariat replied that any changes to the regulations would come back to the SPREP Meeting, but with a distinction between policy

issues that would require discussion, and operational issues recommended by the working group that could be adopted formally. In cases where the working group would be enabled to make such a delineation, after working with staff, those issues as well as any recommendations would come back to the SPREP Meeting.

246. The Meeting:

- **approved** the engagement of an independent consultant to work with the Secretariat in reviewing the existing Staff Regulations;
- **approved** the draft Terms of Reference attached for the reviews; and
- **agreed** to the working group continuing to meet inter-sessionally with the Secretariat and the Consultant and submit a final draft of the amended Staff Regulations to the next SPREP Meeting.

9.5 A SPREP Director's Job Description, Salary Banding & Performance Assessment

This was a closed session.

247. The Meeting agreed to:

- **establish** an inter-sessional Working Group to further examine the Directors' Job Descriptions and Salary Bandings; and
- **agreed** that the committee will include but not be limited to Samoa, American Samoa, NZ, Australia, French Polynesia, United States.

9.6 SPREP Director's Performance Assessment

248. The Secretariat presented a proposal that, in line with best practices, would establish a process to evaluate the Director's annual performance. The process proposed that the same Performance Development System (PDS) policy and system used for staff, be adopted for assessment of the Director's performance on an annual basis and that the performance assessment be conducted by a group of three – a Troika consisting of the immediate past Chair, current Chair and next Chair.

249. The Director's 2011 PDP, endorsed by the immediate past chair was submitted to the Meeting.

250. The Meeting:

- **approved** the key achievements of the Director for 2010 (**Attachment 1**) including the Secretariat's Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Review and for performance reward to follow the same approach as that done for all staff;
- **approved** the 2011 Performance Development Plan for the Director (**Attachment 2**) to be used for his annual evaluation in early 2012;
- **approved** the establishment of a Troika (immediate past Chair, current Chair and next Chair) to be chaired by the current Chair, to assess the performance of the Director on an annual basis, in line with the Secretariat's Performance Development System. The Troika shall provide a report to the members at the next Annual Meeting; and

- **noted** that the Secretariat will provide advice and assistance on the process for the Troika.

9.7 Staff Appointments Beyond 6 Years

251. The Secretariat presented the cases to be discussed, processes followed, and new directives issued to clarify the application of the 6-year rule.

252. American Samoa recognised the value of maintaining good services and noted that a fair, merit-based process had been followed. American Samoa further recognised the contributions of Alofa Tuuau and Stuart Chape over the years and the value of their accumulated experience. American Samoa considered both staff members as assets to SPREP and supported the re-appointment of both staff.

253. Cook Islands also supported the recommendations for both re-appointments and commended the Secretariat on its management of the recruitment process.

254. French Polynesia noted, with satisfaction, the renewal of the contracts for both professionals and found that the conditions for employment the recruitment conditions remain attractive in spite of the deterioration that had been identified in the SDR and reference markets since in excess of 60 applications had been received for each of these positions.

255. Tonga noted the composition of the selection panels and asked whether the representation of the Secretariat on such panels could be reduced and balanced by increased representation by Members, but supported the recommendations as written.

256. Samoa also supported the recommendations and congratulated the two re-appointees. Samoa advised the Meeting that Samoa does not have “shadow ministers”, and asked that the meeting record be amended to correct this (in the relevant working paper).

257. Federated States of Micronesia also congratulated the two re-appointees and the Secretariat for its recruitment process.

258. The Meeting:

- **noted** the reappointment of Mr Stuart Chape to the position of Programme Manager, Island Ecosystems, for another three year term; and
- **noted** the reappointment of Ms Alofa Tuuau to the position of Finance Manager, for another three year term.

9.8 SPREP Building Proposal to Accommodate Climate Change Activities

259. The Secretariat presented its proposal for funding to build a climate change centre at the SPREP headquarters and advised Members that the Secretariat had been invited to submit an application to JICA for a new building to accommodate the organisation’s growing climate change programme.

260. Samoa stated that in its capacity as host country of the SPREP Secretariat, the Government had submitted, on behalf of SPREP, the new building proposal for which a decision by the Government of Japan was pending. Samoa also proposed a change to the proposed recommendation (from “endorse” to “note”) given that the proposal had already been sent.

261. American Samoa commented on the good initiative and thanked the Government of Samoa for submitting the proposal.

262. Federated States of Micronesia also agreed on the initiative but expressed concern on the process and stated that in future the Secretariat should seek advice prior to such proposals so that Members were better prepared and the issue would only need to be brought to the Meeting for noting.

263. New Zealand stated that this proposal might have financial implications in the long term, for example, maintenance and other costs, and that it would have appreciated being better informed about the application prior to the Meeting, as noted by Federated States of Micronesia. New Zealand welcomed the proposed eco-friendly components of the initiative and hoped that this would be a first substantial step for the Secretariat becoming a carbon neutral agency.

264. United States thanked the Secretariat for seizing this initiative and noted that it was an opportunity to build a Pacific showcase for climate friendly construction, perhaps the first platinum LEEDS certified building in the Pacific.

265. The Meeting:

- **noted** the Application being made to JICA for Grant Aid to Build a Climate Change Centre.

9.9 Risk Management Plan

266. The Secretariat presented its Risk Management Plan (RMP) noting that in 2008, the European Commission Audit had noted the need for a RMP and this was presented at the previous SPREP meeting. The Secretariat highlighted the plan is a key element of the change management process and will enable the organisation to prioritise effectively.

267. The Secretariat advised that the RMP was a living document and subject to change during an annual review. The Secretariat also advised that the RMP had been noted in the recent EU Audit.

268. Australia commended the Secretariat for an excellent risk management plan, and noted that a small number of elements required further work.

269. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the SPREP 2011 Risk Management Plan.

Agenda Item 10: Items Proposed by Members

10.1 Country Profiles – Exchange of Information by Members on Year of Dugong

270. The Chair noted the excellent work reported on during the previous agenda items, and suggested that Members submit papers to the Secretariat for compilation, circulation and as a record for future reference.

271. The Meeting:

- **agreed** to submit national reports as soon as possible to the Secretariat.

10.2 E-waste (Cook Islands)

272. Cook Islands advised the Meeting its national initiative called the E-day, which had involved national and regional partnerships. The general objectives were to reduce e-waste, increase community awareness and promote safer disposal, with a focus on computer equipment. Working with a New Zealand company, a pilot voluntary programme was instigated. There is currently no e-waste storage in the Cook Islands, a common feature

in the region. A committee was established to work on collection of e-waste, assisted by SPREP and other partners. At a cost in-country of NZ\$ 13,000 and an estimated shipping cost of NZ\$ 78,000, they were able to collect almost 40 tons of computers that were eventually shipped in 7 containers over 2 days, and there are still some e-waste computers remaining. The future-looking work also took into account the donations from abroad of computers and looking to their future disposal. Cook Islands has now agreed to work with Kiribati and Samoa through SAICM on practical measures to reduce e-waste. The representative noted that this is becoming a huge concern in the region.

273. American Samoa noted that his country also faced a similar problem and appreciated the information and the sharing of this experience.

274. French Polynesia noted that this was a de-stocking operation initiated by the country to collect computer equipment only as a component of e-waste and encouraged such initiatives to continue while also looking at wider e-waste materials, and that waste processing should be considered in the future. In the long term it would be useful to entice producers and distributors to shoulder the financial responsibility for this.

275. The Meeting:

- **noted** the presentation by the Cook Islands.

Agenda Item 11: Regional Cooperation

11.1 CROP Executives Meeting Report, including the Climate Change Task Force

276. The Secretariat provided an advance verbal report on the CROP CEO meeting 2011,

pending the completion and dissemination of the formal report.

277. Key issues of these deliberations were: strengthening the coordination of the CROP agencies activities and functioning in order to work more effectively together to serve Members; the progress of the implementation of recent decisions on the regional institutional framework; and the functioning of the CROP thematic working groups, e.g. the CROP Sustainable Development Working Group on Rio+20 and the Marine Sector Working Group on Oceanscape.

278. The formation of a Climate Change Task Force to develop the regional technical support mechanism and partnerships for supporting adaptation, mitigation, policy and financing climate change issues and facilitating of climate change resilience capacity building in Member states, was also covered.

279. The Meeting:

- **noted** the Secretariat's verbal report on the CROP Executives Meeting Report and the Climate Change Task Force.

11.2 Clean Pacific Campaign

280. The Secretariat presented the Clean Pacific Campaign recalling the recommendation made at the 21st SPREP Meeting to endorse the Waste Reduction and Pollution Prevention Campaign for 2012. It noted commitment by Members to fully participate in planning and delivery and to nominate campaign focal points.

281. The Secretariat advised that 12 Members had provided the nomination with four providing response to the Draft Waste Reduction and Pollution Campaign. It further

advised that USD35,000 had been secured and that an additional USD167,000 is needed.

282. New Caledonia sought clarification on the deadline for submitting nominations, highlighting that the information had been circulated within two of the three provinces that are competent in matters relating to the environment.

283. The Secretariat stated the end of October, 2011 as the deadline for campaign focal point nomination.

284. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the Campaign Framework in Table 1, with the understanding that the "High Priority" objectives will be targeted based on the secured budget, with other activities implemented as additional funds are secured; and
- **reaffirmed** commitment to implementation of the Clean Pacific campaign and **agreed** to submit outstanding focal point nominations.

Agenda Item 12: Statements by Observers

285. Statements were made by several observers at the Meeting. A full list of the observers and text of their statements is attached as Annex 5.

Agenda Item 13: Other Business

286. No matters were raised under this Agenda Item.

**Agenda Item 14: Date and Venue of
Twenty-third SPREP Meeting**

287. In accordance with SPREP policy of alternating venues between Members and Headquarters for cost reasons, New Caledonia offered to host the 23rd SPREP Meeting in 2012.

288. The Meeting unanimously accepted and thanked New Caledonia for its kind offer.

**Agenda Item 15: Adoption of Report of
the Twenty Second SPREP Meeting**

289. The Meeting adopted the Report of Proceedings.

Agenda Item 16: Close

290. The Chair thanked all representatives for their contributions to their discussions, noting that they had accomplished a significant amount over the 3-day meeting. She commended the Secretariat for the excellent organisation of the 22nd SPREP Meeting.

291. The Director thanked the Chair for her leadership and acknowledged delegates for their active participation. He further thanked the interpreters and translators and the Secretariat staff for their assistance in organising and contributing to the week's events and to the success of the Meeting.

Annex 1: List of Participants**AMERICAN SAMOA**

American Samoa Protection Agency (EPA)
PO Box PPA
PAGO PAGO, American Samoa 96799
Tel: +684 633 2304
Fax: +684 633 5801

Dr. Fanuatele To'afa Vaiaga'e
Director
Email: tvaiagae@gmail.com

Ms. Va'asa Simanu
Assistant Director
Email: vaasa.asepa@gmail.com

Ms. Marina Illingworth
Program Manager
Australian Agency for International Development
PO Box 214
Suva, Fiji
Tel: +679 338 8352
Email: marina.illingworth@ausaid.gov.au

Mr. Cameron Darragh
DCCEE
c/o PO Box 240
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 21929
Fax: +685 20231
Email: cameron.darragh@sprep.org

AUSTRALIA

Mr. Andrew McNee
Assistant Secretary, Strategic & Advice Branch
DEWHA
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Tel : +612 6274 2490
M: +614 9697-039
Email: andrew.mcnee@environment.gov.au

Dr. Stephen Powell
EL2, Rio+20 Taskforce
Dept of Sustainability, Environment, Water
Population and Communities
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Tel: +612 6274 2445
Fax: +61 2 6274 2446
Email: Stephen.Powell@environment.gov.au

Mr. Ryan Medrana
First Secretary
Australian Agency for International Development
PO Box 214
Suva, Fiji
Tel: +679 338 8360
Email: ryan.medrana@ausaid.gov.au

COOK ISLANDS

Mr. Vaitoti Tupa
Director
National Environment Service
PO Box 371
Rarotonga, Cook Islands
Tel : (682) 21 256
Fax: (682) 22 256
Email: Vaitoti@oyster.net.ck

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

Mr. Andrew Yatilman
Director
Office of Environment & Emergency
Management
FSM National Government
PS-69 Palikir, Pohnpei
FSM 96941
Tel: (691) 320 8814/5
Fax: (691) 320-8936
Email: andrewy@mail.fm

FRANCE

Hadelin De La TOUR du PIN
Ambassadeur
Secrétaire Permanent pour le Pacifique
France/Ministère des Affaires Étrangères &
Européennes
Ministère Charge de l'Outre-Mer
27 rue Oudinot 75358
Paris 07 SP, France
Tel: +33 6 08 96 43 39
Fax: (689) 47.22.71
E: hadelin.delatourdupin@diplomatie.gouv.fr

Mr. Marc Fagot
Chief of Department
Ministry of Ecology
France
Tel: +331 4081 7867
Email:
marc.fagot@developpementdurable.gouv.fr

FRENCH POLYNESIA

Hon. Jacky Bryant
Minister
Department of Environment
Papeete
French Polynesia
Tel: (689) 508860
Fax: (689) 508860
Email: jacky.bryant@environment.min.gov.pf

Mr. Engel Raygadas
Chief Executive Officer
Environment Department
BP 100 Papeete, Tahiti
French Polynesia
Tel: (689)-47 22 76
Fax: (689) 47 22 71
Email: engel.raygadas@environment.gov.pf

Mr. Bruno Peaucellier
Director
International Relations
PO Box 2581
98213 Papeete, Tahiti
French Polynesia
Tel: (689)-47 22 76
Fax: (689) 47 22 71
Email: bruno.peaucellier@presidence.pf

MARSHALL ISLANDS

Ms. Yumiko Crisostomo
Director
Office of Environmental Planning and
Policy Coordination (OEPPC)
PO Box 975
MAJURO 96960
Republic of the Marshall Islands 96960
Tel: (692) 625 7944
Fax: (692) 625 7918
Email: yumikocrisostomo@gmail.com or
oeppc@ntamar.net

NAURU

Mr. Michael Aroi
Director Regional Affairs
Department of Commerce & Industry &
Environment
Republic of Nauru
Tel: (674) 557 3133
Email: mike.aroigmail.com

NEW CALEDONIA

Mr. Bruno Iekawe
Government of New Caledonia
Ministry of Sustainable Development
BP M 98849 Noumea cedex
Government of New Caledonia
Tel: +64 24 65 55
Email: bruno.iekawe@gouv.nc

Dr Yves LAFOY
Office of regional Cooperation and External
relations
14 rue Georges Clemenceau 98800
Noumea cedex
New Caledonia
Tel: +64 (0)27 2601 411
Email: yves.lafoy@gouv.nc

Ms. Anne-Claire Goarant
Regional Cooperation & External Affairs
Government of New Caledonia
14 rue G Clemenceau
98800 Noumea Cedex
New Caledonia
Tel: +687 250044
Fax: +687 250047
Email: anne-claire@gouv.nc

Ms. Caroline Machoro
Chief of the Department of Marine and
Freshwater Environment & resources of
Northern Province
BP 41 98860 Kone
New Caledonia
Tel: +687 47 72 00
Fax: +687 47 72 00
Email: c.machoro@province-nord.nc

Ms. Nathalie Baillon
Chief of the Department of Marine and
Freshwater Environment & resources of
Northern Province
BP 41 98860 Kone
New Caledonia
Tel: +687 47 72 17
Fax: +687 47 72 17
Email: n.ballion@province-nord.nc

Ms. Ghislaine Arlie
President of the Environment commission
of the Southern Province
Southern Province
BP L1 98849, Noumea cedex
New Caledonia
Tel: +687 25 80 00
Fax: +687 25 80 00
Email: ghislaine.arlie@province-sud.nc

Mrs. Christine Pollabauer
New Caledonia Congres
1, boulevard Vauban
98800 Noumea
New Caledonia
Tel: +687 25 80 00
Fax: +687 25 80 00
Email: iohlen@congres.nc

NEW ZEALAND

H. E Nick Hurley
High Commissioner
NZ High Commission Office
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 21711
Fax: +685 21711
Email: nick.hurley@mfat.govt.nz

Mr Stuart Horne
Deputy High Commissioner
High Commission Office
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 21 635
Fax: +685 20 086
Email: stuart.horne@mfat.govt.nz

Mr. Willy Morrell
Development Manager
International Development Group
MFAT
Wellington, New Zealand
Tel: +64 4 439 8618
Fax: +64 4 439 8618
Email: willy.morrell@mfat.govt.nz

Mr. Doug Ramsey
Manager, Pacific Rim
NIWA
PO Box 11115, Hamilton Gate
10 Silverdale Rd, Hamilton 3216
New Zealand
Tel: +64 7 859-1894
Fax: +64 7 856-0151
Email: d.ramsay@niwa.co.nz

Ms. Barb Hayden
Chief Scientist
Biodiversity & Biosecurity National Institute
NIWA
PO Box 8602, Christchurch 10 Kyle St
Riccarton, Christchurch 8011
New Zealand
Tel: +64 3 343 7878
Fax: +64 3 348 5548
Email: b.hayden@niwa.co.nz

Ms. Annie Wheeler
Senior International Advisor
Research and Development Group
Department of Conservation
National Office
Wellington, New Zealand
Tel: +64 9 307 4843
Fax: +64 9 307 4843
Email: awheeler@doc.govt.nz

NIUE

Mr. Sauni Tongatule
 Director
 Department of Environment
 PO Box 80
 Alofi, NIUE
Tel: (683) 4021
 Fax: (683) 4391
 Email: sauni.tongatule@mail.gov.nu

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Dr. Wari Iamo
 Secretary of the Dept of Environment & conservation-DEC
 Acting Executive Director
 Office of Climate Change & Development
 Papua New Guinea
 Tel: +675 325 0180
 Fax: +675 325 0182
 Email: wiamo@dec.gov.pg

Ms Gwendoline Sissiou
 Director
 Climate MRV
 Office of Climate Change & Development
 Papua New Guinea
 Tel: +675 325 0194
 Fax: +675 325 0183
 Email: gsissiou@yahoo.com

Ms. Kay Kalim
 Deputy Secretary
 Office of Climate Change & Development
 Port Moresby
 Papua New Guinea
 Tel: +675 325 0180
 Fax: +675 325 0182
 Email: kkalim@dec.gov.pg

Mr. James Sabi
 Manager, Technical Support Officer
 Office of Climate Change & Development
 Port Moresby
 Papua New Guinea
 Tel: +675 301 4500
 Fax: +675 325 0182
 Email: jsabi@dec.gov.pg

Ms. Ainesa Kole
 Logistic & Ministerial Support Officer
 Office of Climate Change & Development
 Port Moresby
 Papua New Guinea
 Tel: +675 325 0180
 Fax: +675 325 0182
 email: arkole@dec.gov.pg

SAMOA

Mr. Taulealeausumai Laavasa Malua
 Chief Executive Officer
 Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
 Apia, Samoa
 Tel : +685 23800
 Fax : +685 23176
 Email : taulealea.malua@mnre.gov.ws

Ms. Faalavaau Perina Sila
 Deputy CEO
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade
 Apia, Samoa
 Tel : +685 21171
 Fax : +685 21504
 Email : perina@mfat.gov.ws

Ms. Tasha Shon
 Assistant CEO - Political, International Relations
 & Protocol Division
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade
 Apia, Samoa
 Tel : +685 21171
 Fax : +685 21504
 Email : tasha@mfat.gov.ws

Mr. Faleafaga Toni Tipamaa
 Assistant CEO – Department of Environment & Conservation
 Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
 Level 3, DBS Building
 Apia, Samoa
 Tel: +685 23800/7267665
 Fax : +685 23176
 Email : toni.tipamaa@mnre.gov.ws

Mr. Mulipola Ausetalia Titimaea
 Assistant CEO - Meteorology
 Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
 Apia, Samoa
 Tel: +685 23800
 Email: ausetalia.titimaea@mnre.gov.au

Mr. Tagaloa Jude Kolhase
Assistant CEO - PUMA
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 23800
Email : jude.kolhase@mnre.gov.au

Mr. Suluimalo Amataga Penaia
ACEO, Water Resources Division
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 23800
Email : amataga.penaia@mnre.gov.au

Ms. Sala Josephine Stowers-Fiu
Assistant CEO – Legal Services
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Level 3, DBS Building
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 23800
Fax : +685 23176
Email : josephine.stowers@mnre.gov.ws

Ms. Filisita Heather
Assistant CEO - Land Management
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 23800
Email: filisita.heather@mnre.gov.au

Ms. Annie Rasmussen
Project Coordinator
Climate Change
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Level 3, DBS Building
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 20855
Fax: +685 20855
Email: annie.rasmussen@mnre.gov.ws

Ms. Malama Moemoemausu
Project Coordinator - MESL
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 23800
Email: malama.moemoemausu@mnre.gov.ws

Ms. Natasha Kolose
SLM Coordinator
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 23800
Email: Natasha.kolose@mnre.gov.ws

Ms. Moira Faletutulu
PACC
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 23800
Email: moira.faletutulu@mnre.gov.ws

Ms. Elizabeth Kerstin
Senior Parks & Reserves Officers
Department of Environment & Conservation
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 28680/23800
Fax: +685 23800
Email: elizabeth.kerstin83@gmail.com

Mr. Malaki Iakopo
Principal Policy & Regulatory Officer
Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 23800
Email: malaki.iakopo@mnre.gov.ws

SOLOMON ISLANDS

Hon. John Moffat Fugui
Minister
Ministry of Environment, Climate Change
Disaster Management & Meteorology
PO Box 21
Honiara, Solomon Islands
Tel: +677 21348/23032 Ext:212
Fax: +677 28054 Mb: +677 95147
Email: minister@mecm.gov.sb

Mr. Rence Sore
Permanent Secretary
Department of Environment, Climate Change
Disaster Management & Meteorology
Honiara, Solomon Islands
Tel: +677 23031
Fax: +677 23031
Email: ps@mecm.gov.sb

Mr. Joe Horokou
Director
Department of Environment, Climate Change
Disaster Management & Meteorology
Honiara, Solomon Islands
Tel: +677 23031
Fax: +677 23031
Email: horokoujoe@gmail.com

Mr. Casper Supa
Project Coordinator
Ministry of Agriculture & Livestock
Honiara
Solomon Islands
Tel: +677 28337
Mb: +677 852 4247
Email: ckasie@gmail.com

TOKELAU

Ms. Liza Lister-Lui
Health Manager
Tokelauan Affairs
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685-20822
Fax: +685 21761
Email: liza.kelekolio@lesamoa.net

Mrs. Fuatino Ah Wai
Personal Assistant
Tokelauan Affairs
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685-20822
Fax: +685 21761
Email: fuatino.ahwai@lesamoa.net

TONGA

Mr. Asipeli Palaki
Director
Ministry of Environment & Climate Change
PO Box 917
Nukualofa, Kingdom of Tonga
Tel: (676) 23611/23210
Fax: (676) 23216
Email: ceo@lands.gov.to

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dr. Norman Barth
Regional Environment Officer
31 Loftus street
US Embassy Suva
Suva, FIJI
Tel: +679 331-4466
Email: barthnh@state.gov

Ms. Kelly A. Cohun
International Relations Officer
Office of Ocean & Polar Affairs
Bureau of Oceans & International Environmental
And Scientific Affairs, U.S Dept of State.
2201 C Street NW, Room 2758
Washington, DC 20520, USA
Tel: +202-647-3073
Fax: +202-647-1106
Email: cohunka@state.gov

Ms. Sandeep Singh
Regional Environmental Affairs Specialist
31 Loftus street
US Embassy Suva
Suva, FIJI
Tel: +679 331-4466 Ext 8210
Email: singhsk1@state.gov

