

# **National Biodiversity Strategies & Action Plans**

## **PACIFIC REGIONAL REVIEW**

**Cook Islands  
Fiji  
Federated States of Micronesia  
Kiribati  
Marshall Islands  
Nauru  
Niue**

**Palau  
Papua New Guinea  
Samoa  
Solomon Islands  
Tonga  
Tuvalu  
Vanuatu**

**October 2007**

**Eleanor Carter**



**COMMONWEALTH  
SECRETARIAT**



**SPREP**

## ACRONYMS

BINGO	Big International Non-governmental Organisation
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CI	Conservation International
CITES	Convention on the International Trade of Endangered Species
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species
COMSEC	Commonwealth Secretariat
COP	Conference of Parties
CROP	Council for Regional Organisations in the Pacific
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
GEF	Global Environment Fund
GEF-PAS	Global Environment Fund - Pacific Alliance for Sustainability
GLISPA	Global Island Partnership
IBPoW	Island Biodiversity Programme of Work
IUCN	World Conservation Union
LDC	Less Developed Country
MDG	Millenium Development Goals
MEA	Multi-lateral Environmental Agreement
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAPA	National Adaptation Programmes of Action
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NCSA	National Capacity Self Assessment
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NIP-POPS	National Implementation Plans - Persistent Organic Pollutants
NSDS	National Sustainable Development Strategy
PACC	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change
PIDP	Pacific Islands Development Programme
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PoW	Programme of Work
SC - POPS	Stockholm Convention - Persistent Organic Pollutants
SCBD	Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity
SOPAC	South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SPREP	Secretariat for the Pacific Regional Environment programme
SPTO	South Pacific Tourism Organisation
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USP	University of South Pacific
WHC	World Heritage Convention
WWF	World Wide fund for Nature

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This review examines the current status of NBSAP development across fourteen South Pacific member nations, and assesses the scales of actionable planning and M&E protocols existing within these plans.

The results of the review show that the status of NBSAP development and implementation in the selected Pacific member countries is varied; from some countries still awaiting funding to begin their NBSAP development process, to others that are busy undertaking implementation activities.

All of the completed NBSAPs have made national level commitments to a range of themes relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and there is considerable commonality between the themes addressed across the region.

A common omission from NBSAPs is a monitoring and evaluation protocol with appropriate targets, indicators, timescales and prioritizations.

This regional review also examines the issues of mainstreaming and the key challenges faced by member states in the development and implementation of their NBSAPs. These range from issues of financing and available capacity, to the challenge of 'limitations of scale' and multiplication of strategies evident in the region. It also identifies opportunities to address these challenges, and presents information to encourage further discourse amongst regional agencies for their potential roles in providing technical backstopping and M&E development support to member countries.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

In this regional review of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) there are five key areas that are presented and discussed:

- i) The current status of NBSAP development and production across fourteen South Pacific member nations, and commonalities in visions and themes presented.
- ii) A review of the actionable planning in the existing NBSAPs and the mechanisms available for monitoring and evaluation.
- iii) The extent of mainstreaming and cross-sectoral adoption of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use principles.
- iv) The key challenges faced by member states in the development and implementation of their NBSAPs.
- v) Addressing these challenges and identifying opportunities

Countries included in this review are: Cook Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

This work was carried out at the request of SPREP with support from the Commonwealth Secretariat (COMSEC), UK. It was undertaken May - October 2007 and forms one component of six-part work-plan to: review NBSAPs; provide consulting services to two nations at juxtaposing stages of NBSAP development and implementation<sup>1</sup>; provide training and capacity building services to NBSAP coordinators and identify training opportunities in the region.

This report is aimed at several audiences:

Firstly it has been written as a useful reference tool for NBSAP Coordinators and associated personnel in the relevant departments, for use when reviewing NBSAPs, updating planning documents, developing associated implementation plans or developing improved targets and indicators for NBSAPs in the future.

Secondly it aims to be a useful reference for the Secretariat of the CBD, in updating the information they have with regards to NBSAPs in the Pacific, and the particular challenges faced in implementing these strategies in this region.

Finally it is designed as a useful reference document for SPREP, as a regional organization, to provide an initial overview of the status of NBSAPs in these focus countries (which can be updated at regular intervals now that the initial database is established), and identify key areas where support is requested.

---

<sup>1</sup> See associated report: Carter, E. (2007) Developing and Implementing National Biodiversity Strategies & Action Plans: Case studies from the Solomon Islands and Samoa. SPREP / COMSEC

## 1.1 Background to NBSAPs: The Convention on Biological Diversity, its obligations & recommendations

The call for National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) emerged as a key issue at the Rio Summit in 1992 and was addressed in the formulation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

'Article 6' of the CBD states that:

*"Each Contracting Party shall, in accordance with its particular conditions and capabilities:*

- (a) Develop national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or adapt for this purpose existing strategies, plans or programmes which shall reflect, inter alia, the measures set out in this Convention relevant to the Contracting Party concerned; and*
- (b) Integrate, as far as possible and as appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies."*

This Article is mandatory and creates an obligation for national biodiversity planning.

However, there is no 'right or wrong' way to produce an NBSAP, and no fixed criteria or 'mandatory' checklist that nations are required to follow. It is very much up to individual nation states what approach they feel best suits their needs and challenges.

There are, instead, a plethora of recommendations and guidelines to support nations in the development of their NBSAPs that have emerged over the years subsequent to the Rio Summit. The Secretariat of the CBD (SCBD) encourage nations to reflect the overarching objectives of the CBD in their NBSAPs (in light of specific national circumstances), and include objectives and actions that show the sequence of steps that are going to be taken to meet the goals listed in the convention (CBD).

The SCBD also highlights the requirement to **mainstream** the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources across all sectors of the national economy and policy-making framework (as outlined in Article 6[b]) and describes this as being 'the complex challenge at the heart of the Convention'.

The Conferences of Parties (COPs)<sup>2</sup> have gone on to provide more specific guidance to signatory nations in relation to NBSAP production. COP-2 & COP-3 encouraged parties to ensure wide stakeholder input into the development of NBSAPs<sup>3</sup>. Various key issues were also highlighted as being important areas to address in NBSAPs<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> These are conference where all member parties meet every two years.

<sup>3</sup> decision II/17

<sup>4</sup> including measures for *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation, equitable sharing of benefits from the use of genetic resources, conservation and sustainable use of wetlands, and conservation of migratory species and their habitats. (Decisions III/9 & III/21)

These two COPs also promoted the use of **measurable targets** that are fully assimilated into the plans<sup>5</sup>, and recommended the incorporation of certain **thematic areas** into NBSAPs, based upon those promoted in the overarching CBD (see section 3.1.2), and encouraged the reflection of associated **cross-cutting issues** identified by the CBD.<sup>6</sup> They also urged nations to include information on the **values of biodiversity** in their NBSAPs; recognizing that public and private decisions across different sectors of the government and wider public can be strengthened if they are informed of the economic value of the ecosystem services underpinned by biodiversity, and of the cultural, spiritual and aesthetic importance of healthy systems and robust natural support systems.<sup>7</sup>

COP-7 encouraged NBSAPs to reflect the goals of the CBD **Strategic Plan 2010**, and encouraged the use of **indicators** to facilitate the assessment of both the progress made in the implementation of NBSAPs and the extent to which NBSAP goals have been incorporated into other sectoral plans in-country.<sup>8</sup>

### **1.1.1 Guidelines for NBSAP development**

As well as the various recommendations emerging from the CBD COPs with regards to NBSAP development processes, a range of 'guidelines' have been produced to further support governmental departments in producing NBSAPs.

These include:

- National Biodiversity Planning: Guidelines based on Early Experiences around the world (WRI/UNEP/IUCN, 1995)
- A Guide for Countries Preparing National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (UNDP/BPSP, 1999)
- A Guide to Developing a Biodiversity Strategy from a Sustainable Development Perspective (IEPF/UNDP/UNEP, 2000)
- A Guide to the Convention on Biological Diversity (IUCN, 1998)
- Economics and the Convention on Biological Diversity (IUCN, 2000)
- Interim Assessment of Biodiversity Enabling Activities: National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (GEF)
- National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Planning : BSAP Preparation Materials - Compiled materials for the BSAP preparation process (FFI)
- Revised Guidelines for Additional Funding of Biodiversity Enabling Activities (GEF 2000)

### **1.1.2 Financing NBSAP development.**

The key source of financing for NBSAP production has been through the Global Environment Facility (GEF) 'Enabling Activities'<sup>9</sup>. In the Pacific these funds have been primarily managed through UNDP as the implementing agent. Different nations have had different experiences with this funding mechanism, and further financial support

---

<sup>5</sup> decision III/9

<sup>6</sup> decision II/7 & decision III/9

<sup>7</sup> VIII/9.UNEP/CBD/COP/8/31

<sup>8</sup> decision VII/30

<sup>9</sup> [http://www.gefweb.org/Documents/Enabling\\_Activity\\_Projects/enabling\\_activity\\_projects.html](http://www.gefweb.org/Documents/Enabling_Activity_Projects/enabling_activity_projects.html)

for NBSAP production (or particular activities associated with NBSAP development) has come from a range of sources (other donors and indeed domestic treasury departments), depending upon the needs and resources of the countries concerned. Some nations have also gone on to acquire 'add-on' funds (beyond the initial funding) to undertake associated work / complete the NBSAP if further funds were required.