Ms. Kristen Koyama
International Affairs Specialist - NOAA
1401 Constitution Avenue NW
Washington DC 20230
Tel: +202 482 2653
Email: kristen.koyama@noaa.gov

Ms. Helene Takemoto
Senior Program and Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Honolulu District
Fort Shafter, Hawaii
Tel: 808-438-6931
E: Helene.Y.Takemoto@poho1.usace.army.mil

Mr. Phillip Andreozzi
Senior Policy Analyst & Regional Coordinator
US National Invasive Species Council
1201 EYE St.NW Suite 570A/5th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202-354-1882
Mb: 202-615-3383
Email: Phillip_Andreozzi@ios.doi.gov

Mr. Rolf Anderson
Chief, Office of Energy and Environment
U.S. Agency for International Development
8th Floor PNB Financial Center
Pres. Diosdado Macapagal Boulevard
Pasay City, Philippines 1308
Tel: +632 552 9821
Mb: +63 917 8405035
Email: randerson@usaid.gov

Mr .Kerry Reeves
Environment Officer
U.S. Agency for International Development
8th Floor PNB Financial Center
Pres. Diosdado Macapagal Blvd, Pasay City
Philippines 1308
Tel: +632 552 9821
Fax: +632 552 9997
Email: kreeves@usaid.gov

VANUATU

Hon. Steve Kalsakau Mauterei
Minister
Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
PMB 9063
Port Vila, Vanuatu
Tel: +678-23105/22892
Fax: +678-22213
Email: kkaloris@vanuatu.gov.au

Mr. Albert Williams
Director
Department of Environment & Conservation
PMB 9063
Port Vila, Vanuatu
Tel: +678 22227/25302
Mobile: +678-555-2174
Email: albert.williams52@gmail.com
Email 2: awilliams@vanuatu.gov.vu

Mr. Michael Mangawai
Executive Officer
Ministry of Land and Natural Resources
PMB 9063
Port Vila, Vanuatu
Tel: +678 22227
Fax: +678 22213
Email: mjmangawai@vanuatu.gov.au

Mr. Willie Kalo
2nd Political Advisor
Ministry of Land and Natural Resources
PMB 9063
Port Vila, Vanuatu
Tel: +678 22227
Fax: +678 22213
Email: mjmangawai@vanuatu.gov.au

Mr. Kaniaha Salesa Nihmei
Acting Director
Department of Environment & Conservation
PMB 9063
Port Vila, Vanuatu
Tel: +678 22468
Fax: +678 22310
Email: skaniaha@mateo.gov.vu

CROP AGENCIES/ADVISERS

PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM FISHERIES AGENCY (FFA)

Ms. Barbara Hanchard
Oceanic Fisheries Management
Project Coordinator
1 FFA Road, PO Box 629
Honiara, Solomon Islands
Tel: +679 21124 Ext. 216
Tel: +679 23995
Email: Barbara.hanchard@ffa.int

PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM SECRETARIAT (PIFS)

Dr Scott Cook
Economic Infrastructure Adviser
Pacific Island Forum Secretariat
Suva, Fiji
Tel: +679 322 0212
Tel: +679 322 0249
Email: scotth@forumsec.org.fj

Ms Coral Pasisi
Adviser
Pacific Island Forum Secretariat
Suva, Fiji
Tel: +679 322 0212
Tel: +679 322 0249
Email: coralp@forumsec.org.fj

SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY (SPC)

Ms Rhonda Robinson
Deputy Director
Water and Sanitation Program - SOPAC
Private Mail Bag, GPO
SUVA, Fiji
Tel: +679 338 1377
Mb: +679 338 1377
Email: rhondar@sopac.org

Ms Paula Holland
Manager, Natural Resources
South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission
(SOPAC)
Private Mail Bag, GPO
SUVA, Fiji
Tel: +679 338 1377
Mb: +679 338 1377
Email: paulah@sopac.org

Ms Tagaloa Delaine Cooper
Regional Communications & Coordination
Advisor
SPSLCMP
South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission
(SOPAC)
Private Mail Bag, GPO
SUVA, Fiji
Tel: +679 338 1377
Mb: +679 947 9733
Email: Tagaloa@sopac.org

UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC (USP)

Dr. Helene Jacot Des Combes
Research Fellow
The University of the South Pacific
Private Mail Bag, Laucala Campus
Suva, Fiji
Tel: +679 323 2192
Fax: +679 323 2891
Email: descombe_h@usp.ac.fj

OBSERVERS

BIRDLIFE INTERNATIONAL

Mr. Mark O'Brien
Senior Technical Advisor
Pacific Islands Program
Birdlife International
Suva, Fiji
Tel: +679 331 3492
Mb: +679 331 9658
Email: mark@birdlife.org.fj

CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL (CI)

PO Box 2035
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685-21593
Mb: +685-28570

Mr. Michael Donoghue
Executive Director
Pacific Islands Program
Conservation International
Email: mdonoghue@conservation.org

Ms. Sue Taei
Marine Program Director
Pacific Islands Program
Conservation International
Email: staei@conservation.org

Mr. James Atherton
Terrestrial Program Director
Pacific Islands Program
Conservation International
Email: jatherton@conservation.org

Mr. Schannel van Dijken
Marine Program Manager
Pacific Islands Program
Conservation International
Email: svandijken@conservation.org

Ms. Fono Valasi
Human Resources Manager
Pacific Islands Program
Conservation International
Email: fvalasi@conservation.org

CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY SPECIES (CMS)/UNEP

Dr Donna Kwan
Programme Officer-Dugongs
UNEP/CMS Office-Abu Dhabi
C/o Environment Agency- Abu Dhabi
Al Mamoura Building A, Al Muroor Rd (St No.4)
PO Box 45553
Abu Dhabi
United Arab Emirates
Tel: +971 (0) 2 6934 410
Mobile: +971 (0) 56 6987830
Email: dkwan@cms.int

CSIRO

Mr. Piers Dunstan
Research Scientist
GPO Box 1538
Hobart TAS 7001
Australia
Tel: +613 6232 5382
Fax: 613 6232 5485
Email: pies.dunstan@csiro.au

EUROPEAN UNION (EU)

Mr. Thierry Catteau
Attache
European Union- Fiji
Level 4, Fiji Development Bank Centre
360 Victoria Parade
Suva, Fiji
Tel: +679 331 3633
Mobile: +679 330 0370
Email: Thierry.catteau@eeas.europa.eu

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION (FAO)

Dr. Kevin Helps
Senior Officer – Pesticide Management
Pesticide Risk Reduction Group (AGPM)
Agriculture Division
Food & Agriculture Division of the UN
Rome, Italy
Email: Kevin.helps@fao.org

GIZ

Dr. Wulf Killmann
Program Director & Chief Advisor
GIZ
House 10, FORUM Sec Complex
Suva, FIJI
Tel: +679 3305 983
Email: wulf.killmann@giz.de
Email: wulfk@spc.int

INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR THE CONSERVATION OF NATURE (IUCN)

Mr. Taholo Kami
Regional Director - IUCN
Oceanic Regional Office
Private Mail Bag

Suva, Fiji
Tel: +679 331 9084
Mobile: +679 310 0128
Email: taholo.kami@iucn.org

Shyama Pagad
Manager, Information Services
IUCN SSC
University of Auckland
Auckland , New Zealand
Tel: +649 373 7599
Fax: +649 373 7042
Email: s.pagad@auckland.ac.nz

JAPAN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AGENCY (JICA)

Mr. Yuji Okazaki
Senior Special Advisor to the President
JICA Headquarters
Nibancho Center Building 5-25, Niban-cho
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-8012
Japan
Tel: +81 3 5226 9543
Email: okazaki.yuji@jica.go.jp

Mr. Hideo Noda
Director
Environmental Management Division 1
Global Environment Department
JICA Headquarters
Nibancho Center Building 5-25, Niban-cho
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-8012
Japan
Tel: +81 3 5226 9543
Email: noda.hideo@jica.go.jp

Mr. Manabu Aiba
Resident Representative
JICA Samoa Office
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 22 572
Email: aiba.manabu@jica.go.jp

Ms. Naoko Laka
Project Formulation Advisor
JICA Samoa Office
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 22-572
Email: laka.Naoko@jica.go.jp

Mr. Shiro Amano
JICA Expert (Chief Advisor)
Japanese Technical Cooperation Project
For Promotion of Regional Initiative on
Solid Waste Management
Pacific Island Countries (J-PRISM)
PO Box 240
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 21929 Ext: 253
Email: amano.shiro@jica.go.jp

Mr. Komei Kawauchi
JICA Expert
Japanese Technical Cooperation Project
For Promotion of Regional Initiative on
Solid Waste Management
Pacific Island Countries (J-PRISM)
Tel: +8 3 5956 7503
Email: kawauchi.k88@gmail.com

Mr. Keiko Kani
JICA Expert
Japanese Technical Cooperation Project
For Promotion of Regional Initiative on
Solid Waste Management
Pacific Island Countries (J-PRISM)
Tel: +8 3 6361 2453
Email: keiko_kani@kcc.co.jp

Mr. Hideo Azuma
JICA Expert
Japanese Technical Cooperation Project
For Promotion of Regional Initiative on
Solid Waste Management
Pacific Island Countries (J-PRISM)
Tel: +8 3 5956 7503
Email: hazuman@exri.co.jp

Mr. Hiromichi Kano
JICA Expert (Project Coordinator)
Japanese Technical Cooperation Project
For Promotion of Regional Initiative on
Solid Waste Management
Pacific Island Countries (J-PRISM)
PO Box 240
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685-21929 Ext: 258
Email: Kano.Hiromichi@jica.go.jp

Mr. Faafetai Sagapolutele
JICA Local Expert (Solid Waste Management)
Japanese Technical Cooperation Project
For Promotion of Regional Initiative on
Solid Waste Management
Pacific Island Countries (J-PRISM)
PO Box 240
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685-21929 Ext: 223
Email: faafetais@hotmail.com

PACIFIC INVASIVES INITIATIVE (PII)

Souad Boudjelas
Pacific Invasives Initiative (PII)
C/- School of Biology Sciences
University of Auckland
Private Bag 92019
Auckland , New Zealand
Tel: +649 923 6805
Fax: +649 373 7042
Email: s.boudjelas@auckland.ac.nz

RAMSAR

Mr. Llewellyn Young
Senior Regional Advisor for Asia-Oceania
Ramsar Convention Secretariat
28 rue Mauverney
CH-1196 Gland
Switzerland
Tel: +4 (0) 22 999 0177
Mobile: +4 (0) 79 290 2625
Email: young@ramsar.org

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ORGANISATION OF SAMOA (SROS)

PO Box 6597
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685-20664
Fax: +685-27769

Mr .Taitosaua Edward Winterstein
Manager
Environment & Renewable Energy (ERE)
Email: eddie.winterstein@sros.org.ws

Dr. Fiame Leo
Principal Research Scientist
Environment & Renewable Energy (ERE)
Email: fiame.leo@sros.org.ws

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMME (UNDP)**

Mr. Gabor Vereczi
Regional Technical Advisor
Climate Change Adaptation in the Pacific
UNDP Country Office
Private Mail Bag
Apia, Samoa
Tel : +685 27482
Mb: +685 7280081
Fax: +685 23555
Email: gabor.vereczi@undp.org

**UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME (UNEP)**

Mr. Alphonse Kambu
Programme Officer
Environment Law & Governance Branch
DELC, UNEP
P.O Box 47074 (00100)
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 20 7625226
Fax: +254 20 7623859
Email: Alphonse.Kambu@unep.org

Dr Greg Sherley
Task Manager Biodiversity Conservation
UNEP
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685-23670
Mobile: +685-7505346
Email: greg.sherley@undp.org

Mr. Jenny Roberts
Intern - UNEP
Private Bag
Apia, Samoa
Tel: +685 7292 597
Email: Jennifer.lucy.roberts@gmail.com

**WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION
(WMO)**

Mr. Robert Masters
Director
Development and Regional Activities Dept
7 bis, avenue de la Paix
Geneva
Tel: +41 (0) 22 730 8111
Fax: +41 (0) 22 730 8181
Email: rmasters@wmo.int

Mr. Henry Taiki
WMO Office for the South West Pacific Centre
PO BOX 3044
Vailima, APIA
SAMOA
Tel: +685 25706
Fax: +685 25771
Email: htaiki@wmo.int

Consultant

Mr. David Gowty
International Development Consultant
149 Kennedy Terrace, Paddington, Brisbane
Queensland 4064
Australia
Tel: +61 403495964
Email: davidgowtyandassociates@gmail.com

FRENCH LANGUAGE SOLUTIONS

Interpreters/Translators

Mr Olivier Richard
Ms Valerie Hassan
Mr Bertold Schmitt
Mr Pierre Pellerin
Ms Roseanne Trottier

Technician

Mr. Alan Doyle

SPREP SECRETARIAT

| | |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| PO Box 240 | Tel : (685) 21 929 |
| Vailima | Fax : (685) 20 231 |
| Apia, Samoa | Email : sprep@sprep.org |

David Sheppard
Director

Kosimiki Latu
Deputy Director

Stuart Chape
Programme Manager – Island Ecosystems

Dr. Netatua Pelesikoti
Programme Manager – Pacific Futures

Clark Peteru
Environmental Legal Adviser

Espen Ronneberg
Climate Change Adviser

Alofa S Tuuau
Finance Manager

Makereta Kaurasi-Manueli
Project Accountant

David Haynes
Pollution Prevention & Waste Management
Adviser

Lui Bell
Marine Species Officer

Dr. Alan Tye
Invasive Species Adviser

Bruce Jefferies
Terrestrial Ecosystems Management Officer

Tim Carruthers
Coastal Management Advisor

Easter Galuvao
Biodiversity Adviser

Anthony Talouli
Marine Pollution Adviser

Taito Nakalevu
Project Manager- PACC

Dr. Philip Wiles
PIGOOSC

Silia Kilepoa Ualesi
Project Manager- PIGGAREP

Sefanaia Nawadra
Sustainable Development Officer

Dr. Gillian Key
Capacity Development Adviser

Dr. Posa Skelton
Pacific Invasives Learning Network Coordinator

Peniamina Leavai
Project Officer - PACC

Dean Solofa
PI-GCOS Officer
Seema Deo
Education & Social Communications Adviser

Nanette Woonton
Media & Public Relations Officer

Epeli Tagi
IT Network & Systems Support Engineer

Christian Slaven
IT Database Developer Officer

Billy Chan Ting
IT Web Applications Developer Specialist

Simeamativa Leota-Vaai
Human Resource & Administration Manager

Tim Carruthers
Coastal & Marine Advisor

Makelesi Gonelevu
Knowledge Management Officer

Miraneta Williams
Assistant Librarian

Rosanna Galuvao
Executive Assistant to the Director

Apiseta Eti
Executive Assistant to the Deputy Director

Petaia l'amafana
Property Services Officer

Lupe Silulu
Registry Supervisor

Pauline Fruean
Conference & Travel Officer

Joyce Tulua
Secretary PM-Pacific Futures

Theresa Fruean-Afa
Programme Manager – IE Programme

SPREP Intern

Setaita Tavanabola
Clive Hawigen
Kathleen Leewai

Work Attachments

Trevor Durbin
Anne Badequin
Taniela Faletau
Andrew Kennedy

Annex 2: Official Address by the Honourable Prime Minister, Government of Samoa, Susuga Tuilaepa Aiono Lealefalea and Welcoming Remarks by the Director General, SPREP, Mr David Sheppard

Official Address by the Honorable Prime Minister of Samoa

Reverend Benjamin Tapelu
Hon. Ministers of Environment from French Polynesia, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu
The Director of SPREP
Members of Cabinet
Members of the Diplomatic Corps
Distinguished Delegates to the 22nd SPREP Meeting
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is a pleasure to address you all this evening, on the occasion of the Opening of the 22nd Annual SPREP meeting.

This gathering is an important event for a simple reason. You are here to discuss and keep informed on how best our environment can be developed in a sustainable way, based on the present and future concerns of our Pacific Island nations. Our environment sustains us, but it is now vulnerable to population pressures, ill-planned economic development, pollution and climate change. The degradation of our marine resources threatens a significant food source and foreign exchange earner. It has serious consequences for tourism, a major source of revenue for our economies. Finally, it adversely affects the quality of life of Pacific peoples, in terms of living in harmony with nature as our ancestors had done for several millennia.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am informed that the agenda for the SPREP meeting this year covers a range of issues including Pacific Mangroves initiatives, the status of coral reefs in the Pacific, an Oceania Humpback whale recovery plan, a revised Pacific Islands Framework of Action on Climate Change, strategies for improved regional waste

management including better public awareness, the Rio + 20 process and a proposal for the decentralization of SPREP services. These are crucial issues facing our communities and our environment and it is important that we give guidance to our Secretariat to continue its work in support of our national efforts.

I have just returned from the Pacific Islands Forum Leaders, and I welcome the Leaders' Waiheke Declaration on Sustainable Economic Development as timely, leading up to Rio+20. This reaffirms our regional commitment to sustainable development, and articulates key issues that can be taken to Rio+20 – and countries need to take this into account when formulating their national positions. I would urge all Pacific Island Countries to take an active part in the process leading up to the Rio conference next year.

I also welcome the strong support by Leaders for the Pacific Oceanscape and the appointment of the Oceanscape Commissioner. This further reinforces to the world prior to Rio+20 that for the Pacific, we want the Green Economy applied in a Blue World. Oceans and island issues need to be high on the Rio+20 agenda. We reiterated the critical importance of ensuring the sustainable development, management and conservation of our ocean, noting our region's high dependency on our oceans for livelihoods, food security and economic development. The Forum Leaders made a specific call for the 2012 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development to recognize the significant global value and contribution of our Pacific Ocean to sustainable development. This is a clear demonstration of the political commitment of Pacific leaders to the

stewardship of our natural resources by our own communities.

1. ECOSYSTEM AND INVASIVE SPECIES MANAGEMENT

While we celebrate our achievements and many successes in the protection and conservation of our island ecosystems, biodiversity and natural resources, it is important to note that the quality and quantity of our ecosystems and natural resources continue to decline due to many factors.

Invasive species pose one of the most serious threats to biodiversity conservation and the sustainable development of Pacific island communities. Across the Pacific invasive species, pests and diseases have contributed to economic losses. Examples include Samoa's taro productions and exports wiped out by the taro leaf blight, and the myna bird nuisance in its threat to endemic bird species and the general environment.

SPREP together with regional organizations with key partners are already working together with governments and organizations in the region to strengthen ecosystem management and conservation, as well as efforts to control invasive species. Obviously a key part of the success of this work depends on the government's commitment to provide support through the national policies planning and implementation.

Needless to say, our Pacific countries must work together with the rest of the world through the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and other international instruments. The Nagoya Protocol and the CBD Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 – 2020 adopted by 193 CBD parties in October 2010 should further strengthen our small islands working in partnership to achieve our goals in these vital areas.

In this context the network of marine protected areas by many island countries including territories for various marine species not only support the collective conservation work of our region but very importantly also facilitate sustainable economic development.

2. WASTE MANAGEMENT

The management and disposal of hazardous waste such as asbestos-containing materials and electronic wastes is a cause for concern in the Pacific region.

In order to protect Pacific communities from exposure to airborne asbestos fibres and work towards an asbestos-free Pacific, we need to be careful to protect all individuals who will be exposed to potential risk, be they residents, workers in the building and waste disposal industries, or disaster response personnel. The best means of protection may be a combination of initial stabilization of asbestos containing materials to minimize or prevent further release of fibres, followed by eventual removal and disposal. Development and adoption of regional and national asbestos policies under the new SPREP regional asbestos strategy will establish an appropriate framework for the Pacific that improves management of asbestos and promotes shared asbestos.

Similarly, the regional management of electrical and electronic wastes must include recovery and recycling to prevent future contamination of the environment. The recently drafted Pacific E-waste management strategy describes an integrated framework to progressively collect, store and dispose of E-waste in the region. It is supported by a five year action plan that should see a significant reduction in the amount of E-waste going to our landfills or being dumped in other dangerous ways in the Pacific.

3. UNFCCC PROCESS LEADING TO DURBAN

Pacific Island Countries have been engaged in the climate change negotiations since the very beginning, supported by SPREP and other CROP officials. It has been a long and strenuous process and saw the successful completion of negotiations on the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 and this implementation a few years later. We are now at a crucial point in time, with the time-bound targets of the Kyoto Protocol expiring in 2012. The protocol itself does not expire, but there is significant uncertainty then on its future, given the close inter-linkages between the various Kyoto mechanisms and those expiring targets.

Ever since the Bali Conference in 2007, our region has demonstrated our commitment to the development of a successor arrangement that would cover all emitters in the developed as well as developing countries categories. As you know, we are still some distance away from reaching a global agreement. This is a very serious concern for the region with the impact of climate change already clearly evident in all our island countries.

4. EXPECTATIONS OF PACIFIC ISLAND COUNTRIES (PICS)

The Pacific Island Countries have been meeting throughout the year and at many different venues, and I believe that the priorities and expectations that we are bringing forward are as follows:

On Green House Gas Mitigation:

We are now all aware of the correlation between climate change and the rise in temperatures and the effect of Green House Gases (GHG) concentrations on the temperature. The maths on targets for the reduction of emissions for each category of countries has already been made. Yet, there is still the ongoing debate on what can be realistically achieved both in terms of upper

limits to GHG concentrations and temperature increases. There have also been several permutations being advanced on how countries may achieve targets. All this must not however distract from the fact that the stabilization of global climate is a collective responsibility for all the forecast is grim particularly for Pacific islands if not enough is done and in time. Each of our countries must do our part. For Samoa, we are committed to reducing our dependence on fossil fuels and to be carbon neutral by 2020.

On Adaptation:

We need to build support for the work programme on loss and damage (noting that the final decision will be taken at COP18), so that a meaningful discourse can be held on what is entailed, what can be achieved and what is needed. Being a badly under-insured region, we would want to see a system that provides incentives for risk reduction. We must also advance our national activities to tap into the available funding opportunities from the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Adaptation Fund, and the Fast Start Financing through international and bilateral arrangements, to support our adaptation programmes. The major SPREP project to assist Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs) to implement ecosystem-based adaptation measure from climate-linked threats requires the support of our members to achieve its important goals.

On Legal options:

There are not many choices. It is either the COP17 adopts legally binding agreements in Durban (2 track), or the unfortunate adoption of a decision agreeing that there will be one at COP 18.

On Finance:

It has been a pleasure and honor for Samoa to represent our Pacific interest through Samoa's

participation in the Green Climate Fund Committee. I am informed that the upcoming COP will consider adopting recommendations on the design of the Green Climate Fund, and approves the Green Climate Fund as an operating entity of the financial mechanism of the Convention.

5. NEW STRATEGIC PLAN FOR SPREP

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The SPREP Strategic Plan was published after an extensive period of consultation with the organisation's Membership, Donors and other stakeholders. It identifies the areas of primary focus for SPREP for the period between 2011-2015. In this Plan, 'Climate Change' is identified as one of the four key areas to be targeted by SPREP in moving forward. The project which is the subject of this proposal falls within this area of the Strategic Plan.

Expansion of SPREP compound to accommodate increase in climate change activities:

I am aware that SPREP's climate change programme has expanded significantly in recent years, from 4 staff in 2006 to over 14 in 2011, placing space limitations on SPREP to further expand its climate change services to the region. A proposal by SPREP to climate proof, as well as utilize its office facilities as demonstrations of sustainable development supportive infrastructure, is an excellent initiative to further indicate our region's commitment to climate change mitigation. At the same time it will also demonstrate how the whole SPREP office setup is adapted to the changing capacity in supporting the needs of member countries because of the impacts of climate change.

Opportunities also exist for reducing waste and sewage at SPREP by connecting the current sewerage system to an anaerobic system in order to produce methane, compost and

irrigation water. This would not only lead to valuable lessons learned for the region in terms of climate change adaptation and mitigation, but would also serve as practical demonstrations of feasible sustainable architecture.