## **1.2 Relevant global initiatives & partner conventions**

In addition to the CBD strategic plan, there are a range of global initiatives that feed into and inform NBSAP development and implementation processes, and it is worth taking a moment here to contextualize these national level plans (NBSAPs) within the broader regional and international framework.

For example, emerging from the CBD are a range of 'Programmes of Work' (PoWs) – one of which has particular relevance to the Pacific Region: The Island Biodiversity Programme of Work (IBPoW). This PoW outlines *"a set of priority and supporting actions to implement the objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in islands"*. It recognizes that *"all islands, and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in particular, rely on biodiversity for sustainable development, have close links between culture and environment, have special concerns and particular vulnerabilities, have limited land area, have high levels of endemism and extensive coastal and marine biodiversity"*.<sup>10</sup> Emerging out of this, the Global Island Partnership (GLISPA) was launched in March 2006 to actively support implementation of the new IBPoW under the CBD.

Additionally there are a number of other global initiatives that emerged out of, and since, the Rio Summit that are of great relevance to Pacific islands and have connectivity to the issue of conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity. Hence these initiatives inevitably have cross-over linkages with the NBSAP development and implementation processes in the region. These are discussed further in section 3.3 on mainstreaming, however they include the: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD); United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea (UNCLOS); Millenium Development Goals (MDGs); Stockholm Convention and Agenda 21.

## **1.3 Relevant regional initiatives**

In the Pacific there are a number of regional initiatives and strategies that also have linkages to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, and hence both inform – and are informed by – the national strategies and action plans being developed by Pacific member nations. These include:

The Pacific Plan - In 2004 there was consensus to strengthen regional cooperation and integration amongst Pacific islands countries. This became manifest through the Auckland Declaration of April 2004 where Pacific Forum leaders agreed to the development of a 'Pacific Plan' with the goal to *"Enhance and*

---

<sup>10</sup> Decisions VIII/I <http://www.cbd.int/decisions/default.aspx?m=COP-08&id=11013&lg=0>

*stimulate economic growth, sustainable development, good governance and security for Pacific countries through regionalism.*"<sup>11</sup> Whilst management of the natural environment or biodiversity conservation are not central themes of the Pacific Plan, there is overt reference to '*Improved Natural Resource Management and Environmental Management*' in the plans Strategic Objective no. 5, with initiatives being promoted for the first three years in: sustainable development, fisheries, forestry, coastal waters, waste management, energy, freshwater management, biodiversity and climate change.

The 'Action strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region' was developed by the Roundtable for Nature Conservation as a result of the 7<sup>th</sup> Conference on Nature Conservation & Protected Areas, held in 2002. Its mission is to '*protect and conserve the rich natural and cultural heritage of the Pacific islands forever for the benefit of the people of the Pacific and the world.*'<sup>12</sup> It builds upon the three pillars of sustainable development (environment, society and economy) and aims to provide guidance to a wide range of actors in the Pacific community, including governments, in the development of their plans and programmes for nature conservation. This strategy is currently in the process of review at this time, and a revised strategy for 2008-2012 is being discussed at the Alotau Conference in October 2007. This revised strategy has taken considerable guidance from the objectives and aims of the NBSAPs so far developed in the region, and the new objectives in the Action strategy have arisen from the key common themes prevalent in NBSAPs and the IBPoW.<sup>13</sup>

Additionally there are a range of further regional initiatives relevant to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity that are too numerous to discuss in detail here; such as the:

- Pacific Invasive Initiative (PII)
- Pacific Invasive Learning Network (PILN)
- Coral Reefs Initiative for the Pacific (CRISP)
- Locally Managed Marine Areas initiative (LMMA)
- Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum (PBIF)
- sub-regional Micronesia Challenge

Regional support for both regional and national level programmes in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity is also provided by a number of inter-governmental organizations active in a range environmental and humanitarian issues<sup>14</sup> as well as NGOs (from smaller scale local NGO initiatives to large scale BINGOs). These too have regional initiatives underway, including:

---

<sup>11</sup> The Pacific Plan, 2005, p.3

<sup>12</sup> Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region: 2002-2007, p. 3

<sup>13</sup> Tortell, P. (2007) IN DRAFT: Review of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Region, 2003-2007: *Report of the Roundtable to the 8th Regional Conference on Protected Areas and Nature Conservation.*

<sup>14</sup> These are collectively known as CROP agencies, and include: The Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Forum Secretariat (Forum Sec), Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission (SOPAC), South Pacific Tourism Organisation (SPTO), University of the South Pacific (USP), Pacific Islands Development Programme (PIDP), Fiji School of Medicine, and the South Pacific Board for Educational Assessment



- IUCN Oceania regional programme
- WWF South Pacific Programme
- BirdLife International Pacific Programme
- Conservation International Pacific Islands Program and Melanesia Program
- UNESCO Man in the Biosphere Programme, Pacific operations.

A final noteworthy point in contextualizing national level planning of biodiversity conservation into the wider regional framework is a mention of the 'Roundtable for Nature Conservation'. This is the Pacific's largest cross-sectoral coalition of organizations working to increase effective conservation action in the region. This Roundtable was formed in 1997 on request from Pacific island countries and territories for stronger collaboration and coordination of conservation initiatives. Its membership includes: regional and national NGOs, regional and international inter-governmental agencies, public and private donors, and national agencies leading or coordinating multi-country efforts or working on issues of regional significance. The Roundtable facilitates 'Working Groups' on key issues and is a forum for stakeholders to come together to discuss and develop new ways to address the main issues of nature conservation facing the Pacific Islands.

In 2004 a Pacific NBSAP Working Group and email network was formed through this Roundtable, with the purpose of facilitating information sharing and cooperation between NBSAP coordinators in member countries. The NBSAP Coordinators listed in table 3 are all members of this working group along with: other representatives from member government departments; representatives from SPREP; the Pacific Science Association; the Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum and the company Environmental Management Ltd. This working group also serves to promote NBSAPs to Roundtable members and improve the monitoring and evaluation of NBSAPs.

## **1.4 Existing knowledge on NBSAPs in the Pacific region**

The first NBSAPs to be produced in the Pacific region were in the late 1990s. Of the fourteen countries being reviewed in this report eleven have completed NBSAPs and three have yet to produce one.

In the Pacific there have been various regional-level reviews of one or more components of the NBSAPs to date<sup>15</sup> and various joint reviews of NBSAP components looking at specific case studies of particular countries or issues.<sup>16</sup> However, an in-depth overview of NBSAP status, examining the key issues of implementation planning and processes has not been undertaken to date, and this review attempts to fill this gap in NBSAP analysis in the Pacific region.

Over the years the Secretariat of the CBD (SCBD) has also undertaken several world-wide reviews of NBSAP development and implementation<sup>17</sup> drawing primarily on the information presented by countries in their 'National Reports' that Parties are obliged to submit to the SCBD every four years.<sup>18</sup> However, as Table 1 shows, many countries in the Pacific region have not been able to submit these reports regularly.

---

<sup>15</sup> See Schuster & Reti, 2001; Tabunakawai, 2002; SPREPa, 2004; NBSAP WG, 2005; SPREPa, 2006; SPREPb, 2006 in the 'further references' section at the end of this report.

<sup>16</sup> See Thomson, 2006a; Thomson, 2006b

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.cbd.int/meetings/wgri-02/outcome.shtml>

<sup>18</sup> Article 26, CBD.

Reasons for the failure of some nations to submit their national reports include the challenges of time and human resources (outlined further in section 3.5) and the non-user-friendly layout of the reports themselves (these issues have been thoroughly discussed in a range of reports).<sup>19</sup> This means however that much of the information held by the SCBD is consequently out of date or incomplete, and it is hoped that this review will go some way to updating this information.