Samoa welcomes the proposals for the expansion of the SPREP facilities within its existing compound. SPREP's role as the lead agency for critical environmental issues including climate change and waste management is crucial for our region and the organizations must therefore have adequate accommodation for all its programmes.

To end my remarks, I wish the Honorable Ministers, the delegates, the development partners' representatives and regional agencies a successful meeting. I hope that you will be able to see and enjoy some of our country during your stay in Samoa.

It is a pleasure to now declare, the 22nd Meeting of SPREP officially opened.

Soifua ma ia manuia.



Welcome Address by the SPREP Director

Reverend Tapelu
Honourable Prime Minister of Samoa
Honourable Minister of Natural Resources and Environment of the Government of Samoa
Honourable Ministers of the Government of Samoa
Representatives of the Diplomatic Corps in Samoa
Distinguished Ministers and delegates to the SPREP Meeting
Dear guests
Ladies and gentlemen

Thank you Reverend Tapelu for your uplifting spiritual words this evening. And thank you to

the choir for their inspiring singing. We have made a great start.

Thank you, Prime Minister for honoring us with your presence tonight and for making time in your busy schedule to open this Opening Ceremony

I would like to extend a warm welcome to everyone to this Official Opening Ceremony. I hope your journey to our shores was a safe one, and thank you for making the time to attend this very important meeting.

I am well aware this is a busy time for all of us working in the environmental field and that you are all busy people.

This is my third SPREP meeting since returning as Director.

Last years' SPREP meeting set a clear direction for SPREP for the next 5 years by adopting the SPREP Strategic Plan for 2011 to 2015. This has been our guiding framework - or voyaging canoe, our vaka - for navigating environmental issues in our region over the next 5 years.

We have a clear direction and have made significant progress over the past year in addressing environmental issues in the Pacific. This has been possible by having many more paddlers – our partners – to help us move the SPREP canoe forward.

The environmental challenges in our region are immense and they are growing.

Last week's Pacific Islands Forum meeting in New Zealand reinforced climate change as the over arching challenge facing Pacific countries and territories.

Many of us gathered in Niue in March this year for the 3rd Pacific Climate Change Roundtable Meeting. We were able to see at first hand the immediate impacts of climate change and

extreme weather events, in particular the impacts of Cyclone Heta in 2004.

Climate Change is not just an environmental issue – it is an issue of survival with immense social, economic and moral dimensions.

Although our region contributes only 0.03% of the world's total greenhouse gas emissions, our countries are among the most vulnerable to the effects of climate change.

There is a need to act decisively – and to act now. Many Pacific countries and territories have risen to the challenge and are taking major and positive steps.

The Prime Minister of Tonga in his address to the Forum last week noted countries of the Pacific region have collectively committed that by 2020 50% of the region's energy will be from renewable energy. These are bold and very ambitious targets.

The SPREP and UNDP PACC Project – Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change – is now starting to demonstrate many practical outcomes which are helping Pacific Countries and Territories to adapt to climate change, particularly in sectors such as food security, health and agriculture. In a word of one of the delegates to the Niue Roundtable: "PACC is working". We need to build on this success and it is very positive to see donors such as Australia and the United States helping Pacific countries adapt to climate change by building on the PACC process and priorities.

Another positive trend has been to link climate change adaptation with disaster risk reduction and we applaud the efforts of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Tonga and other countries in developing Joint National Action Strategies and policies which link these key issues.

Climate Change is an issue for which our region requires support from the international community.

Pacific Environment and Finance Ministers met in Apia in July and welcomed new developments with climate financing such as the Cancun Green Fund and the associated Transitional Committee.

However, they urged developed countries to meet their commitments, particularly under the Copenhagen Accord and its associated fast start mechanism.

Forum leaders last week also emphasised that funding for climate change must flow more effectively and quickly to support Pacific island countries and territories to adapt to climate change.

We need to continue to exert pressure for a legally binding agreement to address climate change and specifically to limit greenhouse gas emissions. The Climate Change meeting in Durban in November this year is a vital step towards this goal.

Failure of the international climate processes is not an option for us in the Pacific. We need an outcome that guarantees a firm legal and institutional framework for action now, and for the future.

The loss of biodiversity remains a major challenge for Pacific countries and territories. The Biodiversity Convention meeting in Nagoya last year, CBD COP 10, was attended by many Pacific countries. We worked hard together under the umbrella theme of the Pacific voyage. The efforts of many in this room ensured the Pacific voice was heard and heard loudly.

Ambassador Feturi from Samoa reminded us at the Niue Climate Change Roundtable meeting that: *"no-one has a monopoly on good ideas"*. We applied this principle at the CBD COP 10

meeting. Wide ranging input from SPREP Members and partners ensured the Pacific voyage was a resounding success.

Biodiversity is essential for life in Pacific islands, it provides our food, our shelter, and underpins our livelihoods.

Biodiversity of Pacific island countries is being lost at alarming rates and the rates of biodiversity loss in our region are among the highest in the world for some species. Threats such as deforestation, overfishing, and invasive species must be addressed as a priority.

SPREP has expanded its programmes on biodiversity over the last year on land and at sea.

We have been pleased to support the Oceanscape proposal put forward by President Tong from Kiribati to ensure the better sustainable management and conservation of our precious Pacific ocean – the lifeblood of this region.

We have responded to Member requests to assist with the reduction of waste and pollution in Pacific countries and territories. Partnership from Japan and France is starting to make a difference in addressing the challenge of waste and pollution.

A wise person once said: *"if you want to run fast you go alone, if you want to go far you go together."*

SPREP aims to go far, and partnership has been fundamental to SPREP's change management process over the last few years.

We are pleased to welcome 40 observers to this years' SPREP meeting and we would like you to know how much we value our joint work together. Thank you.

Environmental challenges in the Pacific are enormous and we must all paddle together

and in the same direction if these challenges are to be effectively addressed.

We are pleased to have increased our partnerships so SPREP can better implement our Strategic Plan. We welcome the announcement from the United Kingdom that they will shortly apply to be a member of SPREP.

We have taken a different approach to this years' SPREP Meeting with the inclusion of a Pacific Environment Forum which aims to increase the technical content and focus of the meeting. I am pleased that today's forum has been a great success.

Over the coming week we will be reporting to this meeting on many positive developments with SPREP over the last year. In particular we have increased the range and scope of our activities in member countries and SPREP is becoming a more effective and dynamic organisation better able to serve our Members.

We have an important week ahead of us. We look forward to receiving the benefit of your collective wisdom and guidance as we move forward together on this path.

In closing I would like to acknowledge the hard work of SPREP staff, over the last year. I feel honored and very fortunate to be able to lead such a team of competent and hardworking men and women.

Many of you have had the opportunity to work directly with our staff members. We look forward to strengthening the bonds of this relationship and our friendship over the coming week and beyond.

I applaud the efforts of SPREP Members to ensure a better Pacific environment is passed on to our children and future generations.

Thanks are due to our host country. Samoa is a beautiful country and I hope you will be able to visit some of its sites and attractions. SPREP is indeed fortunate to be so generously and graciously hosted by the Government of Samoa. We deeply appreciate this support and generosity.

Thank you Prime Minister for your continued and strong support for SPREP over many years.

I look forward to a positive, busy and enjoyable week together.

Thank you,
Fa'afetai lava

Annex 3: Agenda

Agenda Item 1: Opening Prayer

Agenda Item 2: Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures

Agenda Item 4: Action Taken on Matters Arising from Twenty-first SPREP Meeting

Agenda Item 5: 2010 Overview

5.1 Presentation of Annual Report for 2010 and Director's Overview of Progress since the Twenty-first SPREP Meeting

5.2 Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the 2010 Annual Work Programme and Budget

5.3 Audited Annual Accounts for 2010

Agenda Item 6: Institutional Reform and Strategic Issues

6.1 Study on options for establishing a Sub-Regional Presence for SPREP

6.2 SPREP Secretariat New Organisational Structure

Agenda Item 7: Strategic Financial Issues

7.1 Report on Members' Contributions

7.2 Nauru's Membership Contribution Arrears

Agenda Item 8: 2012 Work Programme and Budget

8.1 Island Ecosystems Programme

8.1.1 2011 Pacific Year of the Dugong campaign and CMS collaboration

8.1.2 Oceania Humpback Whale recovery plan

8.1.3 Status of Coral Reefs in the Pacific (ICRI/Samoa)

8.1.4 Pacific Mangroves Initiatives (SPREP/IUCN)

8.2 Pacific Futures Programme

8.2.1 Launch of *revised PIFACC and Road Map for 2016*

8.2.2 Climate Finance – Global Environment Facility, Kyoto Adaptation Fund, Green Climate Fund, FEMM 2011 Outcomes

8.2.3 Regional Mechanism to Address Loss and Damage from Climate Change

8.2.4 Outcomes of 2011 Niue Pacific Climate Change Round Table (PCCR)

8.2.5 Pacific Meteorological Council's Meeting Outcomes

8.2.6 Rio + 20 Regional Process – Update

8.2.7 UNFCCC COP 17 in Durban

8.2.8 Draft Regional Asbestos Strategy

8.2.9 Draft E-waste Strategy

8.2.10 SPREP as Implementing Agency/Project Agency for GEF

8.3 Consideration and Approval of Proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2012

Agenda Item 9: Corporate Services

- 9.1 Annual Market Data
- 9.2 SDR Stabilisation Mechanism
- 9.3 Review of local staff terms and conditions
- 9.4 Amendment to staff regulations
- 9.5 SPREP Director's Salary Banding
- 9.6 SPREP Director's Performance Assessment
- 9.7 Report by the Director on Staff Appointment Beyond 6 years
- 9.8 SPREP Building Proposal
- 9.9 Risk Management Plan

Agenda Item 10: Items Proposed by Members

- 10.1 Country Profiles – Exchange of Information by Members on Year of Dugong.
- 10.2 E-waste (Cook Islands)

Agenda Item 11: Regional Cooperation

- 11.1 CROP Executives Meeting Report, including the Climate Change Task Force
- 11.2 Clean Pacific Campaign

Agenda Item 12: Statements by Observers

Agenda Item 13: Other Business

Agenda Item 14: Date and Venue of Twenty-Third SPREP Meeting

Agenda Item 15: Adoption of Report of the Twenty-Second SPREP Meeting

Agenda Item 16: Close

Annex 4: Draft Report on the Establishment of a Sub regional Presence for SPREP by Mr Gowty, Consultant

Consultancy to Assist the SPREP Secretariat in Exploring Options for Establishing a Sub-regional Presence in the Pacific Region

Preliminary Report

David Gowty

August/September 2011

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

Executive Summary

Summary of recommendations

Background

Methodology

Options for SPREP to establish a Pacific sub-regional presence

Synthesis of SPREP member, partner and donor consultations

Member country feedback

1. Donor partner feedback
2. Partner agency feedback
3. CROP and other regional agency feedback

Analysis and recommendations

Annexes

1. Terms of Reference
2. List of people and agencies consulted
3. Travel schedule
4. Generic Host Country Agreement

3. LIST OF ACRONYMS

BLI - Bird Life International

CBO - Community Based Organisation

CROP - Committee of Regional Organisations in the Pacific

CTI - Coral Triangle Initiative

FLNKS - Front de Liberation Nationale Kanak et Socialiste

FSM - Federated States of Micronesia

GCRMN - Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network

GEF - Global Environment Facility

HCA - Host Country Agreement

HQ - Headquarters

HR - Human Resources

ICR - Independent Corporate Review

ICRI - International Coral Reef Initiative

ISME - International Society of Mangrove Ecosystems

JICA - Japanese International Cooperation Agency

MAREPAC - Marine Resources Pacific Consortium

MCES - Micronesian Chief Executives Summit

MEA - Multilateral Environment Agreement

MOU - Memorandum of Understanding

MPA - Marine Protected Areas

MPS - Micronesian Presidents Summit

MSG - Micronesian Spearhead Group

PAN - Protected Area Networks

PACC - Pacific Adaptation for Climate Change

PICCAP - Pacific Islands Climate Change Adaptation Project

PCS - Palau Conservation Society

PICRC - Palau International Coral Reef Center

PICTs - Pacific Island Countries and Territories

PIFS - Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat

PIGGAREP - Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project

PNG - Papua New Guinea

POPs - Persistent Organic Pollutants

RIF - (Pacific) Regional Infrastructure Framework

RMI - Republic of the Marshall Islands

SD - Sustainable Developments

SPC - Secretariat of the Pacific Community

SPREP - Secretariat of the Regional Environment Programme

SRO - Sub-regional Office

TORs - Terms of Reference

UN - United Nations Organisations

UNDAF - United National Development Assistance Framework

UNFPA - United Nations Population Fund

UNICEF - United Nations Children's Fund

UNDP - United Nations Development Program

USA - United States of America

USP - University of the South Pacific

VMS - Vanuatu Meteorological Service

W&CPFC - Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 21st SPREP Meeting held in Madang, Papua New Guinea in September 2010, endorsed the concept of establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP in the Pacific region and called for the Secretariat to investigate options. The rationale for establishing a regional presence is to further strengthen and better align SPREP member activities with the 2011 – 2015 SPREP Strategic Plan and fulfil its regional mandate which is: *“To promote cooperation in the Pacific region and to provide assistance in order to protect and improve its environment and ensure sustainable development for present and future generations”*

In July 2011 the terms of reference (TOR) for a consultant to undertake a study of the options concerning establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP in the Pacific region were completed and a consultant appointed. The Secretariat developed and distributed a questionnaire to all Members and Key Partners/Donors to gather key input on their views on the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP, and how it will contribute to better delivery of services to PICTs, and enable SPREP to achieve the new strategic priorities under the new SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015.

The next step in the process involved extensive consultation during field visits to 7 Member countries in 2 sub-regional areas of Melanesia and Micronesia. These countries included 3 Micronesian islands of Palau, Marshall Islands and Federated States of Micronesia. The 4 Melanesian countries visited included Solomon Islands, Fiji, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea. No visits were made to Polynesian Member countries due to time and logistical constraints. However issues they raised in their questionnaire response was taken into consideration in the study. During the visits to the selected countries in Micronesia and Melanesia, consultations were held with relevant/key government officials of SPREP Members, donors and other partner stakeholders. Additionally, follow up consultations were held with relevant CROP

Agencies regarding the possibilities for co-location of SPREP staff and their experiences with decentralisation. Other consultations included discussions with SPREP Secretariat staff, as well as with relevant donors to ascertain options and interest in providing support for the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP.

The consultations findings and recommendations appear below. In summary, the notion of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in both Micronesia and Melanesia were overwhelmingly supported by a wide spectrum of agencies consulted during the study. Although it has not been possible to put a numerical figure on the cost/benefits of bringing SPREP services closer to the Members, there is substantial anecdotal evidence to support this initiative, based to a large extent on the decentralisation experiences of SPC and the UN Joint Presence Initiative. Both these regional agencies support SPREP decentralisation, as do the SPREP Pacific island Members consulted who anticipate that the establishment of a sub-regional presence in Micronesia and Melanesia will eventuate in mutual benefits and lead to more effective and efficient use of SPREP resources, as well as provide Members with greater opportunities to contribute to SPREP governance

5. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

(A) Micronesia

- 1) SPREP undertakes to establish a sub-regional presence in Micronesia as soon as possible, ensuring that a nucleus of relevant SPREP programmes are represented by either newly appointed or re-located staff.
- 2) SPREP explore with FSM and SPC the opportunity to co-locate an initial number of staff as mentioned above, to share office equipment and management costs, should the civil engineering assessment of the current SPC office building in Pohnpei prove to be structurally sound. Should the building prove to be unsound, FSM,

undertake to obtain an alternative building for both SPC and SPREP that they all agree is suitable for a joint CROP agency presence.

- 3) FSM be encouraged to actively seek funding to construct the Micronesian Village to include accommodation for SPC, SPREP and other CROP agencies to operate a joint CROP agency presence.

(B) Melanesia

- 1) SPREP undertakes to establish a sub-regional presence in Melanesia as soon as possible, ensuring that a nucleus of relevant SPREP programmes are represented by either newly appointed or re-located staff.
- 2) SPREP explore with Vanuatu the opportunity to co-locate an initial number of staff as mentioned above, to share office equipment and management costs with SPC to create a 'one stop joint CROP agency presence', once the renovations to the house allocated to SPC is completed. Should this arrangement fall through, and if the MSG Secretariat is willing, SPREP should negotiate with the MSG Secretariat to co-locate with them. If this arrangement is not acceptable, then a fall back position for SPREP would be to explore the option to co-locate with the VMS.

6. BACKGROUND

The 21st SPREP Meeting held in Madang, Papua New Guinea in September 2010, endorsed the concept of establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP in the Pacific region and called for the Secretariat to investigate options. The rationale for establishing a regional presence is to further strengthen and better align SPREP member activities with the 2011 – 2015 SPREP Strategic Plan and fulfil its regional mandate which is: *"To promote cooperation in the Pacific region and to provide assistance in order to protect and improve its environment and ensure sustainable development for present and future generations"* The 2009

Report on the Independent Corporate Review (ICR) of SPREP called on Members to consider implementing a strategy of decentralising Secretariat activities within the region in order to improve its effectiveness at the operational level. Rather than employing the current "fly-in, fly-out" approach, the ICR called for the placement of Secretariat staff in strategic sub-regional locations which would allow for sufficient time for both government staff in the relevant Pacific islands and territories (PICTs) that require extensive support, and Secretariat personnel to achieve planned outcomes. This is consistent with the current trend where some CROP, UN and other regional organisations have already placed staff at strategic sub-regional locations in order to provide improve the delivery of service to their Members.

7. METHODOLOGY

In July 2011 the terms of reference (TOR) for a consultant to undertake a study of the options concerning establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP in the Pacific region were completed and a consultant appointed. A copy of the TOR is attached to this report at Annex (1). The Secretariat developed and distributed a questionnaire to all Members to gather key input on their views on the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP, and how it will contribute to better delivery of services to PICTs, and enable SPREP to achieve the new strategic priorities under the new SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015. A copy of the questionnaire is attached to this report at Annex (iv). Additionally, the same questionnaire was distributed to Key Partners/Donors to also gather key input in the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP, and how it will contribute to better delivery of services to PICTs, and enable SPREP to achieve the new strategic priorities identified under the new SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015.

The next step in the process involved extensive consultation during field visits to 7 Member countries in 2 sub-regional areas of Melanesia and Micronesia. These countries included 3 Micronesian islands of Palau,

Marshall Islands and Federated States of Micronesia. The 4 Melanesian countries visited included Solomon Islands, Fiji, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea. No visits were made to Polynesian Member countries due to time and logistical constraints, however issues they raised in their questionnaire responses were undertaken by other means as mentioned below. Consultations were held with relevant/key government officials of SPREP Members, donors and other partner stakeholders through telephone, teleconference or video conference calls as part of following up the questionnaire responses. Additionally, follow up consultations were held with relevant CROP Agencies regarding the possibilities for co-location of SPREP staff and their experiences with decentralisation. Other consultations included discussions with SPREP Secretariat staff, as well as with relevant donors to ascertain options and interest in providing support for the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP.

8. OPTIONS FOR SPREP TO ESTABLISH A PACIFIC SUB-REGIONAL PRESENCE

As a result of discussions with the SPREP Secretariat, Members, donors and other CROP agencies and stakeholders there are four main options or models that SPREP could adopt should they decide to establish a sub-regional presence in the Pacific region. There are precedents for all these options due to other CROP and partner agencies already establishing various forms of sub-regional presence in the Pacific region. All these options have distinctive operational characteristics, as well as pros and cons. They include:

1) Co-location with a CROP or other agency.

Examples of this arrangement may be found in Pohnpei and Palau where a number of UN agencies, such as UNDP and UNICEF share an office known as the UN Joint Presence Initiative. Another example may be found in Vanuatu where the SPC Regional Rights Resources Team

(RRRT), the SPC human rights programme shared an office with the USP Faculty of Law.

The operational characteristics of this arrangement include all agencies managing their own programmes independently of each other, despite their common interests. Both agencies share certain office equipment, some operational costs and space proportionally on a mutually agreed basis, or else one agency pays the other to 'rent' space and facilities. This arrangement assists all agencies sharing support costs, such as a driver, receptionist and office cleaning services. As each agency has separate programmes they normally have negotiated a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or host country agreement (HCA) with the national government, as well as formalised arrangements between themselves to govern their co-location, including cost sharing and support services sharing arrangements. This arrangement has been described as a, 'marriage of convenience' between like minded agencies.

The advantages of co-locating with a CROP or other agency include a cost-effective way of establishing a presence in the country by sharing support and other services with a like-minded organisation, whilst maintaining an independent identity, presence and programme. It usually means that the joint office is staffed when duty travel in country or outside the country requires staff to be absent from the office. It also allows the agency to expand staff and programme activities incrementally and relatively smoothly. Another advantage is that the employees of the agencies sharing the office facilities are able to engage in professional cross sectoral interaction in a creative and fruitful collegial environment.

The disadvantages of co-locating with a CROP or other agency include the risk that one agency may dominate office space and facilities, unfairly cost split and the arrangement lead to divided loyalty amongst shared support staff. Should one of the agencies sharing the office decide to end the co-location arrangement, it could lead the remaining agency or agencies disadvantages. Additionally, shared offices may experience personality issues where one agency staff person is unable, for various reasons to happily share the office space harmoniously. And lastly, it has been mentioned that, “marriages of convenience” such as office space co-location have a history of ending in a bitter divorce.

2) Single agency with a number of staff supporting various regional projects

An exemplary example of this arrangement may be found in Pohnpei where SPC in 2007 established the SPC North Pacific Sub-regional Office. This office is headed by a manager and the professional staff all travel frequently to, and provide technical and other assistance to projects based in the sub-region. The office is governed by a HCA negotiated with the Government of FSM.

The overwhelming strength of this arrangement is that the countries in the sub-region feel that their priorities are better addressed and that their national development strategies and activities are better supported by the closeness and frequent attention by the sub-regional office staff. The advantage of technical staff located in the sub-region result in more responsive and cost effective travel, as well as countries feeling that they are getting good value as a result of their membership. Anecdotal evidence suggests that there are budget savings due to professional staff time and travel being rationalised and focused on the sub-region. The professional staff also feel that their improved knowledge of

conditions and priorities of the countries in the sub-region mean they are better able to tailor their technical assistance and inputs into national development plans of the countries in the sub-region.

The main disadvantages of a sub-regional office include the risk of communication problems that may arise due to the distance from HQ. In particular, the ICT and finance systems need to function well and be compatible with the HQ systems. A well functioning ‘Help Desk’ system needs to be established between the sub-regional office and HQ to address ICT and finance systems breakdowns, as well as sub-regional staff trained to use the systems. Additionally, HCAs need to be comprehensive, realistic and regularly monitored.

3) Single agency with a number of staff dedicated to supporting national projects

An example of this office arrangement can be illustrated by the SPC Solomon Island National office where the office is headed by an Officer-in-Charge with specific sectoral expertise. The staff are focused on a major project or dedicated to a specific sector or sub-sector. Additionally, the staff are dedicated to capacity building counterpart staff as well as providing technical assistance in the country where they are located. The national office presence is governed by an MOU or a HCA.

The advantages of this office arrangement concern the targeted technical assistance and support that staff are able to provide to assist a number of national projects within the same sector or sub-sector. Additionally, staff have intimate knowledge of national priorities and implementation issues which can mean that project risks and unintended consequences can be dealt with rapidly. Counterpart mentoring can be efficiently provided over the life of the project. The national offices are also able

to be rapidly expanded to accommodate new projects and additional staff.