**TABLE 1 – NATIONAL REPORTS SUBMITTED TO THE SCBD**

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>First National Report submitted?</b>	<b>Second National report submitted?</b>	<b>Third National Report submitted?</b>
<b>Vanuatu</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Fiji</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Samoa</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Cook Islands</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Niue</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>FSM</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Palau</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Tonga</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Kiribati</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>PNG</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Nauru</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Tuvalu</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>

<sup>19</sup> See: <http://www.unep-wcmc.org/cbd/measures/index.html>

## 2. THE REVIEW PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY

Various steps were undertaken in the process of this review:

- Completed NBSAPs from 11 countries were studied and relevant information extracted.
- Existing reviews of NBSAPs (both from within the region and globally) were studied.
- Questionnaires were distributed to NBSAP coordinators in the countries being reviewed (with a 77% return of completed questionnaires: 10 out of 13 distributed).
- Interviews (both formal and informal) were undertaken with NBSAP coordinators & related personnel in-countries
- Interviews (both formal and informal) were undertaken with NBSAP related regional consultants and SPREP staff.
- Associated reports from across the region (Roundtable reports, regional strategies etc) were reviewed.
- Associated plans and strategies related to other multi-lateral environmental agreements (MEAs) were collated and reviewed.
- CBD COP decisions, recommendations, guidelines and articles were analysed and reviewed.

This information is, as far as it has been possible to verify, accurate as of September 2007.

**However, it is worth noting that three of the countries in the review did not respond to the questionnaires, and due to the current re-drafting of the Papua New Guinean NBSAP, much of the analysis of this particular NBSAP has been omitted at this time.**

### 3. RESULTS

#### 3.1 The current status of NBSAP development and production across 14 South Pacific member nations, and commonalities in visions and themes presented.

Background information on the 14 countries reviewed is provided in table 2. Vanuatu and Fiji were the first countries of those reviewed to have completed NBSAPs. Tonga & Kiribati have completed NBSAPs awaiting cabinet approval, and Nauru, Solomon Islands and Tuvalu have yet to complete their NBSAPs.

**TABLE 2 – BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

COUNTRIES	Total land area (km2) *	Population *	Per capita GDP (USD) *	CBD ratified:	YEAR OF NBSAP COMPLETION
Vanuatu	12,190	215,000	1,658	1993	1999
Fiji	18,272	836,000	1,926	1993	1999
Marshall Islands	181	55,400	2,362	1992	2000
Samoa	2,935	182,700	2,108	1993	2001
Cook Islands	237	14,000	8,563	1993	2001
Niue	259	1,600	5,854	1996	2001
FSM	701	112,700	2,113	1994	2002
Palau	488	20,700	5,808	Acs 1998	2005
Tonga	650	98,300	1,893	Acs 1998	2006 **
Kiribati	811	93,100	613	Acs 1994	2006 **
PNG	462,840	5,695,300	796	1993	DRAFT- 2006 ***
Nauru	21	10,100	unknown	1993	Not completed
Solomon Islands	28,370	460,100	521	1995	Not completed
Tuvalu	26	9,600	1,563	2002	Not completed

\* Source: SPC 2005 Statistical Summary (ISSN 1021-7436)

\*\* NBSAP still awaiting final government / cabinet approval

\*\*\* This NBSAP for PNG is only the first draft and is awaiting some major revisions. For this reason the NBSAP is - at this time - not available for citation.

#### 3.1.1 Institutional overview & information

Table 3 provides reference information for the departments and key individuals responsible for NBSAP development and implementation in each country reviewed.

**TABLE 3 – INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION**

<b>COUNTRIES</b>	<b>AGENCY LEADING NBSAP IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>NBSAP COORDINATOR</b>	<b>Email contact:</b>
<b>Vanuatu</b>	<b>Vanuatu Environment Department</b> , Private Mail Bag 9063, Port Vila, Vanuatu Ph: +678 25302	Touasi Tiwok	environ@VANUATU.COM.VU
<b>Fiji</b>	<b>Department of Environment</b> , PO Box 2131, Suva, Fiji, Ph: +679 311699	Eleni Tokaduadua	etokaduadua@govnet.gov.fj
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	<b>Office of Environmental Planning &amp; Policy Coordination</b> P.O Box 975 Majuro, Marshall Islands 96960. tel: (692) 625 7944 fax: (692)625 7918	Deborah Barker	oeppc@NTAMAR.NET
<b>Samoa</b>	<b>Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment</b> , Apia, Samoa Ph: (685) 31 197 /31 198, Fax: (685) 25 869/23 176	Faumuina V.S Pati Liu	pati.liu@mnre.gov.ws
<b>Cook Islands</b>	<b>National Environment Service</b> , PO Box 371, Avarua, Rarotonga, Cook Islands, Ph: +682 21256	Elizabeth Munro	liz@environment.org.ck
<b>Niue</b>	<b>Department of Environment</b> , PO Box 80, Alofi, Niue Ph: +683 4021	Judy Tanevesi	tongatules@mail.gov.nu
<b>FSM</b>	<b>Department of Economic Affairs</b> , PO box PS-12, Palakir, Pohnpei State FSM 96941 Ph: +691 3202620	Marion Henry	marionh@MAIL.FM
<b>Palau</b>	<b>Office of Environmental Response and Coordination</b> , P.O. Box 6051, Koror, PW 96940, REPUBLIC OF PALAU, Tel: 680-488-8681/5435, Fax: 680-488-8638	Joel Miles	jmiles@PALAU-OERC.NET
<b>Tonga</b>	<b>Ministry of Lands and Survey, Natural Resources and Environment</b> Tel: (676) 25 050	Patisepa Saafi	patisepa_saafi@hotmail.com
<b>Kiribati</b>	<b>Environment Conservation Division (ECD)</b> , Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture Development (MELAD), PO Box 234, Bikenibeu, Tarawa, Republic of, Kiribati, Ph: +686 28000, 00686 28000 / 28593, Fax: 00686 28334	Nenenteiti Teariki-Ruatu	teiti.ecd@melad.gov.ki; nrtitaake@yahoo.com.au
<b>PNG</b>	<b>Biodiversity Assessment Conservation Division</b> , Dept Environment and Conservation, PO Box 6601, Boroko NCD, PNG Ph: +675 323 0279 or 325 0195. Fx: +675 325 0182	James Sabi	biodiv@daltron.com.pg; jamessabi@hotmail.com
<b>Nauru</b>	<b>Department of Commerce, Industry &amp; Resources</b> , Nauru Government Offices, Central Pacific, Yaren District, Nauru T: +674 4443133 ext 303	Tyrone Deiye	tdeiye@gmail.com
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Conservation Division</b> , Ministry of Forest, Environment and Conservation. P.O.Box G24, Honiara, SI Ph:(677) 24215/22263	Jozef Hurutarau	jhurutarau@gmail.com
<b>Tuvalu</b>	<b>Ministry of Natural Resources</b> , Department of Environment, Vaiaku, Funafuti, Tuvalu. Ph: +688 20179	Enate E. Tauga'a	enateevi@gmail.com'

### 3.1.2 Themes addressed in the NBSAPs

In the recent review of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Region<sup>20</sup>, Tortell examined the NBSAPs of 10 countries (plus the Conservation Plan of New Caledonia) to assess what common themes, objectives or other targets might be relevant to the Action Strategy. He also cross-checked these against the themes in the Island Biodiversity Programme of Work (IBPoW) of the CBD, as well as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Pacific Plan (results presented in Table 4).

**TABLE 4 – COMMON THEMES FROM THE ROUNDTABLE REPORT** <sup>21</sup>

THEMES, OBJECTIVES, TARGETS	NBSAPs										OTHERS			TOTALS
	COOK ISLANDS	F S MICRONESIA	FIJI	MARSHALL ISLANDS	NIUE	PALAU	VANUATU	SAMOA	PAPUA NEW GUINEA	TONGA	NEW CALEDONIA Biodiversity Conservation Plan	MDGs – GOAL 7	PACIFIC PLAN	
Community – empowerment, awareness, involvement, ownership and benefits		√	√	√		√		√	√	√			√	8
Traditional culture and practices; indigenous property rights	√	√	√	√				√	√	√			√	8
Improving knowledge, research, education, public awareness	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	12
Developing and managing protected areas, habitats	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	13
Species conservation – terrestrial, coastal and marine, and agrobiodiversity	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	13
Management of invasive species and genetically modified organisms	√	√	√	√	√	√		√		√			√	10
Capacity building and training, Governance		√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√			√	10
Sustainable economic development, sustainable use of resources		√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	11
Mainstreaming conservation	√	√				√		√		√	√			6
Financial resources, mechanisms	√	√	√		√			√		√		√	√	8
Waste management, pollution		√		√	√	√						√	√	6
Natural disasters													√	1
Energy												√		1
Climate change												√	√	2
Water management												√		1

<sup>20</sup> Tortell, P. (2007) Review of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Island Region 2003-2007: Report of the Roundtable prepared for the 8<sup>th</sup> Regional Conference on Protected Areas and Nature Conservation; Report 2 – Recommendations for strengthening the action strategy and enhancing its implementation.