The main disadvantage concerns the risk that staff and counterparts may be sidelined to work on projects other than their priority projects, sometimes to the disadvantage of their pre-planned work plans. Secondly, projects may fall behind schedule if the Officer-in-Charge is too preoccupied with office administration at the expense of the main projects not achieving their scheduled targets. This arrangement can be costly if the sole agency occupying the premises is responsible for all office costs, including rent and utilities. And lastly, poor HQ support to the national office concerning IT, procurement, HR and finance systems can result in a dysfunctional office.

4) Single agency with staff dedicated to supporting a national project

An example of this option may be found in the SPC Majuro-based Renewable Energy Project office, where the Renewable Energy Adviser is co-located with government counterpart staff within in a government ministry. This arrangement usually suits a situation where a single staff person is dedicated to a specific project and works closely with national counterpart(s). The in-country presence is normally covered by an MOU or HCA. These out posted project staff may be linked to a larger sub-regional project, so when the project ends the agency withdraws their staff. The advantages and disadvantages of this arrangement are similar to those mentioned in 3) above.

9. SYNTHESIS OF SPREP MEMBER, PARTNER AND DONOR CONSULTATIONS

(a) SPREP Member country feedback

1. PALAU

(i) Role of SPREP in Palau

SPREP has had a long, extensive and valued presence in Palau over the past decades. Their work in the past, as is their current work is viewed very positively by government and non-government agency representatives. The flagship projects mentioned by government officials were the support to environment education in 1987 and the 1999 Stockholm Agreement initiative. The Minister of State in particular was very appreciative of the past and continued support from SPREP that Palau receives, noting that SPREP current support includes valued sub-regional projects, such as the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) Project. NGOs also mentioned their appreciation for support provided by SPREP to Palau in environment education and in the conservation sector, such as the Bird Life International (BLI) project, as well as a previously supported project concerning the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network.

(ii) General view of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

Palau agencies consulted expressed very positive views about SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Micronesia. Both government and non-government agencies cited the higher profile that SPC has in Micronesian countries due to the establishment of their Northern Pacific Office in Pohnpei. There was a strong feeling that a, “duly dedicated sub regional office and representatives based in Micronesia it would add the value including raising the profile of the (SPREP) Strategic Plan with our national leaders, program implementers and CBOs”. It was mentioned that a sub-regional presence in Micronesia would provide greater opportunity for Micronesian countries to engage more directly with SPREP in terms of accountability and SPREP’s governance, as well as more effectively utilise the technical assistance and expertise that SPREP staff based in the sub-region

would be more efficiently able to provide.

In relation to comments concerning the opportunity that a SPREP sub-regional presence would provide for more effective delivery of services to members, the SPC North Pacific Office model was frequently mentioned. For example feedback on this issue was summarised as follows. "The Micronesian Country members are now utilizing the assistance of SPC experts in both national and regional initiatives, such as the MCES working committee, health, renewable energy, food security, understand(ing) and address(ing) climate change impacts, etc." Should SPREP establish a sub-regional presence in Micronesia it is clear that there would be expectations that by bringing SPREP staff resources closer to the north Pacific Member countries that there would be concomitant flow on of benefits, as has been perceived in the case of the SPC North Pacific Office.

(iii) View of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Palau

There is a very strong feeling amongst all environment sector stakeholders in Palau that were consulted, including government agencies, CROP agency and non-government agencies that should SPREP establish a sub-regional presence in Micronesia it should be located in Palau. The reasons put forward to support this view are numerous, and include:

- a. The Government of Palau has demonstrated a substantial commitment to supporting environmental issues as illustrated by the government legislating the world's first and only national sanctuary for shark conservation and a marine mammal sanctuary. Palau has a 'Green Fee' of USD15 payable by all travelers leaving Palau which is used to support community-based Protected Area Networks (PAN).

- b. There are very good communications links between Palau and the rest of the Pacific region. Airline arrival and departure flights occur daily, and plans are underway to purchase and lay optic cables to speed up internet services.
- c. Palau has good facilities, a good track record and support services concerning hosting Micronesian workshops or seminars on all topics of interest to SPREP as reflected in their Strategic Plan 201-2015. Palau has field sites of interest where all environment sub-sector issues can be demonstrated, including those of major interest to SPREP such as biodiversity, environmental pollution controls, marine protected areas and coral reef conservation.
- d. There are numerous community-based conservation agencies in Palau, working at both national and provincial levels that, together with the relevant government agencies involved with the environment sector would benefit from SPREP expertise based in Palau. Additionally, it was mentioned that these agencies are also in a good position to provide feedback to SPREP staff concerning environmental policies and operational issues to the mutual advantage of all agencies involved.
- e. As mentioned in more detail below, the Government of Palau would facilitate the establishment and ongoing work of a SPREP office in Palau by providing various assistance, just as they have to other regional and international agencies based in Koror, such as SPC, the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and the United Nations (UN) Joint Presence Initiative Office.
- f. Palau currently hosts a number of sub-regional agencies involved with the environment sector, such as the

Micronesian Shark Foundation, the Micronesian Challenge Office, as well as the Pacific International Coral Reef Research Center (PICRC).

- g. In the past there have been project implementation issues that have delayed and affected SPREP supported projects in Palau. It was mentioned that if SPREP had a physically closer working relationship then this would facilitate the smoother implementation of project activities.
- h. And finally, a view was mentioned on a number of occasions that it was only fair that a CROP agency be located in Palau in order to spread the benefits of having a CROP agency in more than one sub-regional Member country. By SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Palau it would be seen as recognising and rewarding Palau, as it were, for the innovative and exceptional commitments and advances they have made to establish the world's first shark and marine mammal sanctuaries, as well as acknowledge the investment made to stimulate community-based environmental awareness and biodiversity conservation.

(iv) Legal, financial, fiscal, geographic or other implications of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Palau

As mentioned above, should it be decided to establish a sub-regional presence in Palau the government would provide substantial support to SPREP. This support would involve legal, financial, fiscal and other assistance, just as they have for other regional and international agencies located in Palau. For example, the Government of Palau would negotiate with SPREP a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), or Host Government Agreement (HGA) that would reflect the legal status of SPREP's Palau entity, and govern their

operational activities in the same way that they have with SPC, JICA and the UN. Key clauses in the MOU or HCA include tax free status for staff, tax exemption for imported staff and office good and effects, including vehicles, as well as the provision of unrestricted work permits for SPREP staff spouses. Feedback from CROP and other agencies with similar MOUs and/or HCAs with the Government of Palau indicate that the arrangements are working very well.

In terms of financial and fiscal support for a SPREP sub-regional presence based in Palau, the government has indicated that they would facilitate the availability of office space and other support according to availability. For example, a number of options for office space were mentioned including co-locating with the Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism or at the underutilised PICRC building in Koror. The government also indicated a willingness to facilitate assisting SPREP open bank accounts, including foreign exchange accounts, as well as identifying suitable housing for SPREP staff, given that there is no formal real estate or domestic house rental agency in Koror.

(v) Options for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in Palau

Given the above comments on the interest and support for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in Palau by both government and CBOs, as well as the scale of the SPREP activities in biodiversity and climate change in Micronesia, SPREP could consider the option available to relocate staff involved with these projects to Palau. Firstly, given the substantial amount of commitment, attention and activity concerning biodiversity and climate change issues not only in Palau, but in the sub-region, it could be conceivable that the majority of SPREP staff involved with these sub-sectors in Micronesia be incrementally relocated to Palau. This would entail establishing a SPREP sub-regional office in Palau with a focus on biodiversity and

climate change, which will have the ability and resources to service the needs other Micronesian countries. Additionally, other SPREP staff with expertise in other areas could be located in Palau in order to facilitate a critical mass of SPREP staff to service the needs of Micronesia in other environment sub-sectors, such as pollution and solid waste management (SWM).

As there is no other CROP agency located in Palau, co-location at this stage is not an option, nor is the establishment of a national office, such as the SPC Solomon Island Office not practical due to the scale and complexity of the Micronesian sub-regional aspects of the SPREP supported biodiversity and climate change initiatives. Placing one or two out posted SPREP staff in Palau is also not a realistic option given the comments above.

2. THE REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

(i) Role of SPREP in the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI)

According to government and NGO personnel consulted, SPREP has had a long history of working in RMI due to SPREP previously assisting with issues such as the development of a national plan to address oil spills, as well as providing training to a range of stakeholders in the area of multi-lateral agreements. SPREP assistance was also noted concerning their input into the RMI National Climate Change Policy, as well as the Joint National Action Plan on Disaster Risk management. RMI also has an MOU with SPREP to coordinate the Pacific Adaptation on Climate Change as it is rolled out in RMI. Other SPREP projects mentioned included a biodiversity conservation projects in the late 1990s, a waste management project involving persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and a waste management national implementation plan.

(i) General view of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

The support for SPREP to establish a sub-regional office in Micronesia was strongly supported by all in RMI who were consulted. The option for SPREP to establish a presence in Fiji or Solomon Islands, rather than Micronesia was not supported as it was felt that the impact for the Micronesian sub-region would be minimal. The advantages mentioned for SPREP establishing a presence in the sub-region included communication benefits if a SPREP office was closer, cost effective travel to support project initiatives in the northern Pacific, as well as the benefits to SPREP of having inputs at the political level through the MPS and the MCES. Additionally, some agencies indicated they would welcome SPREP as a resource to facilitate new initiatives and as a very valuable, more readily accessible partner. The delayed formal government response to the question of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Micronesia to some extent concerns uncertainty about their *modus operandi* and structure. However, there appears no doubt that the concept was well received.

(ii) View of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in the Marshall Islands

Whilst at time of writing the Government of RMI had not formulated their stance on this question, individuals consulted were generally in favour, noting that there would be direct spin-off benefits to RMI agencies involved with the environment sector, especially given the current challenges of climate change, POPs and water quality issues. The establishment of a stand alone sub-regional office in RMI versus a co-location arrangement did not seem to be an issue given that there is no existing CROP or regional agencies in RMI with spare office space that could be shared with SPREP. Some agencies interviewed mentioned that RMI has demonstrated that they are able to support international agencies, such as the

various diplomatic representatives stationed at Majuro, as well as the PNA.

(iii) Legal, financial, fiscal, geographic or other implications of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in the Marshall Islands

As mentioned above, it is premature to comments on legal, financial, fiscal and other assistance should it be decided to establish a sub-regional presence in RMI, other than to add that should RMI decide to support such an office, their support would be forthcoming and adequate for SPREP needs. This support would involve, just as they have for other regional and CROP agencies located in RMI, such as the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) and SPC. For example, the Government of RMI would negotiate with SPREP a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), or Host Government Agreement (HGA) that would reflect the legal status of SPREP's RMI entity, and govern their operational activities in the same way that they have with PNA, SPC, JICA and the UN. Key clauses in the MOU or HGA include tax free status for staff, tax exemption for imported staff and office good and effects, including vehicles, as well as the provision of unrestricted work permits for SPREP staff spouses. Feedback from CROP and other agencies with similar MOUs and/or HCAs with the Government of RMI indicate that the arrangements are working very well.

In terms of financial and fiscal support for a SPREP sub-regional presence based in RMI, the government has indicated that they are currently drafting their formal view which, at time of writing, was not available to be included in this report.

(iv) Options for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in the Marshall Islands

Given the operational aspects of SPREP's work in the environment sector it could be appropriate for SPREP to be co-located with a number of RMI government

agencies, such as the Ministry of Resources and Development or the Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination. It could also be conceivable that SPREP could establish a presence in the RMI by being located in their own office, such as the case with the PNA. This latter option would allow SPREP to incrementally expand the scale of operations concerning projects supported and staff placements.

3. FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

(v) Role of SPREP in the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM)

Feedback from the FSM national and Pohnpei State governments indicate that SPREP have not only had a long and productive relationship with FSM, but some years ago SPREP posted a staff member to FSM. He left once the project ended, which was expected. However, there have been many other well regarded initiatives between SPREP and FSM since that time, including a POPs project, the current PACC project in Kosrae, a GEF funded invasive species control project, EIA training, and assistance to facilitate FSM's Stockholm Convention accession.

(vi) General view of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

Like Palau and RMI, FSM government and NGO staff are positive about SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Micronesia albeit prefaced with concerns about their *modus operandi* and structure. For example, it was pointed out that if SPREP was to operate in Micronesia by creating a 'trust fund' that would potentially siphon off funds that currently are received from donors by other FSM agencies, then the SPREP presence would not be welcomed. Additionally, if SPREP was to implement projects rather than support other agencies, especially those with a strong community base that have

traditionally been the environment project implementers, then they would not be seen as operating in a developmentally sound way.

(vii) View of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in the Federated States of Micronesia

The support for SPREP to establish a sub-regional office in Micronesia was strongly supported by all in FSM who were consulted. As was articulated by people in RMI during the consultations, the option for SPREP to establish a presence in Fiji or Solomon Islands, rather than Micronesia was not supported as it was felt that the impact for the Micronesian sub-region would be minimal. The advantages mentioned for SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in FSM included references to organisations in Pohnpei that are already established and functioning well, such as the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission, SPC, the UN Joint Presence Initiative, the role of FSM as providing a sub-regional transport and communications hub, the growing national conservation awareness, the stable social and political system, as well as the firm support from government at all levels.

In relation to the question of the structure of a SPREP sub-regional office, co-location was more often mentioned as the favoured arrangement. As SPC is currently well established in Pohnpei, there was noted some attraction to have a 'joint' CROP agency office, similar to the UN's Micronesian joint offices in Palau, RMI and FSM. The difference being that the UN joint offices represented the three UN agencies of UNFPA, UNICEF and UNDP. The consensus of most agencies consulted was that a joint CROP office would allow the CROP agencies to maintain their identities by not sharing a manager who would represent all the CROP agencies, but rather allow each CROP agency to have their own separate agency head, and simply basically co-locate in the one building.

However, if SPREP was to co-locate with SPC in the current SPC building, it may present somewhat of a dilemma for a number of reasons. Firstly, although the ground floor is currently vacant and in need of the planned renovations, advice from the Pohnpei State Governor's office suggests that the current SPC building may be structurally unsound, to the point where the Governor has called for the building to be surveyed by a civil engineer to ascertain its soundness. Secondly, although SPC support the principle of SPREP co-locating with them during their initial stages of establishing a presence in Micronesia, and have generously offered to accommodate the embryonic SPREP north Pacific presence, the SPC North Pacific Office continues to be in an expansion mode and may not be able to sustain their co-location offer for long into the future. Therefore the SPC co-location option for SPREP looks initially attractive. If it were to proceed, SPREP would need to make sure that the current building housing SPC in Pohnpei is structurally sound and any ground floor renovations satisfactorily undertaken, as well as be prepared to re-locate should SPC require the space for their expansion.

Although in its infancy regarding planning and funding, the Government of FSM have an ambitious plan to construct what has become known as the 'Micronesian Village', a complex of purpose built office and cultural facilities in the heart of Pohnpei. Land has been allocated and support has been forthcoming from the national and Pohnpei state governments, SPC and various cultural groups. The estimated budget for the initial construction design is around USD15 million which would allow a number of key buildings to be completed within a 2 – 3 year construction period. Should the Micronesian Village development receive donor funding then construction is said to be able to proceed quickly, which could provide CROP and other agencies with a permanent home, including any proposed

SPREP sub-regional office in the northern Pacific.

(viii) Legal, financial, fiscal, geographic or other implications of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in the Federated States of Micronesia

As mentioned above, should SPREP decide to establish a sub-regional presence in FSM the government would provide substantial support to SPREP. This support would involve legal, financial, fiscal and other assistance, just as they have for other regional and international agencies located in FSM, such as SPC, the UN Joint Presence Initiative, the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (W&CPFC) and various diplomatic missions, such as Australia, Japan, USA and the People's Republic of China. For example, the Government of FSM would negotiate with SPREP a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), or Host Country Agreement (HCA) that would reflect the legal status of SPREP's FSM entity, and govern their operational activities in the same way that they have with SPC, W&CPFC, and the UN. Key clauses in the MOU or HCA include tax free status for staff, tax exemption for imported staff and office goods and effects, including vehicles, as well as the provision of unrestricted work permits for SPREP staff spouses. Feedback from CROP and other agencies with similar MOUs and/or HCAs with the Government of FSM indicate that the arrangements are working very well.

In terms of financial and fiscal support for a SPREP sub-regional presence based in FSM, the government has indicated that they would facilitate the availability of office space, although their preference is for any SPREP presence in FSM to initially be co-located with SPC. The government also indicated a willingness to facilitate assisting SPREP open bank accounts, including foreign exchange accounts, as well as identifying suitable housing for SPREP staff, given that there is no formal

real estate or domestic house rental agency in FSM.

(vi) Options for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in the Federated States of Micronesia

Given the strong feeling expressed by the Government of FSM concerning any initial SPREP presence be co-located with SPC, the option of SPREP establishing a stand alone office in Pohnpei, such as the UN Joint Presence Initiative seems remote. Even if the current SPC office is confirmed as being condemned and unsafe for habitation SPC would have to evacuate in order to demonstrate a duty of care towards staff and visitors, the Government of FSM would feel obliged to re-locate them in another suitable office building that presumably SPREP could share. The option of a SPREP staff member, or members being attached for a long period to a FSM government department, or posted to one of the other three FSM states, seems unlikely, given the interest within FSM for SPREP to establish a permanent office as part of a CROP agency presence in FSM.

4. PAPUA NEW GUINEA

(ix) Role of SPREP in Papua New Guinea

SPREP has been supporting project activities in Papua New Guinea (PNG) over many decades, and some of the more memorable initiatives involving SPREP have included a Pesticides and Heavy Metals project with UNEP in the mid-1980s, a Chemical Profile for PNG and support for biodiversity, particularly turtle conservation. The PNG Focal Point for SPREP at the government level is the Department of Environment and Conservation, whilst the Institutional Focal Points are the University of PNG in Port Moresby and the University of Technology in Lae. A number of PNG nationals who are now in senior positions and still actively working in the environment sector have previously worked for SPREP.

(x) General view of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

The support in PNG for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in Melanesia is overwhelmingly positive. All the people and organisations in PNG contacted during the consultancy expressed very strong support for SPREP to set up an office with an initial staff focus on climate change and biodiversity. The reasons put forward to support this view included the view that the SPREP strategic priorities would be enhanced as the Secretariat became more visible and improved its communication with Members in the sub-region, leading to more improved and effective service delivery. Additionally, there was a feeling that by establishing a presence in the Melanesian sub-region the Secretariat would be better placed to understand the mechanisms and politics of how things are done in this particular sub-region.

(xi) View of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in PNG

Whilst most of the PNG informants were very enthusiastic about SPREP establishing a presence in their sub-region, the location of the sub-regional office in PNG was not an issue of great concern. Of more importance was the Secretariat being permanently located somewhere in the sub-region where PNG could have more direct access than is currently the case with the Secretariat based in Apia, Samoa. In fact a strong argument against locating a SPREP office in PNG concerned the fact that most of the neighbouring Melanesian countries have less capacity to support their environment sector activities than PNG, so it would be logical for SPREP to base a sub-regional presence in either Solomon Islands or Vanuatu. There was a preference in PNG for the initial SPREP office to be co-located with either a CROP agency or sub-regional agency, such as FFA or the Melanesian Spearhead Group respectively.

(xii) Legal, financial, fiscal, geographic or other implications of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in PNG

Should SPREP decide to establish a sub-regional presence in PNG the government has indicated that it would provide support to SPREP. This support would involve legal, financial, fiscal and other assistance, just as they have for other regional and international agencies located in Port Moresby, such as SPC and various diplomatic missions, such as Australia, Japan, USA and the People's Republic of China. For example, the Government of PNG would negotiate with SPREP a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), or Host Country Agreement (HCA) that would reflect the legal status of SPREP's PNG entity, and govern their operational activities in the same way that they have with SPC. Key clauses in the MOU or HCA include tax free status for staff, tax exemption for imported staff and office good and effects, including vehicles, as well as the provision of unrestricted work permits for SPREP staff spouses.

In terms of financial and fiscal support for a SPREP sub-regional presence based in PNG, the government has indicated that they would facilitate the availability of office space, although their preference is for any SPREP presence in PNG to initially be co-located with the PNG Focal Point, i.e. the Department of Environment and Conservation.. The government also indicated a willingness to facilitate assisting SPREP establish a PNG presence, including identifying suitable housing for SPREP staff, noting that house rental costs and general operating costs in Port Moresby are very high.

(xiii) Options for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in PNG

As mentioned above, the Government of PNG would be willing to assist SPREP establish a presence in Port Moresby, or another location, such as Madang or Lae.

The preferred option for a SPREP office in PNG would be to co-locate, although as was done with the SPC PNG National Office, a stand alone office could also be an option, although it would be very expensive. Although the logical co-location option with the Department of Environment and Conservation has been suggested, another option would be to co-locate with, or be hosted by the University of PNG, the major SPREP institutional focal point.

5. SOLOMON ISLANDS

(xiv) Role of SPREP in Solomon Islands

According to government and CROP agency staff consulted, SPREP has had a long history of working in Solomon Islands due to SPREP previously assisting with issues such as the development of a national plan to address climate change, turtle conservation research and monitoring, the development of the national protected areas legislation, as well as providing capacity building by means of providing training to a range of stakeholders in the areas of biodiversity and climate change. SPREP also assisted Solomon Islands with the PIGARET project and the PACC. As pollution issues, including solid waste management are important issues in Solomon Islands, SPREP assisted with POPs activities and involved Solomon Islanders in POPs meetings.

(xv) General view of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

All organisations consulted in Honiara welcomed the possibility of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence, based on their expectation that having SPREP staff sub-regionally based would go a long way to assist the Secretariat in not only improving its image as a regional entity mandated to assist Members in managing their environment, but would in time assist improve service delivery and become more effective and relevant to Members in Melanesia. This in turn would

contribute to mutual gains as Members would more effectively access SPREP technical assistance and contribute to cost effectively contributing to national capacity building, as well as the Secretariat benefiting from Members making better use of resources and participating more fully in SPREP organisational issues.

(xvi) View of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Solomon Islands

The Government of Solomon Islands and all other organisations consulted, including CROP and international agencies were all supportive of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Honiara. For example, the government has offered assistance to SPREP to locate appropriate office space and help with finding suitable housing for SPREP staff, in an environment where suitable rental accommodation has not been easy to come by for expatriate staff newly arrived in Honiara.

(xvii) Legal, financial, fiscal, geographic or other implications of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Solomon Islands

There appear no significant legal, financial geographic or other barriers to SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Solomon Islands. Over the past few years a number of organisations have established a presence in Honiara, including SPC, the Commonwealth Governance Facility and the UN Joint Presence Initiative. The government has facilitated the establishment of these organisations, all of which are examples where a sub-regional presence has resulted in positive outcomes for both the Solomon Islands and the organisations. The government has signed either an HCA or MOU with each of these organisations and continues to support them as they recruit staff, import equipment and develop their national, as well as sub-regional program activities.

(xviii) Options for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in Solomon Islands

The preference most frequently suggested for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in Solomon Islands concerned the co-location option due to the cost effectiveness of co-locating with an established, like minded organisation, such as the SPC Solomon Island Country Office, FFA or the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster management and Meteorology. In discussions with the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology, they would welcome SPREP establishing an office within their building, but there is clearly limited space available in what seems an already crowded office environment. The option of SPREP establishing in Honiara in a CROP agency office was suggested by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and External Trade. However, following a visit to the SPC Solomon Island Country Office, the Officer-in-Charge expressed support for the idea, but also indicated that due to SPC staff office accommodation requirements, it would be presently impractical for SPREP to co-locate with them.

One other possibility would be for SPREP to co-locate with FFA. The FFA Director-General suggested this option and has kindly offered office accommodation for an initial, modest number of SPREP specialists. FFA currently hosts a number of other agencies, including staff from the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS), the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA) and the Asia, Caribbean, Pacific (ACP) Fisheries Program.

6. FIJI

(xix) Role of SPREP in Fiji

SPREP has, for many years supported the Government of Fiji with a number of important projects in the environment sector. These activities include Managing

for the Future : A project to reverse degradation of coral reefs and related ecosystems and enhance livelihoods in the Pacific Islands Region (CRISP; Review-Implementation of the Regional Wetlands Action Plan for the Pacific Islands Workshop; Pacific Regional Consultation on the International Regime on Access & Benefit Sharing; Regional Workshop for the Pacific Countries on the preparation of the Fourth National Report of the Convention on Biological Diversity; Marine Species Research and Conservation; Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) in ACP Countries; Waste Reduction Campaign; SPILLCON 2010-Asia Pacific International Oil Spill Prevention & Preparedness Conference; and the Pacific Biodiversity and Climate Change Ecosystem-based Adaptation Analysis and Needs Assessments Meeting and Review of the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change Meeting.

A significant amount of capacity building in the form of training and workshops have been provided by SPREP to many government officers working in the environment sector, as well as SPREP providing an impressive amount of capacity supplementation support to Suva-based Department of Environment staff.

(xx) General view of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

The Government of Fiji has indicated that they support the concept of SPREP establishing a presence in the Melanesian sub-region, although at time of writing were uncommitted to any particular location for the sub-regional presence.

(xxi) View of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Fiji

Whilst the notion of a SPREP sub-regional presence in Fiji has not been disregarded by staff of the Department of Environment, advice provided in Suva

during the consultancy indicates that it is premature to provide more detailed comments at this stage.

(xxii) Legal, financial, fiscal, geographic or other implications of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Fiji

Although specific details of the Government of Fiji's intentions regarding possible support to SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Fiji have not been articulated, the Department of Environment is of the opinion that the government would provide appropriate legal, financial, fiscal and other appropriate support to a SPREP sub-regional presence should it be located in Fiji. However, as mentioned above, this has yet to be formally confirmed pending further internal discussions with the appropriate authorities in Suva.

(xxiii) Options for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in Fiji

Should SPREP decide to establish a sub-regional presence in Fiji, there appears to be a number of options that could be further examined concerning where the SPREP presence could be housed. One feasible option mentioned by SPC was for SPREP to co-locate with SPC in Nabua, rather than with the SPC SOPAC Division at Tamavua, as there is currently no space at the Tamavua SPC office. The Nabua co-location arrangement would be seen as a reciprocal arrangement to the current SPC office currently co-located with SPREP in Apia. The Department of Environment indicated their interest for SPREP to be more closely accessible to them in Suva, but no indication was provided as to the possibility of co-location with them.

7. VANUATU

(xxiv) Role of SPREP in Vanuatu

SPREP have had a long and appreciated association with Vanuatu. Some of the

memorable projects supported over the years include the assistance with RAMSAR, the Pacific Island Climate Change Adaptation Project (PICCAP), a number of meteorology workshops, as well as various capacity building training activities. Like other countries in Melanesia, the SPREP presence in Vanuatu is considered to have been limited to the often mentioned unpopular, 'fly-in-fly-out' approach to supporting Members that SPREP advisers are said to be frequently employing.

(xxv) General view of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

There is a very strong support in all agencies consulted for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in Melanesia. The benefits cited were consistent with the views from PNG, Fiji and Solomon Islands. Of particular interest to Vanuatu would be having SPREP located in the sub-region as a resource for them to more easily access not just climate change and biodiversity conservation assistance, as was mentioned by PNG and Solomon Islands, but also the meteorology services that have been strengthened by the merging of SOPAC's former meteorology resources with those of SPREP's.

The particular location of any future SPREP sub-regional presence does not appear to be an issue in Vanuatu, but they agree with PNG and Fiji that it would best serve Melanesian countries for it to be located in either Solomon Islands or Vanuatu, as these countries have limited capacity in the environment sector compared to Fiji and PNG. Additionally, the emphasis that both Solomon Islands and Vanuatu are giving environmental issues, especially climate change and biodiversity conservation suggest that the resources that a SPREP presence closer to hand would be well received and assist in more efficient use of SPREP's expertise in these sub-sectors.

(xxvi) View of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Vanuatu

The Government of Vanuatu is very supportive of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Port Vila. Not only would the SPREP resources be readily accessed for the sub-sectors mentioned above, but other key environmental areas that the government are prioritising, such as waste management could also directly benefit. Additionally, government have recently legislated reforms to environmental regulations bringing them in line with world's best practice and have drafted other legislation to assist with environment protection, such as the 'Green Fee' arrangement that Palau has instigated to assist ensure sustainable funding for local, community managed marine and terrestrial protected areas.

Additionally, the government has offered support to SPREP should they decide to establish a sub-regional presence in Vanuatu, by means of providing office space and assistance with the spectrum of the usual issues covered in a Host Country Agreement (HCA) A copy of a generic HCA is included in this report at Annex 4.

(xxvii) Legal, financial, fiscal, geographic or other implications of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Vanuatu

There appear to be no legal, financial, fiscal or geographic impediments to SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Vanuatu. In reality, should an HCA be signed between the government and SPREP the implications for smooth working relationship will be numerous. As mentioned above, the ready access that all agencies working with environmental issues in the country will be potentially intensified and the impact maximised depending upon the extent of the SPREP presence and the government's ability to honour their HCA obligations.

(v) Options for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in Vanuatu

The most attractive option for SPREP to establish a presence in Vanuatu would be to co-locate with an existing regional or CROP agency, such as the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG) or SPC. Both these agencies have a presence in Port Vila and have HCAs with the government that governs their operations. The MSG may be able to offer SPREP office space but at time of writing it was unclear to what extent they may be able to accommodate SPREP.

Additionally, the government has offered SPC a large residential house to use for their office, but SPC have not been able to move in due to the necessary renovations being incomplete. This house could accommodate at least 6 work stations which SPC may not initially require and so free up a couple for SPREP's use. This arrangement would see SPC and SPREP co-locating and represent a joint CROP agency presence, similar to the UN Joint Presence initiative.

Another option would be for SPREP to co-locate with the Vanuatu Meteorology Service (VMS) The VMS also host the Vanuatu National Adaptation Committee on Climate Change Secretariat, and have a newly built office and apparently may have spare office space. The co-location option is preferred as it would allow SPREP to begin operations in Port Vila on a small scale and incrementally enlarge their presence over time should their programme activities in Vanuatu and the sub-region grow.

8. COOK ISLANDS**(i) Role of SPREP in the Cook Islands**

SPREP has provided a range of technical assistance to the Cook Islands, including Review-Implementation of the Regional Wetlands Action Plan for the Pacific Islands Workshop; Prevention, Control and Management of Invasive Alien Species

Project; Pacific Regional Consultation on the International Regime on Access & Benefit Sharing ; Integrated Island Biodiversity Project; Regional Workshop for the Pacific Countries on the preparation of the Fourth National Report of the Convention on Biological Diversity; Marine Species Meeting; Capacity Building related to Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA); E-waste in Pacific Island Countries; SPILLCON 2010-Asia Pacific International Oil Spill Prevention & Preparedness Conference; Pacific Biodiversity and Climate Change Ecosystem-based Adaptation Analysis and Needs Assessments; PIGGAREP; and the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change Project.

(ii) General view of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

The Government of the Cook Islands is of the view that any SPREP sub-regional presence would best be undertaken in partnership with all CROP agencies working closely together provide effective delivery of services to all Member countries.

(iii) View of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in the Cook Islands

The feedback from the Government of the Cook Islands on the question of establishing a sub-regional SPREP office to assist the SPREP Strategic Plan priorities being best achieved includes a comment that they believe that the SPREP Secretariat is the best place to achieve Strategic Plan priorities.

(iv) Legal, financial, fiscal, geographic or other implications of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in the Cook Islands

As the Government of the Cook Islands believes that the SPREP Secretariat is the best place to achieve Strategic Plan priorities, they have advised that they will have difficulty providing more funding and

resources to establish any sub-regional offices.

(xxviii) Options for SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in the Cook Islands

See comments above.

(b) Donor partner feedback

1. Government Australia views on SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

Although the Government of Australia is of the view that the establishment of a sub-regional presence by itself will not contribute to effective delivery of the SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015, they see some possible benefits to SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence. These benefits include facilitating coordination with other CROP agencies and so broadly support SPREP extending its reach across its members. They note the area of climate change as one area where a sub-regional presence could benefit from SPREP and other CROP agencies collaborating by means of a SPREP sub-regional presence. However, they require a detailed cost/benefit analysis in order to determine if a sub-regional presence would lead to increased efficiency and effectiveness for SPREP in any of the sub-regions. They suggest this analysis should consider various forms of a sub-regional presence, including establishing a sub-regional office independent of another CROP agency, to one that is co-located with another CROP agency, or to an arrangement where SPREP second staff to other CROP agencies. Australia would expect that any possible sub-regional presence should be cost neutral to the Secretariat and would be considered as part of SPREP's multi-year agreement with Australia.

2. Government of New Zealand views on SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence

While acknowledging SPREP's efforts to investigate ways of improving its impact in the region, the view of the Government of New Zealand concerning the concept of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence is one option for SPREP to address Strategic Plan 2011-2015 priorities. They note that there are a number of factors that would influence a sub-regional presence resulting in more effective delivery of services to members. These factors include the size and type of Post, the host country context and the extent of SPREP's programme both within the host country and in the sub-region. The possibility of some benefits from a sub-regional presence are noted, including assistance with national priority setting and programme monitoring and evaluation, increased country ownership, as well as improved environmental performance and national capacity to manage natural resources. They also note the need for details of the context of any proposed sub-regional presence model, including costs. Additionally they need to be convinced that a sub-regional office will deliver cost-savings and free up administrative and programme resources for national level activities. Whilst co-location with another CROP agency is mentioned as probably the most sensible option, factors such as SPREP programme size, transport links to other sub-regions, security and accommodation costs were also mentioned. New Zealand also mentioned that they would not augment their funding to SPREP for the establishment of a sub-regional office and that they would rather see SPREP consolidate its current efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of its Apia-based campus in line with RIF recommendations and SPREP's Strategic Plan 2011-2015.

(c) Partner and other agency feedback

1. Palau Conservation Society

The Palau Conservation Society (PCS) is the largest of the numerous Palauan non-governmental organisations specialising in the environment sector. Founded in 1995, PCS takes a full ecosystem approach to conservation at the community level. Their Strategic Plan 2011-2015 underlines their respect for Palauan culture and the science of conservation. They rely on partnerships at national and local levels to target their focus on the conservation of coral reef ecosystems, forested ecosystems, mangroves and seagrass. Operationally, PCS has four programmes, including Conservation and Protected Areas, Policy and Planning, Communication and Outreach, and Administration and Development. PCS help States access resources for Protected Area Networks (PAN) via the Micronesian Challenge, a capacity building and funding mechanism.

PCS has links with SPREP stemming from SPREP's previously supported conservation education and outreach activities, as well as the provision of off island training for PCS staff. PCS also is a member of Birdlife International (BLI) which has resulted in an MOU with SPREP. Although PCS would not foresee any substantial direct involvement with a SPREP sub-regional presence in Micronesia, they would welcome the initiative given SPREP's track record in the environment sector and the additional profile that SPREP could potentially give it.

2. Sustainable Decisions

Sustainable Decisions (SD) is a non-government agency that focuses on providing information about community conservation issues for decision makers to use to assist policy formulation. They are committed to ensuring that policy makers are aware of current environmental science principles and practice so that policies are based on good science and relevant to Palau. SD are very supportive

of SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Micronesia due to countries in the sub-region being more able to access SPREP technical expertise and technical assistance. SD also expect that a SPREP sub-regional presence would lift SPREP's profile and lead to an increased engagement with SPREP activities. Additionally, SD believe that there would be mutual advantages concerning accountability and result in countries becoming more involved with SPREP governance which could result in increased levels of cooperation between Members and SPREP management.

(d) CROP and other regional agency feedback

1. Secretariat of the Pacific Community

The Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) has had a strategic plan to decentralise ever since the Director-General, in 2008 presented the SPC's governing body, the CRGA with a vision of a network of offices, strategically positioned in terms of functions and geographical locations to provide the best support possible to Members. To some extent, the momentum to decentralise was in response to SPC's corporate plan reviewer's view that SPC should move its services closer to the people it served. The Noumea HQ and Suva sub-regional central Pacific office have been long standing, whilst the Pohnpei North Pacific office was established and functioning in 2009. Three national offices, closely linked to specific projects were established in the Solomon Islands, (Honiara), Papua New Guinea (Port Moresby), and Vanuatu (Port Vila). According to SPC, having a presence in the north Pacific and the two western Pacific Member countries has made a discernable and positive difference to perceptions of SPC's role and its ability to provide services and respond promptly to requests from Members in the sub-regions.

Given the above scenario, it is no wonder that SPC is a keen supporter of SPREP's exploratory efforts to look at options to increase their presence in the two sub-regions of Micronesia and Melanesia. There is a truism in the disciplines of economics and management that suggest that by providing services one creates needs. In the case of SPC the needs were clearly there for greater use by Members of SPC's services, as the above paragraph describes and the presence of SPC technical staff to provide services have given the decentralisation approach the impetus for Members to take advantage of the more readily accessible SPC resources that are reportedly now being increasingly delivered in a more cost effective and efficient manner.

2. Forum Fisheries Agency

The Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) was established in Honiara, Solomon Islands in 1979 by sixteen member countries of the then South Pacific Forum to help them manage and develop their "living marine resources and in particular the highly migratory species" such as the vast tuna stocks of the western and central Pacific ocean.

The work of FFA specifically involves collection and dissemination of fisheries data, the provision of technical assistance and policy coordination to facilitate legislative responses to the increasing commercial pressure on the Pacific's tuna fishery. They have built a reputation for competent management, high professional standards amongst their staff of approximately 75, effective use of resources and prompt responses to calls for assistance from Member countries.

FFA would not only encourage and welcome a SPREP presence in the sub-region, but also undertake to do whatever they can to facilitate SPREP's physical entrée into Melanesia, to the extent that they would be prepared to offer SPREP accommodation in their Honiara office, similar to the cost saving arrangement that

they have offered other agencies that have co-located with them. These agencies include the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA), the Africa, Asia and Pacific (ACP) Fisheries Project and the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS). FFA has a Host Country Agreement with the Government of the Solomon Islands that has served them well over the decades, despite this HCA being negotiated when FFA was initially established.

3. The Joint Presence Initiative of the United Nations

The Joint Presence Initiative of the United Nations was conceived as a response to the demands of a number of Pacific island countries and a means to better deal with the development challenges that the Small Island States are facing. It is also an initiative to bring the UN closer to the countries it serves by having a presence in several Pacific island countries. The Joint Presence Initiative strategy essentially aims to make sure that the UN decentralisation process at country level in the Pacific region ensures that one of the three UN agencies most relevant to a particular country's national development plan, that is, either UNICEF, UNDP or UNFPA, takes on a lead UN agency role in a particular country. For example, in FSM UNFPA is the lead UN agency. In Palau it is UNDP. In Vanuatu it is UNICEF. As one person described it, it's a 'one stop shop' for access to the UN agencies, and gives credibility to the UN reform agenda based on the notion of, 'Delivering As One', as the UN in the Pacific Small Island States experience the, 'One Team as One UN' approach to meeting their development goals.

The framework under which the Joint Presence Initiative offices function is linked to each country's national development plan, the Pacific Plan, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the overarching UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the Pacific Sub-Region 2008 – 2012. The UNDAF was developed in close consultation with

Pacific island governments, civil society and development partners and focuses on four main areas, including equitable economic growth and poverty reduction; good governance and human rights; equitable social and protection services; and sustainable environmental management.

All of the Pacific island countries that host a UN Joint Presence Initiative office are all SPREP members and include FSM, Kiribati, RMI, Nauru, Palau, Vanuatu and Tuvalu. Each country has a specific focus or emphasis that the Joint Presence Initiative office implements with one of the three UN agencies mentioned above acting as a lead UN agency, with responsibility to ensure that they provide linkages to other UN agencies such as WHO, ILO, FAO, etc that the country may need to contact. In some Joint Presence Initiative offices staff from all three UN agencies, such as UNICEF, UNFPA or UNDP may be present, but one agency will be nominated to take a leading role to coordinate the UN presence. Although the UN Joint Presence Initiative has been operating in the Pacific since 2008, it should be noted that this strategy has not been formally reviewed or evaluated to confirm that this strategy is appropriate and meeting mutual expectations, anecdotal evidence from both governments and UN staff indicate it provides a valuable resource at the national level. Other Pacific island countries have requested the UN continue to replicate the strategy, with Tonga being mentioned as the next country in line to enjoy the benefits of a UN Joint Presence Initiative in the near future.

The UN Joint Presence Initiative is of interest to CROP and regional agencies in general and SPREP in particular as it provides a model whereby CROP and, or regional agency staff may co-locate in one office, with one CROP or regional agency taking the lead. It lends itself to the notion of a, 'one stop CROP or regional agency shop', that illustrates more efficient and cost effective resource mobilisation,

especially in an environment where a number of CROP or regional agencies are engaged with a common overarching theme, such as climate change that clearly involves a multitude of sectors and sub-sectors such as public health, food security, fisheries, biodiversity, invasive species issues, gender and security, just to name a few.

4. Parties to the Nauru Agreement

Signed in Tarawa in 2009, the Bikenibeu Declaration set up the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA) to serve their eight members, which include Palau, Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Tuvalu. The PNA headquarters are in Majuro, Marshall Islands. The PNA has been dubbed the, "OPEC for Tuna", because it aims to control access to tuna in its waters and so increase economic benefits for its Pacific island members. PNA waters are estimated to supply approximately 25% of the world's supply of tuna.

The PNA would very much welcome SPREP establishing a sub-regional presence in Micronesia. They have found that Majuro is a good location due to the adequate office space provided by the Government of RMI, the dependable communication links by air and the reliable IT service. They have signed a comprehensive MOU with the government of RMI which they have found adequate to meet their needs.

5. Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission

The Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (W&CPFC), also known as the Tuna Commission was established in Pohnpei, in the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) in 2004. The W&CPFC has established a number of monitoring, control and surveillance programs to promote compliance by Commission members with conservation and management measures, such as the

Regional Observer Program which manages the placement of personnel on board fishing vessels to observe and collect data on fishing operations.

The W&CPFC inspects fishing vessels on the high seas by using patrol vessels involved with routine boarding and inspection of fishing vessels operating throughout the Pacific Ocean. The patrol vessels provide the Commission with an important tool with which to monitor and in some cases, take action against, fishing violations on the high seas.

The Commission membership comprises Pacific island nations and distant waters fishing nations, such as Japan, U.S.A. and Taiwan. They have a staff of 21 professional and technical advisers that provide services to their members. They also sub-contract out some of the scientific research related to the Pacific regional tuna fisheries.

The Tuna Commission has had very little involvement with SPREP but nevertheless would welcome SPREP's presence in the sub-region as there may be future opportunities for some project collaboration where SPREP's marine focused activities require data that the Tuna Commission may be able to provide.

The location of the Tuna Commission in Pohnpei has been positive for the organisation as well as for the local community. They estimate that their annual economic footprint includes thousands of dollars spent on consumables, over 3,000 nights per year that Tuna Commission visitors spend in Pohnpei attending conferences and workshops, as well as the economic impact that staff salaries contribute to the local economy. The costs of delivering their services from Pohnpei justify their location in the Micronesian hub as this adds value to deliverables. They foresee that a SPREP presence in the sub-region would have similar, mutual cost benefits. They operate under a MOU with the Government of FSM that they find satisfactory, although it

appears that it's not as favourable as the HCA signed with other regional or international agencies based in Pohnpei.

6. Palau International Coral Reef Center

The Palau International Coral Reef Center (PICRC), is a project that is part of a Common Agenda for Cooperation between Palau, Japan and the U.S.A. Launched in 1993, the partnership was created to address global issues on health problems, over-population, degradation of the environment and aftermath of natural disasters. Palau was chosen as the site for this coral reef centre due mainly to its rich biodiversity (450 identified species of coral and 1,500 species of fish), proximity to research sites and stable government.

PICRC is a semi-autonomous government entity as well as a non-profit Organisation. It was designed to assist in improving the management, use and conservation of Palau and the world's marine environment, and to serve as an educational resource, as well as a tourist attraction due to its unique aquarium exhibits. Since its opening, PICRC has assumed a number of international roles including serving as a Node Coordinator for the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN), member of the Marine Resources Pacific Consortium (MAREPAC), designated as the focal point for the United States Coral Reef Task Force, co-secretariat of the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) with the Government of Japan, Node Coordinator for the Western Pacific SeagrassNet Monitoring, and a member of the International Society of Mangrove Ecosystems (ISME).

There are three main programme areas of interest to SPREP and include research on Marine Protected Areas (MPA), Tropical Watershed, and Coral Reef Biology. PICRC also have an extensive aquarium that illustrates Micronesia's natural marine ecosystems. It composes nine sub-themed aquariums that represent eighteen marine

and coastal habitat ecotypes. The Environmental Education and Awareness programme allows the Center to advance conservation by bridging the gap between the research community and the public in order to educate the public on the ecological, economic and cultural importance of coral reefs and their associated marine habitats. In doing so they aim to increase awareness of the value of conservation so that community members may become active environmental stewards.

In the past SPREP has primarily provided support to the PICRC in the areas of environmental education. In discussions with PICRC staff it was mentioned that they would welcome renewed collaboration with SPREP, adding that they have surplus office accommodation should SPREP be interested in establishing a sub-regional presence in Palau.

7. Melanesian Spearhead Group

The Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG) Secretariat was established in 2008 in Port Vila, Vanuatu. The MSG member states include Fiji, PNG, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and the New Caledonian FLNKS. With a staff of 10 promotes and strengthens inter-membership trade, exchanges of Melanesian cultures, traditions and values, encourages economic and technical cooperation between states and contributes to the alignment of policies in order to further MSG members' shared goals of economic growth, sustainable development, good governance and security.

The MSG Secretariat provides service to MSG members through sound policy advice on social, economic, trade, political and legal issues; promoting and nurturing Melanesian traditions, values and cultures; enhancing partnerships and cooperation with MSG and development partners; recruiting quality staff and ensuring their continuous professional development; and making sure there is financial and

administrative accountability, as well as transparency in all transactions.

There are four program areas that the MSG Secretariat focuses on, including economic growth; sustainable development; good governance; and security. Within these focus areas the MSG Secretariat has identified three programs. They are the Political Affairs Division; the Trade and Investment Promotion Division; and the Economic and Social Development Division. The SPREP counterpart in the MSG Secretariat would primarily be the Economic and Social Development Division.

The MSG Secretariat currently hosts the Office of the Chief Trade Adviser, an out-posted branch of the Suva-based Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS).

10. ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of discussions with a wide range of people in the Pacific sub-regions interviewed during the consultation period, including government leaders, officials, donor agency and NGO staff, there is an overwhelming view that the time has well arrived for SPREP to not only consider decentralising, but to now implement steps to establish sub-regional presences in both Micronesia and Melanesia. The anecdotal evidence that is available to support the SPC decentralisation experiences indicate that establishing a presence in sub-regions of the Pacific can have very positive impact upon both the quality and quantity of services and service delivery, at the policy, planning, implementation and capacity building levels. Comments such as, “by having SPREP closer to our doorstep will assist us make better use of SPREP’s services” reflect a desire to make more efficient use of a valued resource that SPREP membership offers.