<sup>21</sup> Table excerpt from: Tortell, P. (2007) Ibid. P.16

As the table shows, 12 themes emerge from the NBSAPs, the New Caledonia BCP, the Island Biodiversity PoW and other documents. These are:

- Community – empowerment, awareness, involvement, ownership and benefits
- Traditional culture and practices; indigenous property rights
- Improving knowledge, research, education, public awareness
- Developing and managing protected areas, habitats
- Species conservation – terrestrial, coastal and marine, and agrobiodiversity
- Management of invasive species and genetically modified organisms
- Capacity building and training, governance
- Sustainable economic development, sustainable use of resources
- Mainstreaming conservation
- Financial resources, mechanisms
- Waste management
- Climate change

These closely match the thematic areas and cross-cutting themes promoted through the COPs for consideration in NBSAP development and planning (as mentioned in the introduction). These specific thematic areas and cross-cutting issues promoted by the CBD are reviewed in Table 5. As the table shows, the most common areas covered in the NBSAPs are:

Thematic area:

- Agricultural Biodiversity
- Island Biodiversity
- Marine & Coastal Biodiversity

Cross-cutting issue:

- Invasive Alien species
- Protected Areas
- Public Education and Awareness
- Sustainable Use of Biodiversity
- Traditional Knowledge, innovations and practices

**TABLE 5**  
**CBD THEMATIC AREAS AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES IN THE NBSAPS**

<b>THEMATIC AREAS</b>	<b>Vanuatu</b>	<b>Fiji</b>	<b>Marshall Islands</b>	<b>Samoa</b>	<b>Cook Islands</b>	<b>Niue</b>	<b>FSM</b>	<b>Palau</b>	<b>Tonga</b>	<b>Kiribati</b>	<b>TOTAL 'Y'</b>	<b>percentage of all countries reviewed</b>
Agricultural biodiversity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	100%
Dry and sub-humid lands biodiversity	n/a	n/a	N	n/a	n/a	N/A	N/A	NA	Y	NA	1	10%
Forest biodiversity	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9	90%
Inland waters biodiversity	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	7	70%
Island biodiversity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	100%
Marine and coastal biodiversity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	100%
Mountain biodiversity	N	n/a	N	n/a	Y	N	Y	NA	N	NA	2	20%
<b>CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES</b>												
Access to genetic resources and benefit-sharing	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9	90%
Invasive alien species	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	100%
Biological diversity and tourism	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	70%
Climate change and biological diversity	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	5	50%
Economics, trade and incentive measures	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7	70%
Ecosystem approach	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	5	50%
Global Strategy for Plant Conservation	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	2	20%
Global Taxonomy Initiative	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	2	20%
Impact assessments	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	8	80%
Indicators	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	4	40%
Liability and redress – Article 14(2)	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	1	10%
Protected areas	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	100%
Public education and awareness	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	100%
Sustainable use of biodiversity	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	100%
Technology transfer and cooperation	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	5	50%
Traditional knowledge, innovations and practices	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	10	100%



### 3.1.3 Referencing the CBD strategic plan and 2010 targets

The CBD promotes NBSAPs to include reference to the 2010 targets of the CBD strategic plan.<sup>22</sup> However, as Table 6 shows, only Kiribati makes some reference to this in its NBSAP. This is in part because some of the NBSAPs were completed prior to the promotion of inclusion of the 2010 targets.

**TABLE 6 – REFERENCING THE CBD 2010 TARGET IN THE NBSAPS**

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>Does the NBSAP make any reference / linkage to the CBD strategic goal and 2010 target?</b>
<b>Vanuatu</b>	N
<b>Fiji</b>	N
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	N
<b>Samoa</b>	N
<b>Cook Islands</b>	N
<b>Niue</b>	N
<b>FSM</b>	N
<b>Palau</b>	N
<b>Tonga</b>	N
<b>Kiribati</b>	<b>Y</b> (to some extent)

### 3.1.4 'Visions' of the NBSAPs and outline structures

There are common structures to NBSAPs around the world, and the same is true in the Pacific region. Many NBSAPs have an overarching 'Vision' or 'Mission' that the nation intends to achieve through the implementation of their national strategy and action plan.

Table 7 outlines these overarching visions / missions prevalent in the reviewed NBSAPs:

---

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.cbd.int/2010-target/default.shtml>

**TABLE 7 – 'VISIONS & MISSIONS' OF THE NBSAPS**

<b>Vanuatu</b>	<b>MISSION STATEMENT:</b> (1) To manage and safeguard biological resources through government, provinces and local communities so as to maintain fully our natural and cultural heritage for all ni-Vanuatu. (2) Guide government, provinces, local communities and landholders to sustainable management of Vanuatu's natural resources. (3) Ensure that all ni-Vanuatu_including future generations, are able to benefit from biodiversity and enjoy its use. (4) Protect the custom, intellectual and legal rights of ni-Vanuatu as resource custodians and users.
<b>Fiji</b>	<b>GOAL:</b> To conserve and sustainably use Fiji's terrestrial, freshwater and marine biodiversity, and to maintain the ecological processes and systems which are the foundation of national and local development.
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	<b>VISION:</b> The Marshall Islands, this nation of islands, will have lush green vegetation and its environment will be clean and intact. Its waters will be abundant with its resources. We, the people, living in love and harmony with one another and the environment, will continue to harvest our resources sustainably while enjoying our rich culture and traditions, a right which we have inherited from our forefathers.
<b>Samoa</b>	<b>VISION:</b> Samoa's biological and genetic resources is protected, conserved and sustainably managed so that it will continue to flourish and regenerate, for present and future generations
<b>Cook Islands</b>	<b>COMMITMENT:</b> (1) Conserve its endangered species (2) Develop a system of protected areas (3) Reduce the harmful effects of invasive species and prevent further invasions (4) Use biodiversity in a sustainable manner (5) Preserve knowledge related to biodiversity (6) Ensure an equitable sharing of the benefits of biodiversity
<b>Niue</b>	<b>VISION:</b> Niue is an Environmentally Friendly Nation in which conservation and the sustainable management of biological resources support all the living community.
<b>FSM</b>	<b>VISION:</b> The FSM will have more extensive, diverse, and higher quality of marine, freshwater and terrestrial ecosystems, which meet human needs and aspirations fairly, preserve and utilize traditional knowledge and practices, and fulfill the ecosystem functions necessary for all life on earth.
<b>Palau</b>	<b>VISION:</b> The people of Palau are living in harmony with their diverse natural and cultural heritage.
<b>Tonga</b>	<b>VISION:</b> Tonga's biological diversity and natural resources are protected, conserved and enriched and are appreciated and enjoyed by her present and future generations and the rest of the world.
<b>Kiribati</b>	<b>GOALS</b> for next five years: (1) Improvement of informal education and public awareness at local community levels, which would form the basis for improved decision- making and participatory approach in biodiversity protection. (2) Sustainable use and management of land and terrestrial resources that are in line with traditional and customary land and marine tenure systems. (3) Biological resources shall be enhanced, used and managed to maintain biological diversity in the short and long term run. (4) Available data and information on national biodiversity shall be expanded and made available to policy makers and the public. (5) Activities that pollute and threaten biodiversity shall be minimized.

As this range of visions / missions / goals etc shows there is a considerable diversity in approach to each of the NBSAPs, and a wide range of motives particular to each nation that are the drivers for biodiversity conservation. It would be interesting to explore the different motives implicit in these visions and missions when examining later implementation mechanisms and the linkages with societal priorities through which to link biodiversity awareness raising programmes.

For example, the Vanuatu mission statement makes considerable reference to the ni-Vanuatu (Vanuatu people), and it would be interesting to explore whether this indicates that a focus on sovereignty over natural resources and linkages between patriotism and protection of natural resources may prove effective in generating support for biodiversity conservation in this case. In the FSM and Tongan visions a key focus of their national biodiversity conservation efforts is in contributing towards global biodiversity efforts, suggesting a sense of global partnership may be accessed in order to encourage efforts in these nations and gain support for biodiversity conservation. These divergent and complex motivations for biodiversity conservation are worth exploring further.

### **3.2 A review of the actionable planning in the existing NBSAPs and the mechanisms available for monitoring and evaluation.**

At the heart of any NBSAP is the actionable text, the overall strategy and plan for biodiversity conservation. In the NBSAPs reviewed, after the vision / mission has been outlined, most go on to have particular 'themes' or overarching 'goals' of some sort, under which clear 'objectives' have been described, under which further specific 'actions' have been listed (see box 1).