Additionally, it has not been possible to put a monetary value on the costs versus the benefits of decentralisation of the preferred structural arrangement for the SPREP sub-regional presence, the experiences of SPC, the UN Joint Presence Initiative and PNA clearly

indicate that by bringing services closer to Members there are significant savings in terms of travel costs, staff times costs, procurement costs and benefits associated with increased access to professional resources to assist national planning, capacity building and knowledge management. Furthermore, as was mentioned in a few cases during the consultations, Members will feel more comfortable about contributing to SPREP governance and being able to redress the imbalance they perceive concerning member countries closer to SPREP HQ dominating SPREP programmes, decision making and planning.

The Micronesian Member countries overwhelming support the establishment of a sub-regional presence in their sub-region, mainly for the various reasons mentioned above. Although they have articulated unified thinking on this issue, they are less in agreement as to the location and structure of a SPREP sub-regional presence. What is clear about the location is that they don’t feel that a SPREP sub-regional presence in Suva or Honiara, co-located with SPC or FFA respectively would advantage them as they consider these locations just as removed from their vicinity as is Apia. But should SPREP establish a sub-regional presence in Micronesia, where should it be located? Palau has made a good case for establishing it in Koror. FSM has a good case for locating it in Pohnpei. RMI has not articulated their preferences, but discussions in Majuro indicated that they seem less concerned about ownership of a SPREP presence as long as whichever location appears to support the option that best suits their needs. The key factors seem to revolve around communications and the advantage of it being in a central ‘hub’. Experience with international agencies and the needs of the Members for SPREP’s services are other criteria.

With regards to the above, the FSM communication links are impressive – fibre optical cable and relatively fast and reliable internet services, as well as reliable electrical power. Palau is in the process of buying a

similar fibre optical cable. FSM is the centre of the hub for flights to and from Majuro and Koror, as well as north to Guam and from there to Australia, Asia, Hawai'i and the continental U.S.A., as well as, at the time of writing, to Fiji and from there to Tonga, Samoa, New Zealand, as well as to most other SPREP Member countries. All the three countries have CROP agency staff, international agencies and foreign diplomatic missions of importance to the Pacific region present on their soil although Palau is also host to agencies specifically involved with the environment sector, such as the PICRP, the Shark Sanctuary and Marine Mammal Sanctuary. All three countries have adequate to good educational facilities, health care facilities and can provide international staff with adequate housing, despite none of them having a formalised real estate agency networks. Furthermore, they all have operational HCAs or MOUs which adequately govern the operations and mutual responsibilities of the CROP and other international agencies that they host.

The question concerning the structure of the proposed SPREP sub-regional presence is another criterion to help determine the best location for SPREP in Micronesia. Palau has offered substantial, good quality office space in the PICRP compound. FSM has suggested co-location with SPC, that SPC has agreed to 'in principle', which if the building is suitable, would accommodate an initial nucleus of SPREP staff who could be relocated to the Micronesian Village once sufficient progress on that initiative eventuates.

In Melanesia, the SPREP Members are no less circumspect concerning a SPREP sub-regional presence. The support for this initiative is overwhelming and passionate, to the extent that should it be agreed to proceed, the arrangements for SPREP to begin work from a Melanesian base could seemingly occur fairly swiftly. As far as a location for a SPREP presence in Melanesia, both Fiji and PNG are of the opinion that either Honiara or Port Vila should be the venue. Their reasoning is based on their view that both PNG and Fiji have considerable capacity regarding implementing

environment activities, whereas Vanuatu and Solomon Islands have limited capacity on one hand, yet substantial needs and plans for implementing environmentally sustainable initiatives. A SPREP presence in either country would go a long way to support both in their endeavours to address their priority issues and commitments concerning climate change and biodiversity conservation.

Both Solomon Islands and Vanuatu are willing to provide assistance to SPREP to establish a sub-regional presence in their countries. Given the cost effectiveness of co-locating a SPREP presence with another CROP or regional agency, both countries have indicated opportunities for this option. For example, in Solomon Islands, FFA has indicated their willingness to host an initial SPREP presence in Honiara, whereas in Vanuatu SPREP could be housed with SPC once their new premises have been renovated, or else co-located with the VMS. Should the MSG offer office space, then this option could be explored further as there may be mutual benefits for both SPREP and MSG to be co-located due to the MSG trade and investment portfolio involving mining, commercial agriculture and forestry, all areas where there are important environmental issues to be considered.

In terms of access to neighbouring countries and internal travel, both Honiara and Port Vila have frequent flights within Melanesia and to Australia and New Zealand. Their internal flight schedules are also equally impressive. The other factors to be considered regarding the location of a SPREP sub-regional office concern medical and education facilities, as well as residential housing for staff and dependants. In both Honiara and Port Vila, medical and educational facilities are adequate and comparable, whereas the housing market in Honiara is expensive and tight, compared to the reasonable range of suitable, affordable housing available for SPREP staff in Port Vila.

Recommendations:**(A) Micronesia**

- 4) SPREP undertakes to establish a sub-regional presence in Micronesia as soon as possible, ensuring that a nucleus of relevant SPREP programmes are represented by either newly appointed or re-located staff.
- 5) SPREP explore with FSM and SPC the opportunity to co-locate an initial number of staff as mentioned above, to share office equipment and management costs, should the civil engineering assessment of the current SPC office building in Pohnpei prove to be structurally sound. Should the building prove to be unsound, FSM, undertake to obtain an alternative building for both SPC and SPREP that they all agree is suitable for a joint CROP agency presence.
- 6) FSM be encouraged to actively seek funding to construct the Micronesian Village to include accommodation for SPC, SPREP and other CROP agencies to operate a joint CROP agency presence.

(B) Melanesia

- 1) SPREP undertakes to establish a sub-regional presence in Melanesia as soon as possible, ensuring that a nucleus of relevant SPREP programmes are represented by either newly appointed or re-located staff.
- 2) SPREP explore with Vanuatu the opportunity to co-locate an initial number of staff as mentioned above, to share office equipment and management costs with SPC to create a 'one stop joint CROP agency presence', once the renovations to the house allocated to SPC is completed. Should this arrangement fall through, and if the MSG Secretariat is willing, SPREP should negotiate with the MSG Secretariat

to co-locate with them. If this arrangement is not acceptable, then a fall back position for SPREP would be to explore the option to co-locate with the VMS.

11. ANNEXES:**1. Terms of Reference**

Consultancy to assist the SPREP Secretariat in exploring options for establishing a sub-regional presence in the Pacific region

Terms of Reference May 2011**1. Background**

The 21st SPREP Meeting held in Madang, Papua New Guinea in September 2010, endorsed the concept of establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP in the Pacific region and called for the Secretariat to investigate options. The rationale for establishing a regional presence is to further strengthen and better align SPREP member activities with the 2011 – 2015 SPREP Strategic Plan and fulfil its regional mandate which is: *"To promote cooperation in the Pacific region and to provide assistance in order to protect and improve its environment and ensure sustainable development for present and future generations"* The 2009 Report on the Independent Corporate Review (ICR) of SPREP called on Members to consider implementing a strategy of decentralizing Secretariat activities within the region in order to improve its effectiveness at the operational level. Rather than employing the current "fly-in, fly-out" approach, the ICR called for the placement of Secretariat staff in strategic sub-regional locations which would allow for sufficient time for both Government staff in the relevant PICTs that require extensive support, and Secretariat personnel to achieve planned outcomes. This is consistent with the current trend where some CROP, UN and other regional Organisations have already placed staff at strategic sub-regional locations in order to provide improved service to their Members. The successful consultant (consultancy) will prepare a report on all relevant options for

establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP, including co-locating staff at other CROP agencies. The report will outline the financial implications of each option.

2. Process

The process will comprise:

- i. Development and distribution of a questionnaire to all Members to gather key input on their views on the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP, and how it will contribute to better delivery of services to PICTs, and enable SPREP to achieve the new strategic priorities identified under the new SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015
- ii. Development and distribution of a questionnaire to Key Partners/Donors to gather key input on their views on the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP, and how it will contribute to better delivery of services to PICTs, and enable SPREP to achieve the new strategic priorities identified under the new SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015;
- iii. Consultation with relevant/key government officials of SPREP Members through tele-conference/telephone or video conference calls;
- iv. Consultation with relevant CROP agencies regarding possibilities for collocation of SPREP staff;
- v. Consultation with staff from the SPREP Secretariat;
- vi. Consultation with relevant donors to ascertain options and interest in providing support for the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP;
- vii. Follow-up of questionnaires with SPREP Member, Territories and Partners/donors;
- viii. Consultation with certain SPREP Member countries and Territories through selected country visits by the consultant in the 3 sub-regional areas - (Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia)
- ix. Presentation of a synthesis of the responses to questionnaires and consultations with Members and Territories to SPREP Management;

- x. Development of the draft report and submission to 22nd SPREP Meeting in September 2011.

3. Terms of Reference of the Consultancy

SPREP requires a consultant to assist the Secretariat in undertaking a Study/Report on the options for establishing a sub-regional regional presence for SPREP within the Pacific region with the specific tasks:

- i. Follow-up with Pacific island countries and territories (PICTs) and Partners/donors on the questionnaire to ensure that effective feedback is received;
- ii. Travel to selected Member countries and Territories in the Melanesia/Micronesia/Polynesia sub-regions and consult with relevant Government officials on options for establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP;
- iii. Provide a synthesis of key inputs from consultations with SPREP members, partners and donors including feedback on the questionnaire;
- iv. Consult and work closely with the SPREP Secretariat in finalising key inputs in the development of a draft report/study;
- v. Provide the SPREP Secretariat with a draft report/study outlining all options for the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP in the Pacific region including the pros and cons and financial implications for each option;
- vi. Presentation of the final draft report/study to the 22nd SPREP Meeting to be held in Apia in September 2011

4. Consultant Expertise Required

- i. Extensive experience and proven track record in Organisational/corporate/strategic/financial issues and consultative stakeholder engagement, preferably in the Pacific islands region.
- ii. Extensive experience and proven track record in consultative and participatory

- stakeholder engagement, preferably in the Pacific islands region.
- iii. Familiarity with the role and operations of regional Organisations in the Pacific, especially SPREP.
 - iv. Comprehensive understanding of the main environmental and developmental issues in the Pacific islands region preferred.
 - v. Proven ability to deliver required outputs within tight deadlines.

5. Timeframe

- i. Follow-up with Pacific island countries and territories (PICTs) on the questionnaire to ensure that effective feedback is received (5 days)
- ii. Travel to selected Member countries to consult on options for establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP (15 days)
- iii. Work with Secretariat to provide a synthesis of key inputs and outcomes of consultations with SPREP Members, Territories and Partners/Donors (5 days)
- iv. Work with Secretariat to finalise draft report/study (5 days)
- v. Final report/study printed, translated and distributed to SPREP Members
- vi. Presentation of final report/study to SPREP Meeting, Apia, Samoa

2) List of people and agencies consulted.

| Country | Persons met | Title and Organisation |
|--------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Palau | Hon. Victor M. Yano | Minister Minister of State |
| | Mr Gustav Altaro | Director, Bureau of International Trade & Technical Assistance Ministry of State |
| | Mr Joe Itaro | Protected Areas Network Coordinator Ministry of Natural Resources & Tourism |
| | Ms Anu Gupta | Director of Conservation & Protected Areas Palau Conservation Society |
| | Mr Sebastian Marino | National Environment Planner Office of Environmental Response & Coordination |
| | Mr Tony Pollack | SPC Energy Specialist (Palau) Ministry of Public Works |
| | Mr Fernando Sengebau | Director Bureau of Agriculture |
| | Ms Tiare Holm | Principal Consultant Sustainable Decisions |

| Country | Persons met | Title and Organisation |
|------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Ms Carol Emaurois | Information Officer Palau International Coral Reef Center |
| | Ms Roxane Blesam | Compliance Specialist Environment Quality Protection Board |
| RMI | Mr Gee Leong Bing | Director, Office of Compact Implementation Ministry of Foreign Affairs |
| | Mr Anton Jimwerely | PNA Coordinator Parties to the Nauru Agreement |
| | Ms Lydia Kaminaga | Deputy Director, Office of Multi-lateral Affairs Ministry of Foreign Affairs |
| | Mrs Yumiko Crisostomo | Director, Office of Environmental Planning & Policy Coordination Office of the President |
| | Mr Warwick Harris | Deputy Director, Office of Environmental Planning & Policy Coordination Office of the President |
| | Mr Nicholas Wardrop | National Energy Adviser Ministry of Resources & Development |
| | Ms Arieta Gonelevu | SPC Energy Specialist (RMI) Ministry of Resources & Development |
| | Ms Deborah Manase | Director Environment Protection Agency |
| FSM | Mr Amena Yauvoli | Manager SPC North Pacific Regional Office |
| | Ms Shanty Sigrah | Assistant Director, Pacific Affairs Division Department of Foreign Affairs |
| | Ms Cindy Ehmes | Assistant Director, Division of Environment & Sustainable Development Office of Environment & Emergency Management |
| | Mr Andrew Yatiman | Director, Division of Environment & Sustainable Development Office of Environment & Emergency Management |
| | Mr Marion Henry | Secretary Department of Resources and Development |
| | Mr Gibson Susumu | Agriculture Program Manager Department of Resources and Development |
| | Mr Valentin Martin | Fisheries Unit Program Manager Department of Resources and Development |
| | Professor Glenn Hurry | Executive Director Western & Central Pacific Fisheries Commission |
| | Mr William Kostka | Executive Director Micronesia Conservation Trust |
| | Okeane Ehmes | Country Development Manager UN Joint Presence Initiative |
| | High Chief Ihlen Joseph | Chief of Staff State Government of Pohnpei |
| | Mr Robert Spegal | Head Micronesia Human Resources Development Center |
| PNG | Mr Robert Yen | National Coordinator GEF UNDP |
| | Dr Wari Lea Iamo | Secretary Department of Environment and Conservation |
| | Mr Bobby Peinka | Executive Officer Department of Environment and Conservation |
| | Mr John Wilmot | Environment Scientist Department of Environment and Conservation Consultant |

| Country | Persons met | Title and Organisation |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Mr Lahui Ako | Director, Multilateral Economic Affairs Branch Department of Foreign Affairs |
| | Prof. Chalapan Kaluwin | Professor in Environmental Science and Geography University of Papua New Guinea |
| | Professor Frank Griffin | Executive Dean, School of Natural & Physical Sciences University of Papua New Guinea |
| | Dr Peter Petsul | Senior Lecturer, Chemistry Department University of Papua New Guinea |
| | Mr Robin Totome | Lecturer, Biology Department University of Papua New Guinea |
| | Ms Georgina Numbasa | Lecturer, Environmental Science & Geography Dept. University of Papua New Guinea |
| | Mr Noel Mobiha | PNG Space Office Department of Prime Minister and National Economic Commission |
| Solomon Islands | Ms Mia Rimon | Manager SPC Solomon Island National Office |
| | Mr Dan Sua'a | Director General Forum Fisheries Agency |
| | Mr Chanel Iroi | Acting Permanent Secretary and Under Secretary (Technical) Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster management and Meteorology |
| | Mr Joe Horokou | Director, Environment and Conservation Division Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster management and Meteorology |
| | Mr George Hou'ou | Assistant Secretary for Regional Economic Cooperation Ministry of Foreign Affairs and External Trade |
| | Mr Mose Saitala | Director Commonwealth Pacific Governance Facility |
| | Ms Janice Spalding | Regional Program Coordinator Commonwealth Pacific Governance Facility |
| Fiji | Ms Judith Robinson | Acting High Commissioner Australian High Commission |
| | Ms Romaine Kwesius | Counsellor, Development Cooperation Section Australian High Commission |
| | Mr Ryan Medrana | First Secretary (Climate Change), Development Cooperation Section Australian High Commission |
| | Ms Marina Ilingworth | Program Manager, Environment and Climate Change, Development Cooperation Section Australian High Commission |
| | Ms Andie Fong Toi | Deputy Secretary-General Pacific Island Forum Secretariat |
| | Dr Russell Howorth | Director, SPOAC Division Secretariat of the Pacific Community |
| | Ms Fekitamoeola 'Utoikamamanu | Deputy Director-General, Suva Regional Office Secretariat of the Pacific Community |
| | Mr John Yee Chief | Deputy Director, Corporate Services Secretariat of the Pacific Community |
| | Ms Patricia Sachs-Cornish | Senior Planning Adviser, Strategic Engagement, Policy and Planning Facility Secretariat of the Pacific Community |
| | Ms Asenaca Vakacegu | Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist UNICEF |

| Country | Persons met | Title and Organisation |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Mr Aminiasi Qareqare | Acting Principal Environmental Officer Department of Environment |
| Vanuatu | Ms Isabelle Austin | Deputy Representative UNICEF |
| | Mr Donald Wouloseje | Program Officer, UNDP Vanuatu UN Joint Presence Office |
| | May Susan Pascual | Chief of UNICEF Field Office and UN Joint Presence Vanuatu UN Joint Presence Office |
| | Ms Roslyn Arthur | UN Affairs Officer Vanuatu UN Joint Presence Office |
| | Mr Albert Williams | Director Department of Environment |
| | Mr Richard Balkonan | Senior Desk Officer, Asia and Pacific Division Department of Foreign Affairs and External Trade |
| | Mr Salesa Koniahia | Acting Director, Vanuatu Meteorology Service Department of Meteorology and Geo-hazards |
| | Mr David Gibson | Manager of Weather Forecasting and Services Department of Meteorology and Geo-hazards |
| | Ms Lora L-Napuati | Media/Information Officer Melanesian Spearhead Group Secretariat |

3) Travel schedule

| Country | Date (2011) |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Palau | Monday 8 th August - Thursday 11 th August |
| RMI | Friday 12 th August - Tuesday 16 th August |
| FSM | Tuesday 16 th August - Thursday 18 th August |
| Papua New Guinea | Friday 19 th August - Tuesday 23 rd August |
| Solomon Islands | Tuesday 23 rd August - Friday 26 th August |
| Fiji | Friday 26 th August - Tuesday 30 th August |
| Vanuatu | Tuesday 30 th August - Thursday 1 st September |
| | |

3) Generic Host Country Agreement or Memorandum of Understanding

The following is a draft of a generic Host Country Agreement (HCA) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between a regional or international Organisation established in a Pacific island country.

**HOST AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE
GOVERNMENT OF COUNTRY XXXX AND
ORGANISATION XXXX TO ESTABLISH A
NATIONAL COORDINATION OFFICE OF
ORGANISATION XXXXX IN THE CITY OF
XXXXX, COUNTRY XXXX**

**The Government of Country XXXX and
Organisation XXXX**

wishing to give effect to their mutual intent to establish a formal office of Organisation XXXX in Country XXXX;

desiring to define the legal capacity, privileges and immunities to be enjoyed by the officers of Organisation XXXX serving in its office; and

wishing to provide for the privileges and immunities of certain other persons in the interests of facilitating the functions of Organisation XXXX ;

have agreed as follows:

**Article 1
Definitions**

In this Agreement, unless the context otherwise requires,

“appropriate authorities” means the national, provincial, or village authorities in accordance with the laws of Country XXXX;

“Director-General” means the Director-General of Organisation XXXX;

"expert" means a person engaged to perform short-term or temporary work on behalf of Organisation XXXX in the capacity of a temporary staff or a consultant but does not include staff members;

"Government" means the Government of Country XXXX;

"official activities" means all activities undertaken pursuant to this Agreement, including Organisation XXXX's administrative activities;

"Organisation XXXX" means the Organisation XXXX

"staff member" means any person appointed to, or recruited for, a full-time or part-time position with Organisation XXXX and subject to its staff regulations, but does not include an expert or any person recruited locally on hourly rates of pay;

“Organisation XXXX office” means the Organisation XXXX office in Country XXXX.

**Article 2
Legal personality**

Organisation XXXX has a legal personality. It has, in particular, the capacity to establish contracts, to acquire and dispose of movable and immovable property, and to institute and be a party to legal proceedings.

**Article 3
Immunities of ORGANISATION XXXX**

1. Except as otherwise provided for in this Agreement, the activities of Organisation XXXX in Country XXXX shall be governed by the laws of Country XXXX.

2. Organisation XXXX and its official activities, its property, premises and assets shall have immunity from any suit or other legal process except:

- (a) to the extent that Organisation XXXX expressly waives its immunity from any suit or other legal process in a particular case;
- (b) in respect of any contract for the supply of goods or services, any lease for premises, any loan or other transaction for the provision of finance and any guarantee or indemnity in respect of any such transaction or of any other financial obligation;

- (c) in respect of a civil action by a third party for death, damage or personal injury arising from an accident caused by a motor vehicle belonging to, or operated on behalf of, Organisation XXXX;
- (d) in respect of a motor vehicle offence involving a motor vehicle belonging to, or operated on behalf of, Organisation XXXX;
- (e) in the event of the attachment, pursuant to the final order of a court of law, of the salaries, wages or other benefits owed by Organisation XXXX to a staff member or to an expert;
- (f) in respect of a counterclaim directly connected with proceedings initiated by Organisation XXXX;
- (g) in respect of the enforcement of an arbitration award made under Article 11.

3. Organisation XXXX's property, premises and assets shall have immunity from any form of restrictions or controls such as requisition, confiscation, expropriation or attachment. They shall also be immune from any form of administrative or judicial constraint; however, motor vehicles belonging to or operated on behalf of Organisation XXXX shall not be immune from administrative or judicial constraint when temporarily necessary in connection with the prevention of, and investigation into, accidents involving such motor vehicles. These immunities shall cease to apply in relation to property, premises and assets which have been abandoned by Organisation XXXX for a period in excess of twelve months.

Article 4

Premises and property

1. The premises of Organisation XXXX shall be inviolable and shall be under the full authority of Organisation XXXX. The appropriate authorities may enter the premises to carry out their duties only with

the consent of the Organisation XXXX Director-General and under the conditions agreed to by him or her. The Director-General's consent shall be deemed to have been given in the case of fire or other event which may require immediate protective action.

2. The Government shall take all appropriate steps to protect the premises of Organisation XXXX against any intrusion or damage and to prevent any impairment of its dignity.

3. Organisation XXXX shall make known to the Government the location of any premises temporarily occupied for the performance of its official activities. Where any premises are used or occupied by Organisation XXXX for the performance of its official activities, such premises shall, with the concurrence of the Government, be accorded the status of premises of Organisation XXXX.

4. Organisation XXXX shall not permit its premises to become a refuge for any person not entitled to immunity.

5. The records of Organisation XXXX shall be inviolable wherever they are and by whomever they are possessed.

6. The Government shall provide reasonable and appropriate premises for the Organisation XXXX office in Honiara, free of charge. The Government shall assist Organisation XXXX in obtaining public utilities and other services, such as electricity, water, waste disposal, gas and telephone, at its permanent premises.

7. Pending the availability of permanent premises, the Government shall provide suitable interim premises to Organisation XXXX free of charge.

Article 5

Communications

1. Organisation XXXX may employ all appropriate means of communication, including messages in code or cipher. The Government shall not impose any restriction

on the official communications of Organisation XXXX or on the import, export or circulation of its publications or other information materials.

2. Organisation XXXX may install and use a radio transmitter or satellite dish for communication if available communication facilities are inadequate and with notice to the Government, subject to the requirements of the telecommunication laws of Country XXXX.

3. The Government shall take all reasonable steps to assist the Organisation XXXX office to meet its specific technical and administrative communication needs.

Article 6

Exemption from taxes and currency controls

1. Within the scope of its official activities, Organisation XXXX, its property, premises and its income, including contributions made to Organisation XXXX under this Agreement, shall be exempt from all national taxes.

2. Goods, including Organisation XXX's publications, motor vehicles and items for official entertainment purposes that are intended for the official use of Organisation XXXX shall be exempt from all customs and excise duties including sales tax payable at customs, except payment for services. Goods which have been acquired or imported by Organisation XXXX to which exemptions apply shall not be given away, sold, lent, hired out or otherwise disposed of in Country XXXX except under conditions agreed on in advance with the Government.