As discussed in the introduction there is no 'right or wrong' way to produce an NBSAP, and it is very much up to individual nation states what approach they feel best suits their needs and challenges. However, there are some underlying principles to strategy development, whether it be it for a corporate business plan, or an NBSAP, that are useful to examine when undertaking any review process.

In the conservation community, as in any other industry, a wide range of terminology exists around which discourse is often focused. In strategic planning, the terms 'objectives, aims and goals' are used to describe the intended 'outcomes and outputs' of any 'action'. In addition, an array of (often ill-defined) 'tools, instruments and mechanisms' are promoted in order to facilitate implementation of any objectives, and clearly defined targets, as well as documented indicators of success are desirable to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of the intended outcomes.

<b>BOX 1</b>
THEME 1 - xxxx
Objective 1
Action 1.1 ...
Action 1.2 ...
Action 1.3 ...
Objective 2
Action 2.1 ...
Action 2.2 ...
Etc...

This is familiar language to strategists and planners. However, for the wider public, as well as individuals within conservation whose English is a second language and capacity in strategic planning is lacking, such terminology can be confusing and detracting from the meaningful substance of any strategic plan.

Therefore in this review the terminology is kept straightforward and simple. This is intended both to simplify the review process, and as a reminder of the underlying intention of any strategic plan.

To that end the mechanisms for strategy development have been broken down into their fundamental components. Any strategy – whether it is for an international business corporation, or for a governmental biodiversity conservation plan - is essentially composed of six key elements: These can most easily be described as the ‘What, Where, When, Who, Why and How’ of strategic planning.

For example: **What** does nation X want to do; **where** will it do it; by **when** should it be done; **who** is going to be responsible for it and be involved in its development; **why** do you want to do it; and finally **how** is it going to be done, and how will nation X know when it has been successful?

The first three of these factors combined effectively provide a ‘target’ for a strategy.

For example:

*“Nation X wants to establish a network of protected areas to cover 15% of the land area in Y province, by 2015.”*

Here the ‘**What**’ is – to establish a network of protected areas  
The ‘**Where**’ is – to cover 15% of the land area in Y province  
The ‘**When**’ is – by the year 2015.

Following this, in classic strategy development it is important to state ‘**Who**’ is going to lead the way on any activity, and who else (what other partners) are likely to be involved. Finally, ‘**Why**’ and ‘**How**’ are added in to complete the plan (as discussed below).

Taking these six key principles in strategy development, Table 8 shows a summary of the ‘*What, Where, When, Who, Why and How*’ areas that have been covered by the NBSAPs under review.

Each of these sections is discussed in further detail below:

**TABLE 8  
COVERAGE OF THE SIX KEY ELEMENTS IN STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT**

	Vanuatu	Fiji	Marshall Islands	Samoa	Cook Islands	Niue	FSM	Palau	Tonga	Kiribati
<b>WHAT</b> - Have objectives and actions been identified?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
<b>WHERE</b> - Do actions identify locale specific work to be undertaken?	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y**	Y	Y	Y
<b>WHEN</b> - Does the NBSAP have an overall time-frame? (ie. The strategy is from Yr X to Yr Y)	N	N	N	N	N	Y -2 years	N	N	Y - 2 years	Y - 5 Years
Has a timeframe for implementation been set against each obj / action?	Y	N	N	N	N	*	N	Y***	N	Y
Has distinction been made between the varying 'priority levels' of any one objective / action, and have these been highlighted within the NBSAP document itself?	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
<b>WHO</b> - Has the Lead Agency responsible for overall NBSAP implementation been identified?	N	N (but recommendation made)	N	Y	N	Y (2 agencies)	Y	Y	Y	Y
Has the lead agency been identified against each activity?	N	Y	N	N	*	*	N	*	Y****	N
Have the key players / partners / agencies associated with implementing each obj / action been identified against each activity?	Y	Y	Y	Y	*	Y	N	Y	Y	N
<b>WHY</b> – (A) Does the NBSAP outline the ' Non-marketable 'values' of biodiversity?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
(B) Does the NBSAP outline the marketable / economic values of biodiversity outlined in NBSAP – with monetary figures provided.	N	Y	N	Y	N	N (but proposed)	Y (fisheries)	Y (fisheries)	N	Y
<b>HOW</b> - Have separate implementation plan/s been developed since the NBSAP production?	Y (for some components / actions)	N	Y (see assoc'd strategies)	Y (for some components / actions)	Y - NESAF	N	Y (Strategic Development Plan, FSM - Environment Matrix)	N	unknown	Y (for key areas: invasives, conservation areas, main-streaming in NDS)

\* sometimes given  
 \*\* (for protected areas)  
 \*\*\* (though broad)

\*\*\*\* at Theme level  
 \*\*\*\*\* attempt has been made in parts

## **What**

As mentioned, the question of 'what' is to be done is at the heart of any strategy, i.e. what actions are to be undertaken. An example from Samoa's NBSAP is:

**Theme:** Ecosystem Management

**Objective:** To enhance the management of existing protected areas and establish new ones to increase coverage of protected areas to 15% and achieve a full representation of Samoa's ecosystems.

**Action 1:** Develop and implement management plans for the existing protected areas in Samoa.

**Action 2:** Establish conservation areas in under represented ecosystems e.g. Mangrove areas.

All of the 10 countries (100%) reviewed have specific actions listed in their NBSAPs.

## **Where**

Providing site-specific information against actions is not always relevant. For example, some actions may be nation-wide; such as Theme 7, Objective 3 in FSM's NBSAP, where one of the actions is: *"Develop and implement waste collection, storage and disposal programs for residential and commercial premises through the nation."* Or Theme 'D' of the Cook Islands NBSAP, where the action is to *"Establish an independent agency to encourage and manage research on biodiversity and its uses, and to ensure that there is an equitable sharing of benefits."*

However, in some cases, site-specific reference is useful and valid. For example, in the Kiribati NBSAP, action 1.1.1 states: *"Establish at least one community-based conservation area and one marine reserve in the Gilberts Group [and] one community-based conservation area in the Line."*

Nearly all of the NBSAPs reviewed provide site-specific information for particular activities where relevant.

## **When**

This section can be broken into three key questions:

(i) Does the NBSAP document itself have an overarching time frame? I.e. Is the document valid from year X to year Y?

As the table shows only three NBSAPs reviewed have a specific time-frame given for the NBSAP as a whole (Niue, Tonga and Kiribati).

(ii) Has a timeframe for implementation been set against each objective / action?

This is of particular importance in strategic planning. It provides critical information about when any particular action aims to be achieved. As outlined earlier, this is especially important when prioritizing activities (especially where resources are limited), and in setting *targets and indicators* for success (discussed further in section 3.2.1). However, only two NBSAPs in the region have specified

particular timeframes throughout all of their actions (Vanuatu and Kiribati). Two others have provided some reference to time-frames against particular key actions or only as a broad reference (Niue and Palau).

(iii) Has distinction been made between the varying 'priority levels' of any one objective / action, and have these been highlighted within the NBSAP document itself?

Many NBSAPs have large numbers of objectives and actions. Prioritizing these is essential, in order to direct resources appropriately and focus efforts on the more critical issues that require immediate attention. Whilst particular time-frames may not be given against actions, it is still possible for countries to prioritise activities based upon which they feel need addressing sooner rather than later. Of the NBSAPs reviewed, five (50%) have given priority ratings to their objectives and / or actions.

### ***Who***

This section can be divided into three components:

(i) Has the lead agency responsible for overall NBSAP implementation been identified?

60% (six) of the NBSAPs reviewed have listed a particular agency or division within government as primarily responsible for overseeing NBSAP implementation.

(ii) Has a lead agency been identified against each activity?

Depending upon the activity listed, different divisions or departments within government may be better placed to oversee an activities implementation and management. Two nations (Tonga and Fiji) have identified a lead agency for each particular activity, whilst three others have assigned a lead agency for some, but not all, actions. Five nations have not assigned a lead agency against particular actions, though it is assumed that the overarching agency assigned overall responsibility for the NBSAP is expected to be the lead agency (unless otherwise stated).

(iii) Have the key players / partners / agencies associated with implementing each objective / action been identified against each activity?

As well as describing which government agency / department / institution is to take the lead in any activity, some NBSAPs also provide information on who the key partners and key associated players in any activity are expected to be. These can include other government departments, NGOs, community groups, CROP agencies and the like. Indeed, 70% of the NBSAPs reviewed have provided this information.

### ***Why***

This section refers to 'Making the case for the value of biodiversity'. That is; Why is biodiversity conservation important? Why produce the NBSAP?

The CBD promotes the need to improve the understanding of the value of biodiversity, including its role in ecosystem services. The outcome of COP-8 suggests: *"Identifying and assessing the value of biodiversity resources and functions and of the associated ecosystem services can raise awareness, thus creating incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and can also support the adequate design and calibration of other incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity."*<sup>23</sup>

Biodiversity values can be at the cultural, spiritual and aesthetic level, as well as the economic level. Making the case for the value of biodiversity in the NBSAP is important as it can provide important leverage for political and wider support. This is especially relevant in inter-governmental negotiations, between divisions responsible for biodiversity conservation, and those responsible for economic development. Making the case for the 'economic value' of biodiversity is extremely useful in arguing the case for finance ministries and associated divisions to develop appropriate fiscal policies and mechanisms that provide incentives for biodiversity conservation, as well as appropriate regulations and disincentives for environmental over-exploitation and the resultant reduction in biodiversity that underpins vital ecosystem services.

As the data in Table 8 shows, available NBSAPs have been reviewed to assess the extent to which information on the value of biodiversity has been provided. The upper row against the 'Why' category (A) states whether the NBSAP has mention of the non-marketable values of biodiversity (ie: those of cultural / aesthetic / traditional importance as well as wider concerns for ecosystem integrity). This is of key relevance, as many of these ecosystem services supported by biodiversity are not reflected in market prices. As COP-8 found: *"private and public decision-making and the allocation of funds will be distorted if the repercussions of activities on biodiversity resources and functions, and the associated ecosystem services, are not adequately taken into account. This distortion is an important underlying cause of biodiversity decline. Undertaking valuation of biodiversity resources and functions and the associated non-marketed ecosystem services has the potential of improving private and public decision-making."*<sup>24</sup>

All the countries reviewed have some sort of description in their NBSAP regarding non-marketable values of biodiversity. The majority of NBSAPs have such information in the preambles, or introductory sections of their strategies.

The lower row in table 8 (B) assesses whether the NBSAP has gone on to make the case for the direct economic value of biodiversity, such as information emerging from the results of ecosystem service valuations, or simply from existing information on available trade figures from key industries reliant on robust ecological systems, (such as forestry and fisheries).

Only five NBSAPs reviewed have included some sort of section in which specific financial values have been given for sectors of biodiversity of high importance to the economy of the nation (usually fisheries or forestry related export profit data).

---

<sup>23</sup> VIII/9.UNEP/CBD/COP/8/31, p. 235; See decisions IV/10 A and VI/15, annex I, paragraph 22.

<sup>24</sup> VIII/9.UNEP/CBD/COP/8/31, p.233



In the years since the production of some of the NBSAPs it is worth noting however that many countries have stressed their desire for undertaking economic valuations of biodiversity as a priority in the future.

### **How**

The question of 'how' a particular action is going to be undertaken and achieved is usually too complex an issue to outline in full in an overarching strategy. However, the issue of 'how' (or what mechanisms and processes will be used to achieve the desired action) can be addressed by a nation developing (or committing to develop) an associated, detailed plan of implementation against that particular activity.

For example, in the Samoan NBSAP, Theme 2, Objective 1, Action 1.4 states: "*Develop and implement a long term monitoring programme for Samoa's native ecosystems including invasive species*". In addressing 'how' to do this Samoa has gone on to develop various more detailed programmes, including the monitoring programme outlined in the associated 'National Invasive Alien Species Implementation Action Plan (NIASAP) of 2005'.

As for how a nation will know whether or not it has been successful in its actions, this is where **indicators** prove extremely useful. For instance, using our earlier example, the indicator for success in nation X's work establishing protected areas would be: "*By 2015 a network of protected areas has been established, covering 15% of the land area in Y province.*" This is discussed further in section 3.2.1 below.

Most of the nations reviewed have gone on, post-NBSAP production, to develop associated plans addressing the mechanisms for specific implementation of specific actions (to lesser or greater extents). These are discussed further in section 3.3. However, in-depth review of these associated plans are beyond the scope of this assignment.

### **3.2.1 Monitoring & evaluation of NBSAPs**

As mentioned in the previous section, the setting of targets and indicators are very useful tools in monitoring and evaluating both the implementation of NBSAPs and the success of activities undertaken in biodiversity conservation.

A TARGET can be defined as: 'The desired outcome/results to be achieved within a specific timeframe. These should be measurable and achievable'<sup>25</sup>

An INDICATOR tells you: 'How you know when your action has been successfully implemented'

In simple terms using our earlier example, a target would be:

*"Nation X wants to establish a network of protected areas to cover 15% of the land area in Y province, by 2015."*

---

<sup>25</sup> Island Biodiversity Programme of Work (IBPoW) 'D- Working definitions'

The indicator for this target would be:

*"By 2015 a network of protected areas has been established, covering 15% of the land area in Y province."*

The issue of 'measurability' in any target is extremely important, as it is this 'measure' that enables effective and straightforward monitoring of success. For example, in the FSM's NBSAP, Theme 1, Objective 2 states: *"To enhance the management of existing conservation areas and establish new areas to achieve a full representation of the FSM's ecosystems."* This could – in and of itself – be regarded as a 'target'. However, this is not particularly measurable. These types of 'targets' are common in NBSAPs in the region, and are *situational targets*, in that they do not give specific information on the extent (level) to which the desired outcome is expected.

More measurable targets are those that indicate a 'level' of desired outcome using a measurable parameter for reference (i.e. years, percentages or the like). In the Samoan NBSAP an example of a measurable target is: Theme 2 (Ecosystem Management), Objective 2 (Conservation Areas): *"To enhance the management of existing protected areas and establish new ones to increase coverage of protected areas to 15% [from the existing 10%] and achieve a full representation of Samoa's ecosystems."*

As Table 9 shows, of the NBSAPs reviewed, 50% include some measurable targets. However these are rarely set against 'each' objective or action, and are rather overarching targets or given only in certain areas of the NBSAP or under particular themes (such as protected areas).

Similarly, 40% of the NBSAPs reviewed provided some 'indicators' of success. However, these were provided at lesser or greater extents across the range of NBSAPs, from Palau's extensive list of indicators in its NBSAP action matrix, to Samoa's intermittent 'Monitoring goals'.

**TABLE 9 – TARGETS AND INDICATORS**

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>Does the NBSAP have integral measurable TARGETS</b>	<b>Does the NBSAP have integral INDICATORS</b>
<b>Vanuatu</b>	<b>Y</b>	N
<b>Fiji</b>	N	N
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	N	N
<b>Samoa</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Cook Islands</b>	N	N
<b>Niue</b>	N	N
<b>FSM</b>	N	N
<b>Palau</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Tonga</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Kiribati</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>

In some countries, such as Tonga, these targets and indicators are set within defined monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans (or matrixes). However, most NBSAPs do not have integral detailed M&E plans and rather refer to recommendations to develop such plans in the future. It is important to note therefore that some countries have, since the production of their NBSAPs, gone on to develop more refined monitoring systems for the objectives and actions listed in their NBSAPs. For example, in 2004 the Federated States of Micronesia developed a 'Strategic Planning Matrix', and in 2005 the Cook Islands integrated the key objectives of the NBSAP into the 'National Environment Strategic Action Framework (2005-2009)' in which 'Key Performance Indicators' were listed.<sup>26</sup>

Despite the lack of M&E plans inherent in the NBSAPs 60% have, in some form, undertaken reviews / M&E (usually of one particular component of their NBSAP) since their original production. And at least one, Fiji, has also gone on to update / amend their NBSAP (see table 10).