3. The Government shall not impose any foreign exchange restrictions or taxes upon any financial transfers into and out of Country XXXX made by Organisation XXXX or its staff members, experts and representatives, other than those who are citizens of Country XXX.

Article 7

Staff members

1. Staff members of Organisation XXXX:

(a) shall have, even after the termination of their service with Organisation XXXX immunity from any suit or other legal process in respect of acts and things done by them in the exercise of their official functions, including words written or spoken; this immunity shall not, however, apply in the case of a motor vehicle offence committed by such a staff member nor in the case of civil or administrative proceedings arising out of death, damage or personal injury caused by a motor vehicle belonging to or driven by him or her;

(b) shall be, unless they are citizens of Country XXXX, at the time of first taking up their post in Country XXX, exempt from customs duties and other such charges (except payments for services) in respect of import of furniture and personal effects including motor vehicles in their ownership or possession or already ordered by them and intended for their personal use or for their establishment; such goods shall be imported within six months of a staff member's first entry into Country XXX but in exceptional circumstances an extension of this period shall be granted by the Government; goods which have been acquired or imported by staff members and to which exemptions under this paragraph apply shall not be given away, sold, lent, hired out, or otherwise disposed of except under conditions agreed on in advance with the Government; furniture and personal effects including motor vehicles may be exported free of duties when leaving Country XXX on the termination of the official functions of the staff member;

- (c) shall be exempt from all taxes on income received from Organisation XXXX.
- (d) shall enjoy within and with respect to Country XXX the same protection and repatriation facilities with respect to themselves, their families and other members of their households, as are accorded to foreign nationals in time of international crises.

Article 8

Experts

1. Experts shall enjoy, while exercising their official functions in Country XXX and while traveling in the exercise of their official functions in Country XXX, immunity, which shall extend beyond the termination of their functions with ORGANISATION XXXX, from any suit or other legal process in respect of acts and things done in the exercise of their official functions, including words written or spoken; this immunity shall not, however, apply in the case of a motor vehicle offence committed by such an expert nor in the case of civil or administrative proceedings arising out of death, damage or personal injury caused by a motor vehicle belonging to or driven by him or her.

2. The Government shall not require experts to pay taxes on income received from Organisation XXXX.

Article 9

Political neutrality

1. The conduct of Organisation XXXX staff members and experts while traveling in, residing in, and exercising their official functions in Country XXX shall be governed by the provisions of the Organisation XXXX Staff Regulations and Staff Rules.

2. Staff members shall not engage in activities or make public statements, verbal, written or visual, that are of a partisan political nature in the context of Country XXXX.

3. Staff members shall not use privileges or immunities granted to them under this Agreement to further aspirations of a partisan political nature for themselves or their personal associates.

4. Clauses 1, 2 and 3 above do not restrict or prevent experts or staff members from pursuing personal and private political aspirations after the termination of their services with Organisation XXXX.

5. Any staff member who is a national of Country XXX and who wishes to pursue a political career/ aspirations whilst in the service of Organisation XXXX must first resign from Organisation XXXX .

Article 10

Immigration and labour laws

1. Staff members, experts and representatives of ORGANISATION XXXX and their spouses and dependent children under the age of twenty-one years shall comply with the immigration laws of Country XXXX.

2. The Government shall provide suitable entry permits and work permits requested by Organisation XXXX for staff members, their spouses and children under the age of 21 years and for experts, on the same basis as such permits are provided to staff members and their families, consultants and contractors of foreign embassies located in Country XXXX.

Article 11

Object of privileges and immunities accorded to staff members and experts

1. Privileges and immunities are accorded to staff members and experts to ensure the independence of the persons to whom they are accorded in the exercise of their functions to achieve the purposes of the regional service of Organisation XXXX .

2. The Director-General has the right and duty after consultations with the members of Organisation XXXX to waive any immunities, other than his or her own, and

those of his or her spouse and dependent children under the age of 18 years, when he or she considers that such immunities would impede the course of justice and they can be waived without prejudicing the purposes for which they were accorded.

3. If such immunities are not waived, Organisation XXXX shall make the strongest efforts to achieve an equitable solution to the matter. Such a solution may include an arbitration procedure.

Article 12

Notification of appointment

1. Organisation XXXX shall inform the Government when a staff member or expert takes up or relinquishes his or her post. Where possible, prior notice of arrival and final departure shall be given. If staff members are accompanied by a spouse or dependent children under the age of 18 years, prior notice shall also be given, where possible, in respect of such persons.

2. Organisation XXXX shall twice each year send to the Government a list of all staff members and their citizenship and their spouses and dependent children under the age of 18 years accompanying them in Country XXX, and experts.

3. The immunities and privileges given in this Agreement shall only apply to persons who are in the list given to the Government under clause 2 above.

Article 13

Cooperation

1. Organisation XXXX shall cooperate fully at all times with the appropriate authorities in order to prevent any abuse of the privileges, immunities and facilities provided for in this Agreement.

2. The Government reserves its sovereign right to take reasonable measures to preserve security.

3. Nothing in this Agreement prevents the application of laws necessary for health and quarantine or, in respect of Organisation XXXX and its officers, laws relating to public order.

Article 14

Consultation

1. The Government and Organisation XXXX shall consult at the written request of either of them concerning matters arising under this Agreement.

Article 15

Amendment

1. This Agreement may be amended by agreement between the Government and Organisation XXXX, confirmed by an exchange of notes between the Government and Organisation XXXX.

Article 16

Applicable laws and settlement of disputes

1. The applicable laws shall be the laws of Country XXX.

2. Any dispute between the Government and Organisation XXXX concerning the interpretation or application of this Agreement or any question affecting the relations between the Government and Organisation XXXX shall be settled by consultation or negotiation or by some other mutually acceptable method between the Government and Organisation XXXX.

Article 17

Entry into force, amendment and termination

1. This Agreement shall enter into force on the date that the Government and ORGANISATION XXXX have both signed two originals. One original shall be deposited with the Government and one original shall be deposited with Organisation XXXX.

2. This Agreement may be terminated by either the Government or Organisation XXXXX with a reasonable period of notice.

3. If the Organisation XXX office is removed from Country XXXXX, this Agreement shall, after a period reasonably required for the transfer and disposal of the property of ORGANISATION XXXX in Country XXXX, cease to be in force.

4. In either event, the date on which this Agreement terminates shall be confirmed by an exchange of notes between the Government and Organisation XXXX.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly authorised thereunto, have signed this Agreement.

DONE in duplicate at _____ this _____ day of _____ (Year).

**FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF HOST COUNTRY
XXXXXX**

Name: XXXXXX
Minister of Foreign Affairs

Organisation XXXXXXXXXXXXX

Name: XXXXXXXXX
Director-General

Annex 5: Report of the Friends of the Chair: Study on options for establishing a sub-regional presence for SPREP

The meeting recalled that element 3.2 of the SPREP Strategic Plan, 'Strengthening Regional Linkages', tasks the Secretariat to "continually seek ways to improve regional linkages and Member's access to SPREP services and advice". In this context the meeting welcomed the draft report *'Consultancy to assist the SPREP Secretariat in exploring a sub-regional presence in the Pacific Region'* and presentation by Mr David Gowty on the establishment of a sub-regional presence for SPREP as a important step toward meeting the need identified in the Strategic Plan.

The meeting recognized that improving regional linkages was a critical element of ensuring SPREP's success into the future and that there were a number of different approaches which required evaluation, including consideration of costs, benefits and implications for SPREP delivery of services and advice.

The following broad approaches were identified as requiring further evaluation, noting that none of these approaches are mutually exclusive:

- Establishment of sub-regional offices, including co-location with other CROP agencies;
- Periodic sub-regional forums;
- Project-based regional presence;
- Country desk officers based at SPREP Headquarters; and
- Placement of SPREP staff in line agencies in country.

The meeting tasked the Secretariat to bring forward a paper on 'Strengthening Regional Linkages' to the 23rd Meeting of SPREP, which presents a detailed evaluation of options and seeks endorsement of a program of action. The meeting identified the following elements as critical elements in moving forward:

- A formal consultation with all members prior to SPREP's 2012 meeting;
- Specific proposals, along with the rationale for support, linked to the efficient and effective delivery of programs and strategic plan priorities;
- A small number of illustrative cases studies of successful regional presence;
- Identification of Pacific Island Countries that would be the focus for improving regional linkages, including specific programs and projects requiring on-ground support;
- Robust assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposals;
- Identification of the implications of proposals particularly on delivery of services and advice into the future, including the financial impact on the core budget; and
- Identification of any factors, including external factors, likely to significantly impact on SPREP's delivery of services and advice over the term of the Strategic Plan.

Annex 6: Statements by Observers

BirdLife International

The Chair
Director of SPREP and Staff
Distinguished Delegates
Observers
Ladies and Gentlemen

The last 12 months has been a challenging one for bird populations around the region. We have stabilized the tiny populations of Tahiti and Fatu Hiva Monarchs – both with less than 10 breeding pairs – in French Polynesia, and located 33 Crow Honeyeater in New Caledonia, although we failed to find any Pohnpei Starling. We reported increased numbers of Micronesian Imperial-pigeon around Majuro in Marshall Islands – and located another Fiji Petrel off shore in Fiji. We are pleased that the Cook Islands government proposed adding Bristle-thighed Curlew to Appendix 1 of the Convention of Migratory Species. Bristle-thighed curlew can occur in all countries of Polynesia and Micronesia. Clearly the well-being of these birds transcends country boundaries and requires a regional perspective – illustrating the logic of a partnership between BirdLife and organizations such as SPREP.

A couple of months ago Don Stewart, on behalf of BirdLife, and David Sheppard, signed an MoU committing to continued collaboration between the two organizations. The joint aims of this MoU are to further the conservation of species (and I think you can see that much has been undertaken in the last year or so) and the conservation of sites that identify priority areas for birds and biodiversity. Many thanks to Bruce Jefferies for discussions on how best to deliver these aims. We would also like to thank SPREP for continuing to host the Important Bird Areas in the Pacific report, and Easter in particular for highlighting the

Regional Workshop for updating NBSAPs to be held next month.

The other group of globally important birds in the region, seabirds, have maybe had less attention until recently, especially compared with other marine species such as Dugong, Turtles and Sharks. This is about to change as BirdLife recently held discussions with SPREP and CI Pacific regarding selection of priority marine sites for biodiversity. Many thanks to Tim Carruthers for convening the discussion on Oceanscapes at the recent RoundTable.

I thank the Director of SPREP, and you the members, for this opportunity to talk. I thank everyone for your attention.

Thank you.



Conservation International Pacific Islands Programme (CI)

Thank you for the opportunity to present our Observer Statement to the Secretariat and the Members of SPREP.

SPREP is CI's most important partner in this region, and CI's Pacific Islands Programme was originally located in Samoa primarily to ensure a close working collaboration with SPREP in planning, funding and delivering nature conservation outcomes that provide for healthy communities living in healthy ecosystems throughout our region. In this context, CI would like to reaffirm our commitment to refreshing our own Pacific islands strategy 2012-2016, including to achieve better alignment with the SPREP Strategic Plan, the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific and relevant country strategies such as NBSAPs and NAPAs.

Conservation International has had a MOU with SPREP since 2002. Our current MOU is active until 2013 and focuses largely on biodiversity conservation. Our joint activities with SPREP are wide ranging and include various collaborations, particularly on climate change adaptation initiatives and the Pacific Oceanscape. We are pleased to be able to provide funding to SPREP through the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund to implement terrestrial conservation projects in a number of SPREP member states. Currently we have active and approved grants to SPREP worth more than 950,000 USD.

CI has recently developed a new global strategy, based on a number of securities for human well-being such as climate, food, health, water and species conservation. Our tools to achieve this, however, remain the same - strong science and sustained partnerships.

In partnership with SPREP, we remain committed to the full implementation of:

1. **The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund** for the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot, which covers 10% of the planet's surface. We have recently developed an Ecosystem Profile for the New Caledonia Hotspot, and we are currently hard at work preparing a similar profile for the Eastern Melanesian Islands Hotspot (PNG northern islands, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu). We are particularly grateful for the support of the Government of France to the CEPF and for providing the funds to allow the launch of a new round of CEPF funding globally. Since we launched the CEPF in this region three years ago, we have committed more than \$5 million USD to over 60 projects in 13 countries and territories, all of which are SPREP members.
2. **Invasive species management** - Invasive Species Management remains one of the

core activities for the maintenance of ecosystems and species conservation in the Pacific Islands. CI applauds the lead role taken by SPREP and other partners in capacity building and also wishes to acknowledge the collaboration of the Governments of Kiribati, Samoa, UK and USA and a number of conservation organizations, in the recent historic Pacific Islands Restoration Voyage, which conducted pest eradication programmes in Palmyra Atoll, the Phoenix Islands and Henderson Island in the Pitcairn group.

3. **The new CBD targets** agreed at COP10 in Nagoya are a challenge to all SPREP members, and CI is committed to working in collaboration with both the SPREP Secretariat, member governments, donors and other members of civil society to meet those targets.
4. **The Pacific Oceanscape Framework** - together with members of the Marine Sector Working Group, CI has assisted with the development of a Pacific Oceanscape Framework, consistent with the Pacific Plan and Ocean Policy, as mandated by the Forum Leaders in August 2010 and. This bold initiative integrates our marine conservation efforts across the region, at a scale aimed at ocean stewardship for a significant proportion of the largest ocean on the planet. It is indeed an endeavour of global significance and we welcome the appointment of Tuiloma Neroni Slade as the first Pacific Oceanscape Commissioner, to be the region's primary "united voice for the ocean" in this ambitious undertaking. We are pleased to continue our support to Kiribati's PIPA, still the largest MPA in this ocean, and to add support to other recently declared sanctuaries and to the new Cook Islands marine park, the world's largest declared marine park initiative.

5. **Rio+20** – CI applauds and supports the proposal for the Pacific Small Island Developing States to lead an initiative for the promotion of a Blue Economy at the Rio+20 initiative, and to ensure that issues related to the Pacific Ocean and islands are given prominence in the Rio+20 agenda.
6. **The restoration of watersheds** for carbon sequestration, conservation, community livelihoods in the Fiji Islands. With numerous partners, including the National Trust of Fiji, FIJI Water and the University of the Pacific, as well as key institutions of the Fiji Government, CI continues to work closely with landowners and communities in various part of Fiji for new innovative projects in support of healthy ecosystems, from protection of the Sovi Basin forests to the reforestation projects of the Nakauvadra Range. These form part of our contribution to the efforts of both SPREP and Fiji towards forest protection, and an integration of ecosystem services into the mainstream of climate change adaptation approaches in the region. We hope that the experience that has been developed here and in our projects in New Caledonia, can be adapted to other Pacific Islands.

In conclusion, I would like once again to thank the Director and Deputy Director of SPREP and the SPREP staff for their support during the past year and to congratulate SPREP and its members for the achievements presented at this meeting.

Soifua,



**Statement from CMS Secretariat and
UNEP/CMS Office – Abu Dhabi**

Thank you Chair and Members for this opportunity. On behalf of the CMS Secretariat

in Bonn, Germany and the UNEP/CMS office in Abu Dhabi, I would like to thank the Members and SPREP for their continued strong support to CMS and its MOUs of relevance in the Pacific region: Cetaceans, Dugongs, Marine Turtles and Sharks. I thank and note the call from SPREP for other range states to sign the Pacific Cetacean MOU yesterday. I would also like to add a call for other range states to join the Shark MOU as well.

With regards to the Dugong MOU – we look forward to our continued strong working relationship with SPREP, the Signatories and partners to undertake our important work in the region. We have a number of exciting initiatives underway, one of which is an active programme of fund-raising. This includes a GEF concept proposal for a regional dugong and seagrass conservation project. I look forward to progressing these with Signatories, SPREP and partners.

Thank you.



Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)

Thank you for the opportunity to speak and I do so on behalf of the Director General of the Forum Fisheries Agency. My warmest regards to Samoa as the host country for the 22nd SPREP Annual Officials Meeting and to JICA for last night's hospitality.

In the interest of brevity let me just make some very short remarks focusing on the region's GEF funded oceanic fisheries management project.

On behalf of Pacific countries the FFA along with the OFP of SPC are the executing Agencies for the GEF funded Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project, with further partnerships at the Pacific programmes of WWF and IUCN and the Pacific Islands Tuna Association.

The OFMP is a regional project that focuses on assisting Pacific countries ensure the sustainability of important transboundary marine resources (largely tuna) and their environment. The full OFM project evolved from the SPREP led Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for International Waters in the Pacific, which had two components; one of which was an oceanic component and the other integrated watershed resource management (IWRM).

Some of you may recall at the twenty-first SPREP meeting in Madang last year, the Federated States of Micronesia made representation in support of the efforts to secure a second phase of GEF funding for Pacific oceanic fisheries management under the international waters portfolio in GEF5. In response, the GEF Secretariat also present in Madang said they recognized the importance of oceanic fisheries management to the region and agreed to work with countries to try and facilitate the proposal for further assistance.

As GEF Focal Points, many of you way back in 2004 put your signatures on endorsement letters that provided GEF assistance to the region at a critical point in the establishment of a LOSC and UN Fish Stock Agreement compliant regional management mechanism for the safe guard of, not only the significant tuna resources, which represents over 62% of the global supply, but also non target species and other associated marine species. OFMP concludes at the end of this month with a glowing GEF report card of achievements, most notably the negotiation and bringing in to force of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention and establishment of a working Commission.

The long running effort to design for Pacific countries, a follow on phase of GEF assistance under International Waters has been subjected to changing conditions which are being imposed by the GEF Secretariat in GEF5 and in

what appears to be a very competitive global donor environment.

We recognize the central coordinating role of SPREP in GEF submissions but would align ourselves with Director Sheppard's remark yesterday that other regional organisations will make submissions as per their mandates. Having said that, the bottom line is that countries and the region as a whole are the beneficiaries and it is in everyone's interest to mitigate duplication for expedient approval processes. A useful mechanism to "put cards on the table" as such has been the CROP Marine Sector Working Group Meeting and the development of GEF proposal for the implementation of the Pacific Oceanscape.

In the same vein, emerging crosscutting issues arising from climate change need to be incorporated and I think the US representative yesterday said it quite well. Climate change is multidimensional and it will take more than one regional organization to response to the challenges of climate change. The impacts of climate change on fisheries resources and jurisdictions specifically the associated legal problems that sea level rise presents that are almost without precedent, are just some of the features of the next phase of OFM. Areas in which project collaboration and interventions will not be confined to the FFA and SPC as executing agencies.

The relatively recent directive from the GEF CEO that dictates Implementing Agencies must not make submissions beyond their comparative advantage has resulted in the OFMPII proposal having to be restructured to give FAO alongside UNDP project oversight. The content of the proposal remains unchanged from country instructions. We are close to making the adjustments to include FAO at which point country endorsements will be required. We would have liked to share with you the proposal document here in Apia unfortunately its not quite cooked. We will

endeavor to make that available to you as GEF Focal Points soon as possible so that you may ensure that what is being proposed remains consistent with your national priorities.

We have encouraged fisheries officials to make themselves available to you to explain any questions you might have regarding OFMPII but you can also direct them to me in the margins of this meeting.

On a closing note Madam Chair, we would like lend support to SPREP's intention to seek accreditation as a GEF Implementing Agency and wish them well with that process.

Thank you for your attention.



International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Oceania Regional Office

The IUCN Oceania regional office would like to congratulate the SPREP Director and the hardworking SPREP team on their progress over the past year and reiterate our support in the implementation of the upcoming SPREP programmes.

IUCN is a traditional SPREP partner and currently engaging in projects and activities with 11 of the Pacific Island countries. While influencing policy at a national, regional and global level to benefit the conservation of biodiversity; sustainable livelihoods remains a priority. We are currently engaged in the region with various Governments and partners in the following areas:

- a. Marine
- b. Environmental Law
- c. Species and the Red List
- d. Pacific Mangroves Initiative
- e. Water and Wetlands
- f. Sustainable energy
- g. Climate Change/Disaster Management

IUCN has appreciated working with SPREP on the Pacific Islands Roundtable. As Chair, we continue to support this unique mechanism that helps focus activities of environmental and development organizations around the priorities of Pacific Island countries and the SPREP Council endorsed Action Strategy for Nature Conservation. Strong partnerships are essential in ensuring better delivery of our activities.

In a time when climate change is accepted as the most pressing threat to our existence in the region, it is important to also recognize the role of biodiversity and healthy ecosystems as a solution that includes mitigation, adaptation and sustainable livelihoods. The Green Economy and Rio+20 preparations reinforce the need to integrate environment considerations in the development discussion. IUCN looks forward to working with Pacific Governments, SPREP and partners to ensure we see the reality of a sustainable Pacific Islands region before 2020.



Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the people in Pacific region for support given to Japan after devastating disaster of earthquake and tsunami hit in northeastern part of Japan on March 11th this year.

Since the first JICA expert to SPREP was dispatched in the year of 2000, SPREP and JICA has been collaborating for improvement of solid waste management in this area. One of major outcomes from the collaboration was to develop "Pacific Regional Solid Waste Management Strategy" through "Solid Waste Management Project in Oceania Region" ended on May, 2011.

Japanese Technical Cooperation Project for Promotion of Regional Initiative on Solid Waste Management (J-PRISM) is to support actual waste management in line with the said Strategy. For this, “Regional Cooperation Framework” of the Project was signed among SPREPS, each member countries and JICA at last SPREP Annual Meeting, and then a JICA expert to SPREP was dispatched last February this year. Memorandum of Understanding between SPREP and JICA was also signed this July.

Pacific islands are facing common issues in waste management such as difficulty in sufficient recycling and disposing in small limited area, and vulnerability of water, coastal environment, public health and tourism. JICA would like to continuously collaborate with SPREP to overcome those issues, making best use of what we did in the region and Japan.



Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS)

Chair,

Congratulations on a very successful meeting, for which we are most grateful to have participated in. Thank the host country for the wonderful hospitality accorded us all, and look forward to the social events this evening.

The Forum Secretariat works closely and collaboratively with SPREP and its Secretariat on many matters. Over the last year or so this has largely been in the area of, Ocean management, sustainable development and climate change and through the coordination mechanisms of CROP and the Pacific Climate Change Round table.

Ocean Management

The Oceanscape Framework adopted by Leaders in 2010 has progressed well and has been supported collectively by the CROP

Marine Sector Working Group which includes representatives of CROP agencies and other key stakeholders such as Conservation International and IUCN.

Progress of the Oceanscape has been very positive and embraced and lead by Leaders at the highest level. This is indeed encouraging and pronounces to the region and the rest of the world the importance that Pacific Island Countries place on this truly shared resource.

In July this year, the Secretary General of the Forum Secretariat, was nominated by his CROP Executive peers, to become the first Pacific Ocean Commissioner which is a key strategic priority identified in the Oceanscape Framework. This position is aimed to lift the profile of the Pacific Ocean, advocate for its importance to Pacific peoples and the world, and to foster a collaborative an integrated approach to the sustainable development, management and conservation of the Pacific Ocean and its resources. As we meet, in his capacity as the Ocean Commissioner the Secretary General is on his way to the 66th UNGA where he intends to advocate and raise the political profile of the regions key Pacific Ocean issues.

As the Pacific Ocean Commissioner, Tuiloma is supported by the CEO's of the technical Agencies of SPREP, SPC, FFA and USP in effectively representing the broad priorities of the region as espoused by their respective membership. This collaboration is important for the region, and helps to facilitate a holistic approach in Ocean management from sustainable management of coastal and pelagic fisheries, maritime boundary delimitation, impacts of climate change and linking of the very impressive large marine protected areas in the region.

Climate change

“Poverty and climate change are the two great challenges of the 21st century. Our responses to them will define our generation, and because they are linked to each other, if we fail on one, we will fail on the other.” Lord Nicholas Stern, 2010

Climate change and development are inseparable. The Earth is already locked into significant climate change that is, and will continue to impact on all communities and economies.