**TABLE 10 – MONITORING, REVIEWING AND UPDATING OF NBSAPS**

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>Has the NBSAP been reviewed / has strategy monitoring taken place since production?</b>	<b>Has the NBSAP been amended / updated at all since its initial production?</b>
<b>Vanuatu</b>	N	N
<b>Fiji</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	<b>Y</b>	N
<b>Samoa</b>	<b>Y</b>	N
<b>Cook Islands</b>	<b>Y</b>	N
<b>Niue</b>	<b>Y</b>	N
<b>FSM</b>	<b>Y</b>	N
<b>Palau</b>	N	N
<b>Tonga</b>	<i>unknown</i>	<i>unknown</i>
<b>Kiribati</b>	N	N

Table 11 gives further detail of those reviews undertaken to date.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>26</sup> NESAF, p.23

<sup>27</sup> Information taken from literature reviews as well as the responses to NBSAP Coordinator questionnaires

**TABLE 11 – NBSAP REVIEWS UNDERTAKEN**

<b>COUNTRY</b>	<b>NBSAP REVIEW/S UNDERTAKEN</b>	<b>BY WHOM?</b>	<b>WHEN?</b>
FSM	Review of NBSAP for Samoa & FSM with reference to treatment of forest biodiversity, especially forest genetic resources. (SPRIG 2 Milestone 75)	Dr. Lex A.J. Thomson (SPRIG Project Team Leader)	Feb-06
SAMOA	Review of NBSAP for Samoa & FSM with reference to treatment of forest biodiversity, especially forest genetic resources. (SPRIG 2 Milestone 75)	Dr. Lex A.J. Thomson (SPRIG Project Team Leader)	Feb-06
	Focus country NBSAP preliminary review	DEC & SPREP	2007
COOK ISLANDS	Project Evaluation Report: Government of Cook Islands Enabling Activity Biodiversity Project (NBSAP) CKI/98/G31	Dr David Butler	2003
FIJI	Review of NBSAP for Fiji & Niue, with reference to treatment of forest biodiversity, especially forest genetic resources. (SPRIG 2 Milestone 59)	Dr. Lex A.J. Thomson (SPRIG Project Team Leader)	Feb-06
	Review of 'Activities or Actions implemented by Stakeholders - NGOs, Institutions, Statutory Bodies or Government Agencies - which are linked to Fiji's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan'	Department of Environment	2006/7
NIUE	Review of NBSAP for Fiji & Niue, with reference to treatment of forest biodiversity, especially forest genetic resources. (SPRIG 2 Milestone 59)	Dr. Lex A.J. Thomson (SPRIG Project Team Leader)	Feb-06
MARSHALL ISLANDS	General review as part of the Biodiversity Capacity Building Needs Assessment (NBSAP-Enabling Activities additional funding)	OEPPC, BCI (Local Consultants)	2005

### **3.3 The extent of mainstreaming and cross-sectoral adoption of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use principles.**

*"The most important lesson of the last ten years is that the objectives of the Convention will be impossible to meet until consideration of biodiversity is fully integrated into other sectors. The need to mainstream the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources across all sectors of the national economy, the society and the policy-making framework is a complex challenge at the heart of the Convention." (Hague Ministerial Declaration from COP VI to WSSD, 2002)*

Mainstreaming basically means that concerns for biological diversity conservation and sustainable use need to be reflected across all arena's of society, and in all 'economic sectors and development models, policies and programmes' – ultimately into all human behaviour.<sup>28,29</sup> Mainstreaming means ensuring biodiversity concerns take appropriate priority levels in national planning and may involve difficult choices requiring well-informed decisions and trade-offs between: (a) the interests of biodiversity conservation and conventional forms of economic production, both in the short and long term, and (b) the needs of those who gain the benefit and those who bear the costs of such economic impacts from the consideration of biodiversity concerns.<sup>30</sup>

For mainstreaming to be successful, concerns for biological diversity need to be integrated into the planning processes for a range of government departments (agriculture, fisheries, forestry, mining etc). This can be very challenging in traditionally established centralized government constructs where sectors are subdivided and managed relatively independently, where an inherent hierarchy of leaders (Ministers and associated personnel) and actors (civil servants) are required, by de-facto, to promote their own key concerns and priority agendas in their domestic policies and plans (within which concerns for biological diversity may not feature particularly prominently). A clear example of such a situation can be seen in many Forestry Departments around the world, especially in developing countries, where any concern for forest conservation and sustainable management is often in direct conflict with the pressing need to acquire foreign exchange revenue generation through immediate term lucrative logging agreements.

A further challenge to mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in many traditionally sector-driven governmental constructs, is in ensuring that plans and policies (and even legislation) are synchronised. Plans and agendas of different government departments become manifest through the production of policies and laws, and where communication flows between departments and divisions are inadequate, policies and laws developed in one sector of the government may directly conflict with equally valid (under the eyes of the law) policies and legislation in other sectors. This can lead to considerable conflicts when such laws are put to the test, and requires high level law-makers to make decisions in favour of one law over another. Such legal authorities may not have the necessary information or awareness of the importance of biodiversity conservation (and support of ecosystem services) over apparently far more tangible concerns regarding the potential impacts on the national economy in the immediate term.

Despite these challenges, many countries in the Pacific have developed policies and legislation with regards to biodiversity concerns emerging from, or in connection with, their NBSAPs.

---

<sup>28</sup> GEF (2004) Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and sectors (Interim) report. Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility (GEF/C.24/Inf.11 November 10, 2004)

<sup>29</sup> Van Boven, G. & Hesselink, F. (2006) Mainstreaming Biological Diversity: The role of communication, education and public awareness. IUCN, SCBD, UNESCO, CEC

<sup>30</sup> GEF (2004) Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Production Landscapes and sectors (Interim) report. Prepared by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility (GEF/C.24/Inf.11 November 10, 2004)

Tables 12 & 13 give some examples of these.

**TABLE 12 - POLICIES**

	<b>Examples of domestic POLICIES produced that reflect biodiversity conservation concerns</b>
<b>Fiji</b>	Climate Change Policy(draft) 2002
	Forest Policy(draft) 2007
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	draft National Bio-safety Policy 2006
	National Coastal Management Framework 2006
	Policies and Priority Actions for Sustainable Mariculture Development in the Republic of the Marshall Islands 2004
<b>Samoa</b>	The Sustainable Management of Biodiversity Policy (2007)
	A National Deforestation Policy is under development.
<b>Cook Islands</b>	Various site-specific environmental regulations, ie: Atiu Environment Reg, 2007; Aitutaki Environment Reg, 2006; Mitiaro Environment Reg, 2006; etc.
	Environment Protection Fund Reg, 2006
<b>FSM</b>	Scientific and Policy Support for the Development of MPAs (yr?)
	Invasive Species Policy (yr?)

**TABLE 13 - LEGISLATION**

	<b>Examples of domestic LEGISLATION produced as a result of / associated with the NBSAP</b>
<b>Vanuatu</b>	Environment Management and Conservation Act 2003
	Water Resources Act 2003
	Amendments to the Forestry Act 2001
<b>Fiji</b>	Environment Management Act 2005
	Endangered & Protected Species Act 2002
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	National Biosecurity Bill-draft (under review by key agencies & legislative counsel)
	Sustainable Development Regulations (under review by Cabinet) 2006
	Fisheries Management Ordinances (being drafted for Mejatto, Arno, Majuro, Likiep)
	Office of Environmental Planning & Policy Coordination Act 2003
<b>Samoa</b>	The Maritime Zones Act (1999)
	Bio-prospecting regulations drafted 00-01
	EIA regulations (drafted 1998)
	Village Fono Act (1990)
	The watershed protection and management regulations (1992)
<b>Cook Islands</b>	Fisheries Act regulations (amended 2002)
	Biodiversity Prospecting Bill 2006
	Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2006
	Trade and Endangered Spp. Bill (yr?)
<b>FSM</b>	Biosafety Framework Bill 2005
	MPA laws/ regulations 2003
<b>Palau</b>	Bio-security laws (drafted) 2006
	Amendments to the Protected Areas Network legislation, including enabling the Micronesia Challenge (Yr?)
	an act prohibiting shark-finning (name / yr?)
	amendments to fisheries legislation (name / yr?)
	recycling act (yr?)

A further approach to mainstreaming biodiversity concerns is through ensuring that they are reflected in the concurrent strategic plans that are being developed in response to other multi-lateral environment agreements (MEAs).

As mentioned in the introduction and as shown in Table 14, Pacific nations are party to a range of MEAs and international processes, including:

- UNCCD - United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
- UNCLOS - United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
- UNFCCC - United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
- CMS - Convention on Migratory Species
- CITES - Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species
- Ramsar - Ramsar Convention on Wetlands
- WHC - World Heritage Convention
- SC-POPS - Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

**TABLE 14 – PARTY MEMBERSHIP OF MEAs AND ASSOCIATED AGREEMENTS**

	UNCCD	UNCLOS	UNFCCC	CMS	CITES	Ramsar	WHC	SC-POPS
<b>Vanuatu</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	X	✓	✓
<b>Fiji</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓	✓	✓
<b>Samoa</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Cook Islands</b>	✓	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓
<b>Niue</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓
<b>FSM</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓	X
<b>Palau</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Tonga</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓
<b>Kiribati</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓
<b>PNG</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Nauru</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	✓
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	✓	✓
<b>Tuvalu</b>	✓	✓	✓	X	X	X	X	✓

As parties to these conventions, each nation is required (or 'urged') to produce a range of planning documents / strategies etc:

UNFCCC – The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change addresses the issues of global warming, resulting in the Kyoto Protocol - an international and legally binding agreement to reduce greenhouse gases emissions world wide. A key recommendation from this convention is for Least Developed Countries (LDCs) to produce National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs). This would be relevant for Pacific LDCs, namely: Kiribati, Samoa, Solomon islands, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. However, a further strategy has been encouraged through the GEF in the framework of Pacific Adaptation for Climate Change reports (PACCs), which is required by the GEF from *all* Pacific nations in order to release funds to support climate change issues.