Climate change traverses environmental, social, and economic aspects of our countries and communities and for some threatens their existence. Recognising the importance of addressing climate change from all these lenses and associated sectors in a coordinated manner, the CROP Sub-Committee on Climate Change was established by CROP Executives at their meeting in June 2010. Over the course of the year, the CROP Sub-Committee has met 3 times, established a working arm and developed a number of collective approaches to addressing climate change. This has included a concept note on a Regional Technical Support Mechanism aimed to better support and supplement where requested, members ability to effectively respond to climate change.

Through this mechanism CROP have agreed to define their comparative advantages in climate change, and outline their available capacity to ensure that this collective regional support is clearly understood and accessible to member countries for their varying needs.

Over the last couple of years the Leaders have tasked the Forum Secretariat with increasing responsibilities in climate change financing. This work is very much related to efforts underway on development cooperation under the Cairns Compact. Strengthening national

systems including planning and public financial management is central to ensuring that FIC's have improved capacity to effectively manage climate change resources. We will continue to coordinate this work in collaboration with SPREP and other CROP agencies into the future.

We applaud SPREP for taking the step towards becoming an Implementing Agency of the GEF for this region, and note that all CROP Executives have welcomed and supported this application.

Let me reiterate on behalf the Forum Secretariat our sincere gratitude to the host government of Samoa and to the Secretariat for allowing us to participate in this important meeting.

Fakaue lahi mahaki.

XXXXXXXXXX

Pacific Invasives Initiative (PII)

Thank you Madam Chair for the opportunity to say a few words. I would like on behalf of the Pacific Invasives Initiative (PII) team to congratulate SPREP and the SPREP Governing Council on a successful 22nd Annual Meeting. Also, I would like to congratulate SPREP for its achievements over the past year.

Protecting biodiversity in the Pacific region remains an urgent issue. Managing invasive species plays a key part in this fight. Therefore, PII congratulates SPREP on keeping invasive species high on its agenda and we are committed to continue working closely with SPREP and our other partners to advance this important issue in the region. In particular, we are committed to work with SPREP and our other partners to ensure that the Pacific Island Countries and Territories have access to the necessary technical assistance for managing their invasive species problems. We are also committed that this technical assistance

results in the strengthening of local capacity to address the issue of invasive species. This is because we believe that the only way this issue will be addressed effectively is by the countries and territories themselves taking action.

In this regard, I am delighted to observe that the region is increasingly aware of the threat posed by invasive species to its people and natural heritage as demonstrated by the increased number of in-country initiatives. I am also delighted to observe that a cadre of dedicated and able invasive species practitioners is in the making in the region.

On the regional level, I am happy to report that coordination has significantly been enhanced through the Pacific Invasives Partnership (PIP). This partnership has been successful in getting the agencies working on invasive species in the region to commit to addressing priorities identified by countries and territories.

However, given the breadth of the invasive species threat in the region, much remains to be done and more resources are required. I would like to call on you, the representatives of countries and territories and donor agencies to continue and expand your support for invasive species management in the region.

On this note, I would like to thank you Madam Chair for the opportunity to make this short address. I would also like to wish SPREP well with the implementation of their Strategic Plan and the 2012 Work Programme.

XXXXXXXXXX

Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation (PIRT)

The Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation (PIRT) extends sincere appreciation to SPREP for the support and partnership this past year and we congratulate the SPREP Director Mr. David Sheppard and the dedicated and professional staff for

SPREPs 2010 achievements, leadership and vision.

Please be assured of the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation's commitment to the development of a strong and lasting partnership with SPREP and its member countries, to enhance environmental governance and management in the Pacific Region.

The Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation (PIRT) is a coalition of nature conservation and development organizations, governments, inter-government, donor agencies and community groups created to increase effective conservation action in the Secretariat of the Pacific Islands Region. It was formed in 1997 at the request of Pacific Island countries and territories. The forum enables those organizations working on nature conservation in the Pacific to improve their collaboration and coordination towards effective conservation action. It is the key **coordination mechanism for the implementation of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Island Region 2008-2012.**

PIRT partners have been encouraged to sign a charter outlining their commitment to the 2008 to 2012 Action Strategy and Principles adopted at the 8th Pacific Nature Conservation and Protected Areas conference held in Alotau, PNG in 2007. A total of thirteen key partners have now signed¹. At the 2008 PIRT meeting in Fiji, partners agreed to focus roundtable support at the country level, initially in Fiji, the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea, towards improving coordination and implementation of their existing national

¹ IUCN, WWF, Conservation International (CI), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), The Locally Managed Marine Area (LMMA) network, University of the South Pacific (USP), the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP), Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC), RARE and Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International (FSPi), Birdlife International, Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum (PBIIF) and SeaWeb

nature conservation strategies and mainstream them into national development strategies. This will provide lessons to guide roundtable support in other Pacific island countries.

This year we convened our 14th Meeting in Samoa and we would like to thank IUCN Oceania Regional Office and the Fiji Department of Environment for hosting which saw 60 participants from the region ranging from Heads of Organisations, CROP representatives, academics, government representatives, field practitioners, scientists. Our theme this year was ***Nature's role in the Blue-Green Economy*** and let me draw your attention to the final outcomes statement which highlighted and called on our governments

For sustainable development to be effectively embedded into sectoral business plans and actions monitored over the next decade to ensure a transition to a green economy is a reality.

On Pacific Island Governments to ensure that new development funding and investments from external donors and partners and domestic financial institutions, support green and equitable development.

On the Rio+20 Summit to deliver concrete actions to support the maintenance of natural capital of Pacific Islands states and recognize the unique positive contributions of our massive and relatively healthy oceanic and terrestrial ecosystems to the world.

I would like to inform the SPREP meeting of the next Nature Conservation which was planned next year has been deferred to around July of 2013 due to a special request from SPREP to give more time to prepare. We are currently discussing with the Fiji government as a potential host and venue of the 9th Nature Conservation Conference. We would also like to recognise the PNG government who is the

current chair of the conference. A detail information paper of the conference will be prepared for the 2012 SPREP meeting.

We have been providing support to Fiji, Solomon Islands and PNG focusing on improving coordination and implementation of national nature conservation strategies such as NBSAPs and we are happy to report that Fiji has launched their NBSAP Implementation plan this year and we assisted Solomon Islands in developing their Environment cooperate plan and PNG we are working towards establishing a government, NGO and private sector coalition to improve coordination of their nature conservation priorities

With that Mr Chair, Delegates, members and observers, the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation members and partners would like to thank you for this opportunity to update you.



Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)

Honourable Ministers, Distinguished delegates, the Director of SPREP, thank you for the opportunity to present our statement on behalf the Director General of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

Madam Chair - may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your excellent guidance of the 22nd Governing Council meeting of SPREP.

May I also through you take this opportunity to thank the SPREP Secretariat for the excellent service to this meeting and to the Government of Samoa for the warm hospitality extended during our stay.

The Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) would like to acknowledge the important work and achievements of SPREP over the past year and welcomes this opportunity to make a brief statement to the meeting.

During the past year SPC and SPREP have continued to strengthen their working relationship and partnership in a range of programme areas. A significant milestone was the signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the two organizations. The MOU recognises the respective mandates and roles of SPREP and SPC and sets out how the two organizations will work together to ensure a cost effective and coordinated delivery of services to the countries, especially in the area of natural resource management, climate change, and energy.

SPC and SPREP are already working closely together on a range of fronts. In particular, through the CROP CEO Sub-committee on Climate Change, both SPREP and SPC are working in conjunction with other CROP agencies to increase the level of coordination and cooperation in delivering services to members in the area of climate change.

As SPC and SPREP are the two largest providers of climate change technical assistance in the region it is essential that they we continue to build and strengthen joint programmes activities. For example, the recent combined work of SPC and SPREP in assisting countries to develop Joint National Action Plans (JNAPS) that integrate climate change and disaster risk management highlights how the skills and knowledge of both organizations can be applied to deliver effective services to countries.

Other significant recent developments for SPC in the area of climate include the formalising of agreements with the European Community, and the German and United States governments, to increase the provision of climate change technical assistance and capacity building in Pacific Island countries. Two of these programmes also include the provision of support to SPREP to increase its capacity to service the needs of countries.

A written statement highlighting some of the cooperative activities between the SPC SOPAC Division and SPREP has been provided to the Secretariat.

Thank you and fa'afetai tele lava.

SOPAC DIVISION

SPC acknowledges collaboration between SOPAC Division and SPREP on a variety of issues through its three technical programmes: Oceans and Islands, Water and Sanitation and Community Risk.

Ocean and Islands programme

The Oceans and Islands programme is an integrated, technically focused programme that supports the research, development and management of non-living resources in ocean and island systems. Through applied marine science it addresses issues relating to the assessment and monitoring of ocean and coastal physical and chemical processes. In the last year, the Oceans and Islands programme have conducted a variety of activities with SPREP to improve understanding of the natural processes at work in Pacific island countries in order to improve resource management.

In partnership with the New Zealand National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research, SOPAC is working to provide the SPREP Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change project with geospatial information in Mangaia, Cook Islands. This activity will supply nearshore bathymetric and topographical data, oceanographic data and wave inundation models. The work will enhance Cook Islands capacity to manage and plan in selected areas of the coastal zone in response to climate change and climate variability. A technical report outlining data findings has now been drafted. Additionally, NIWA is now conducting the wave and inundation modelling component of the work.

Again, in partnership with the New Zealand National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research, SOPAC is working with the SPREP Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change project to deliver technical survey and data analysis including nearshore and estuarine bathymetry and topographical data. The work will provide data to assess inundation risks due to sea level rise and catchment related flooding. The contract to conduct this work was signed in 2011 and the New Zealand National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research has already undertaken its first scoping visit to Fiji in collaboration with SOPAC Division and the Government of Fiji's Land and Water Resource Management Division. Fieldwork is expected to commence imminently.

Through the South Pacific Sea Level and Climate Monitoring Project, the Oceans and Islands programme have been actively engaged in the Pacific Climate Change Round Table in the role of working group coordinator for the working group on Knowledge and Information Management. In relation to this, the Oceans and Islands programme looks forward to close collaboration with the Pacific Futures Programme of SPREP under the Climate and Oceans Support Program for the Pacific which includes phase 5 of the South Pacific Sea Level and Climate Monitoring Project, the 3rd phase of the Pacific Islands Climate Prediction Project and a new Capacity Development and Communications component.

The Oceans and Islands programme is presently liaising with SPREP in preparation to address environmental aspects of deep sea mining in the EU funded Deep Sea Minerals project. Additionally, following the transfer of the Pacific Islands Global Ocean Observing System project from SOPAC to SPREP under the regional institutional framework, the Oceans and Islands programme has been approached to engage again with this work. In this respect, SOPAC Division looks forward to

forging strong links with the new Coordinator for the Pacific Islands Global Ocean Observing System project.

Water and Sanitation programme

Across the Pacific, many communities remain unprepared for the floods and extended droughts that are an ongoing feature of the region. The serious and emerging impacts of climate change add a new dimension to this long-standing problem – threatening resources, increasing uncertainties, and in many cases intensifying the extremes of existing climate variability. Managing the water-related impacts of climate variability and climate change requires a risk-based approach, and adaptation to these impacts requires integration of effective risk reduction strategies across all sectors.

Globally and across the region, there is a growing recognition of the role of *Integrated Water Resources Management* and *Drinking Water Safety Planning* in responding to climate risks. SOPAC is active in assisting member countries to apply these tools in practice. SOPAC's *Water and Sanitation Programme* is undertaking a long-term programme of capacity building, advocacy and awareness in sustainable water management for member countries, covering water and sanitation services, water governance, and water resources management and assessment. This work aims to strengthen the capacity of countries and communities to deal with today's serious water challenges, in order to improve their ability to respond to current climate variability and adapt to future climate change.

The past 12 months has seen collaboration between SPC and SPREP on a number of water and sanitation fronts. The two programmes are providing support to the *Pacific Meteorological Desk Partnership*, designed to support Meteorological and Hydrological officers in

member countries, with a focus on facilitating opportunities for greater collaboration at both a regional and national level. In Tuvalu, the programmes are jointly supporting the development of policies for the management of water resources, disaster risk and climate change. The SOPAC-executed, Global Environment Fund resourced “Sustainable Integrated Water Resources and Wastewater Management Project in Pacific Island Countries” works closely with the GEF Funded SPREP Executed Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change Project are working in the same areas in RMI, Nauru, Tuvalu and Niue often sharing Steering Committees to ensure close cooperation. A jointly funded review of Water Use Efficiency in low lying atolls will be undertaken in 2011. There are other project synergies that could be achieved with greater cooperation.

While these joint efforts will continue, more needs to be done over the coming year to identify and progress opportunities for effective collaboration on the related issues of water resources management, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.

Disaster Reduction Programme

The Disaster Reduction Programme provides technical and policy advice and support to strengthen disaster risk management practices in Pacific Island Countries and Territories. The Programme carries out this responsibility in coordination and collaboration with other technical programme areas within SOPAC and also with a range of regional and international development partners and donors.

In the last year, the Disaster Reduction Programme has worked closely with SPREP to align regional policies related to disaster risk management and climate change adaptation. Among the numerous collaborative activities undertaken, the Disaster Reduction Programme wishes to highlight pioneering

work between SOPAC, SPREP and several Pacific island countries to establish Joint National Action Plans in disaster risk management and climate change. This work follows the establishment in 2010 of the region’s first Joint National Action Plan for Tonga. Since this time, several JNAPs have now been established. Over 2010-2011, SOPAC Division has collaborated with SPREP to progress the development of Joint National Action Plans in a number of countries including Cook Islands, RMI, Niue and Tuvalu with similar support to take place in the near future in Fiji and FSM.

Another key activity relates to the development of an integrated regional strategy for Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation. The recently held Third Session of the Pacific Platform for Disaster Risk Management in August reaffirmed its desire to see the development of an integrated regional strategy for by 2015 as a successor to the Pacific Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action and the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change, both of which run their present course by then. SOPAC Division and SPREP have thus been working jointly towards the goal of an integrated regional strategy for Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation through the development of Joint National Action Plans in disaster risk management and climate change. Additionally, SOPAC and SPREP have been working jointly on a ‘Roadmap’ document which is being presented to the SPREP Council and which indeed has SOPAC/SPC endorsement. The ‘Roadmap’ to achieve an integrated regional strategy was endorsed by the 2011 Platform which requests Partners to work towards:

- the incorporation of comments from the Platform on the draft “Roadmap towards a Post 2015 Integrated

Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Management and Climate Change Adaptation & Mitigation” with the view to submit it for consideration to the Governing Councils of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme.

- ensuring disaster risk management and climate change policy cohesion across development sectors through greater linkages with finance and planning departments and alignment with the national Millennium Development Goal processes.
- strengthening the implementation of ongoing and new initiatives that pursue an integrated approach to disaster risk management and climate change in the context of development to further build on the existing body of experience and practice.
- preparing policy and practice guidance on the integration of disaster risk management and climate change into development to complement and support efforts being pursued by the Pacific Island Countries and Territories and relevant regional organizations and partners.

This work is being coordinated jointly by SOPAC Division and SPREP, furthering their collaboration in this area.

The key outcomes for the Pacific Platform for DRM are available on line through the Pacific Disaster Net web portal:

(http://www.pacificdisaster.net/pdnadmin/data/original/PPDRM_2011_KeyOutcomes_Final030911.pdf)

Technical Support Services programme

The Technical Support Services programme of SOPAC provides a range of services which cut the work of the three technical work

programmes. In the last year, the Technical Support Services team has engaged with SPREP on a variety of activities. First, the Geographic Information System/Remote Sensing unit has mapped the vegetation of low lying islands including mangroves, the results of which have been copied to SPREP.

Second, as part of work for the IUCN under the Government of Australia implemented PASAP work, the Natural Resource Economics team is conducting an economic assessment of climate change adaptation work in Tuvalu, including looking at lessons from the SPREP-executed Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change project.

The Natural Resource Economics team also signed a contract this year with the WMO to conduct an economic assessment of improved meteorological services. This work – which will inform disaster risk management – is being conducted in liaison with SPREP.

Finally, the Natural Resource Economics team has been invited by SPREP to support the development and implementation of SPREP’s regional economics of climate change study by participating in a steering committee to guide its work.



United Nations (UN)

Thank you Madam Chair.

I refer to the recent 42nd Pacific Islands Forum held in Auckland earlier in the month and Reiterate the commitment of the UN system to support PICS in their sustainable development and environmental management efforts, which was also testified during the historic visit of UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon to the Forum. At this meeting enhancing access to climate finance has been stressed as a key issue. To this end the UN system, which is structured around the UN Development Assistance

Framework, has been contributing to various Pacific policy processes, including the Climate Finance Options Paper coordinated by the PIFS, the study coordinated by SPREP on Mobilising Climate Change Funding in the Pacific Islands, the discussions at the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable, and a number of national policy and institutional processes.

At the regional and national level, the UN system has invested heavily to support regional and national capacities and efforts to address climate change. Over the past 15 years, the UN system has supported SPREP in particular for environmental related programmes delivering an estimated US\$90 million of programmes on climate knowledge and advocacy, adaptation, technology transfer, capacity building, financing, mitigation and adaptation.

While international arrangements are being made to access Fast Start financing and operationalize the Green Climate Fund, the UN system has been supporting Pacific Island countries to enhance access to conventional and new vertical funds, such as GEF or the Adaptation Fund, as well as bilateral sources for immediate adaptation responses, channelling resources to countries to implement concrete actions on the ground at the community level. However, while the current interventions are showing result at the pilot or demonstration level, it is essential to scale up implementation at the sectoral and nationwide levels. Further, sectoral adaptation implementation is currently being pursued in a growing number of countries through UN support, and in partnership with CROP agencies. These involve agriculture, health, coastal management, forestry, tourism, water. To date successful modalities include Flagship regional projects, such as PACC and PIGGAREP because of their partnership focus which should lead towards programmatic approaches in leveraging funds and resources and channel

much needed support to Pacific Island Countries to tackle climate change.

In the area of Biodiversity Conservation and POP's at least four UN Trust Fund GEF PAS funded projects are either under implementation or are due to progress to this stage in the next few months. These include two regional projects, one four country project and one single country project. Three of these projects involve SPREP as the Executing Agency thus providing tangible evidence of the close working relationship between UN agencies, particularly UNEP, with the SPREP. Still other UN funded projects also involve SPREP as the EA or some other partnership arrangement. The growth in number of UN funded projects involving the SPREP in various capacities over recent years is testimony to the growing partnership between SPREP and the region's UN agencies. It also reflects the quality of staff at SPREP who have demonstrated a collegial approach to their work. Finally we would urge colleagues not to lose sight of the excellent progress made in immediate environmental issues such as biodiversity conservation, persistent organic pollutants etc and keep advancing these.



University of the South Pacific (USP)

USP supports SPREP programmes in the region. USP looks forward to working more closely with SPREP to deliver support to Pacific Countries and Communities particularly in managing climate change impacts. USP is also committed to coordinating more with SPREP regarding all its human resource development programme that include capacity building components, especially within the Pacific Futures Programme.



World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

Thank you Madame Chair for this opportunity to present a WMO Statement to the Secretariat and the Members of SPREP.

On behalf of the Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), Mr Michel Jarraud, I would like to congratulate SPREP and its members for a successful 22nd meeting.

WMO mandates are in weather, climate and water. WMO occupies a unique position within the international system. As my friend from SOPAC Division of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) reminded me earlier today, if you don't measure it you can't manage it. We are about measurement and prediction. We are about getting what has been measured and analyzed, using the best science available, to those who need the information to make decisions. While WMO is relative small in terms of its secretariat, with its Members it has developed an unmatched system of global cooperation in weather, climate, hydrology and related environmental observations, data and services. It has been most effective in facilitating the development of National Meteorological and Hydrological Services in almost all of the countries in the world. These achievements include: **(i) Free and unrestricted exchange of meteorological and related data and products**, which is essential for all real-time weather, climate, water and related environmental services, as well as for the assessment of the evolution of the climate system; **(ii) International standards for meteorological and related observations** to ensure high quality and inter-comparability of data – a vital feature for detecting climate change and developing global weather and climate models and related services; **(iii) Capacity-building** in National Meteorological and Hydrological Services throughout the world; **(iv) Promoting science and technology** to transform leading-edge research into useful products and services; and **(v) International leadership** as the recognized within the United Nations System with respect to the monitoring

and prediction of weather, climate, water and related environmental conditions.

But as mentioned by the SPREP Director, and which I believe resonated with the SPREP members, sustainable development in these and other areas cannot be accomplished if we walk alone. In this spirit the WMO's Regional Association for South West Pacific strongly encouraged enhanced cooperation with SPREP. In this context, we commend the leadership of SPREP in developing and promoting regional cooperation among National Meteorological and Hydrological Services in the Pacific region as evidenced by the creation of the Pacific Meteorological Desk Partnership.

In this region SPREP is one of WMO's most important partners. Indeed one of the key reasons that the WMO Office for the South-West Pacific is housed on the SPREP Campus is to ensure a close working collaboration with SPREP on weather and climate information and services throughout this region. WMO has reinforced this collaboration with a recent signed MOU with SPREP for further strengthening of cooperation and, based on the approved restructuring of the SPREP Secretariat by this meeting, we are expect to conclude an agreement in the near future to formally reflect WMO's support for the Pacific Meteorological Desk Partnership.

Madame Chair, while I have the floor I would like to highlight a new initiative relating to climate concerns of the region. The 2009 World Climate Conference-3 (WCC-3) decided to establish a Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS). The focus of this new Global Framework is to bring high-level attention to the need for Climate prediction and information for decision-making. The primary focus of the GFCS is on developing a coordinated and collaborative structure to applying scientific advances in seasonal to inter-annual time-scales, to a wide variety of sectors including agriculture and food security,

forestry, energy, water, health, urban and rural settlements, infrastructure, tourism, wildlife, trade and transport. While the focus is on seasonal and inter-annual predictions, the Congress recognized that multi-decadal prediction is built on the signals seen in the shorter time scales and is dependant on the data collected every day.

A High-level Taskforce created by the WCC-3, prepared a report earlier this year on the creation of the GFCS. Findings of the Taskforce included:

- (a) Present capabilities to provide climate services fall short of meeting present and future needs and are not delivering their full and potential benefits. This is particularly the case in developing, least developed countries and small island developing states;
- (b) Existing climate services are not focused well enough on user needs and the level of interaction between providers and users of climate services is inadequate. Climate services often do not reach “the last mile”, to the people who need them most, particularly at the community level in developing and least developed countries;
- (c) To support climate services, high quality observations are required across the entire climate system and of relevant socio-economic variables and further commitment to sustaining high quality observations is inadequate and enhancements to existing networks are required, particularly in developing countries;
- (d) Effective climate services will depend on maximizing the potential of existing knowledge, new research developments and strong support from and strengthened collaboration between all relevant research communities;

- (e) Efforts to provide effective climate services globally will only be successful if capacity is systematically built to enable all countries to manage climate risk effectively. Current capacity building activities to support climate services need to be scaled up and better coordinated.

Madame Chair, I believe this new initiative has great relevance to the SPREP Members and I am hopeful that the partnership that exists between the WMO and SPREP, as well as other organizations in the region, will include development of the GFCS.

To this end, WMO will continue to work with SPREP, SOPAC Division of SPC and WMO Members in the region to further strengthen the weather, climate and water services of the region. I believe the Pacific Meteorological Council and the Pacific Meteorological Desk Partnership provide appropriate platforms to do this.

In concluding, I would like once again to thank the Director and Deputy Director of SPREP and the SPREP staff for their support during the past years and to congratulate SPREP and its members for the achievements so well presented at this meeting.

Thank you