UNCCD - The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification was adopted in Paris on 17 June 1994. Countries affected by desertification are implementing the Convention by developing and carrying out national, subregional, and regional action programmes. At the national level these take the form of 'National Action Plans' that guide governmental processes and policies in tackling land degradation.

UNCLOS – The United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea, also called the Law of the Sea Convention, provides a set of rules for the use of the world's oceans. UNCLOS came into force in 1994, and defines the rights and responsibilities of nations in their use of the seas, establishes clear guidelines for businesses, protects the environment, and improves the management of marine natural resources.

MDGs - The Millenium Development Goals promote the protection and sustainable management of biodiversity, including genetic resources, species and ecosystem services that support human development.

The Stockholm Convention – addressed issues of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and urges parties to produce National Implementation Plans (NIPs) to guide national responses.

Agenda 21 - emerging from the Rio Summit (from which most of these conventions arose) calls on countries to adopt 'National Strategies for Sustainable Development' (NSDSs) that 'should build upon and harmonize the various sectoral economic, social and environmental policies and plans that are operating in the country.'<sup>31</sup>, <sup>32</sup>

The nations included in this review are at varying stages of completing these various MEA plans and strategy requirements (see Table 15). There appears to be some confusion as to whether national development plans (under a range of titles) can be regarded as NSDSs (as promoted by Agenda 21). However, Pacific nations are making considerable headway in their efforts to ensure their international obligations to the MEAs are met. And through these, the CBD goes on to promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use concerns.

It is beyond the scope of this review to assess whether these associated MEA-related plans and strategies do in fact incorporate and mainstream biodiversity related issues; however, such analysis would be extremely useful in the future.

---

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/index.htm>

<sup>32</sup> McNeill, C.I. (2007) Mainstreaming Biodiversity into National Development Plans: Overview and Selected Tools. Presentation by UNDP.



**TABLE 15 – STATUS OF PLANNING DEVELOPMENT FOR MEAs**

	National Sustainable Development Strategy (NSDS) - Agenda 21	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change reports (PACC) - UNFCCC (GEF)	National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) - UNFCCC	NIP-POP - Stockholm Convention	National Biosafety Frameworks - CBD	National Action Plan - UNCCD
<b>Vanuatu</b>	Y - Priorities and Action Agenda 06/15	Y	draft prepared	under development	Y	<i>unknown</i>
<b>Fiji</b>	Y - Strategic Development Plan 06/08	Y	N/A	Y	N	N
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	Y - Vision 2018 06/18	N	N/A	under development	under development	under development
<b>Samoa</b>	Y - Strategy for the Development of Samoa 05-07	Y	Y	Y	Y	under development
<b>Cook Islands</b>	Y - National Sustainable Development Plan 2007-2010	Y	N/A	N	under development	N
<b>Niue</b>	Y - Integrated Strategic Plan 03-08	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y
<b>FSM</b>	Y - Strategic Development Plan 00/15	Y	N/A	under development	<i>Unknown, N/A</i>	N
<b>Palau</b>	Y - National Master Development Plan 06/20	under development	N/A	under development	under development	Y
<b>Tonga</b>	Y - Strategic Development Plan 06/07 - 08/09	Y	N/A	under development	Y	<i>unknown</i>
<b>Kiribati</b>	Y - National Development Strategy 04-07. Y - update to 2008 – 2011 (under development)	under development	Y	under development	under development	under development
<b>PNG</b>	Y - Medium Term Development Plan 2005-2010	Y	N/A	Y	Y	<i>unknown</i>
<b>Nauru</b>	Y - National Sustainable Development Strategy 06/08	Y	N/A	under development	N	<i>unknown</i>
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	Y - National Economic Recovery, Reform and Development Plan 03/06	Y	draft being prepared	N	N	under development
<b>Tuvalu</b>	Y - National Strategy for Sustainable Development 05/15	Y	draft being prepared	under development	N	Y

In addition to these MEA related plans and strategies, various nations have gone on to develop other relevant plans that incorporate the aims of the NBSAPs (as shown in table 16).

This vast array of plans, strategies, policies and protocols offer considerable opportunities for mainstreaming, but also risk fragmentation between divisions and departments intent on completing their own plans and implementation their own priority agendas. The very scale of planning processes (further discussed in section 3.5) also suggests that planning requirements in the region are highly burdensome and consume considerable time of the limited personnel available in government departments that are also tasked with implementation activities.

**TABLE 16 – FURTHER STRATEGIES DEVELOPED AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL**

	<b>Examples of other plans and strategies developed with key relevance to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use</b>
<b>Marshall Islands</b>	Coastal Management Advisory Council (CMAC) Strategy and Action Plan-2005 Re-Imman Action Plan-strengthening of the Process for Community-Based Fisheries and Resource Management Planning (2007-2009); RMI Biodiversity Capacity Building Needs Assessment (2005); Marshall Islands Invasive Species Task Force Strategy and Action Plan (2007-2010)-DRAFT still undergoing final input from key agencies
<b>Cook Islands</b>	National Environment Strategic Action Framework (NESAF) 05-09; Millennium Development Goals National Report 2005; Manuae Marine Management Plan under development; Manuae Management Plan under development
<b>FSM</b>	Climate Change Adaptation Project (CLIMAP) - ADB
<b>Fiji</b>	Tourism Development Plan 2007
<b>Palau</b>	Micronesia Challenge; National Invasive Species Strategy, and 5-year Strategic Plan for Invasive Species; Protected Areas Network; SNC-CCC
<b>Kiribati</b>	National Implementation Strategy (NIS) – Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme (PICCAP); Phoenix Islands Protected Areas Management Plan - under development (covering terrestrial and marine biodiversity up to 60 nautical miles from each islands); National Implementation Strategy (NIS) – Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme (PICCAP)
<b>Solomon Islands</b>	Grand Coalition for Change Government Policy;

### **3.4 The key challenges faced by member states in the development and implementation of their NBSAPs**

As a part of this regional review, NBSAP coordinators from the three countries without NBSAPs were asked to identify the challenges and obstacles they and their departments were facing in *developing* the NBSAPs.

In Nauru and Tuvalu it would appear the key constraints identified at this time are:

- i) Economic and Financial obstacles (lack of financing). Both of these countries are in the process of acquiring the GEF funds to support the NBSAP development process.
- ii) Institutional, technical and capacity-related obstacles (lack of human resources). Both of these countries have limited numbers of personnel available to focus on this work, and this has been a severe constraint in moving this process forward, as other, more immediate priorities have taken precedence.

In the Solomon Islands there have been two previous attempts to initiate the NBSAP development process. Both ultimately stalled in large part due to the lack of guidance in NBSAP development procedure. Early attempts to develop the NBSAP attempted to ensure full stakeholder collaboration by distributing resources through all relevant departments (Forestry, Fisheries, Environment, Meteorology, Agriculture etc) to undertake their own preparatory work and return with priorities and recommended actions for the NBSAP. This fragmentation of the work ultimately led to a failed consensus for the way forward in NBSAP development and production. In

early 2007 the Environment and Conservation Division (ECD) of the Solomon Islands recognized the need to revive the NBSAP process and ensured that NBSAP development and production received paramount attention in their departmental work-planning. To that end, the Solomon Islands have, this year, established a multi-sectoral NBSAP committee, procured a consultant, undertaken the necessary preparatory work (gap analyses etc) and are currently in the process of undertaking the stakeholder and provincial consultations.

The key challenges and obstacles to NBSAP development in Solomon Islands observed and identified overall were (and in some respects still are) the following:

- i) Lack of personnel in the Environment and Conservation Division responsible for both developing and implementing the NBSAP.
- ii) Available capacity in ECD and associated departments.
- iii) Access to funds (GEF funding was returned after the delays to the previous attempts at NBSAP development).
- iv) Ensuring wide stakeholder and provincial consultation is achieved in such a fragmented archipelago state.
- v) Accessing background information on biodiversity currently held with BINGOs, Universities and associated institutions (that have not yet been shared with government)
- vi) Ensuring inter-governmental departmental collaboration and communication.

### **3.4.1 Challenges to NBSAP implementation**

NBSAP coordinators from the nations with *completed* NBSAPs were also asked about the challenges and obstacles they and their departments are facing in *implementing* their NBSAPs. Table 17 shows the ratings that NBSAP coordinators gave against the key challenges and obstacles identified.

The highest rating for a 'serious obstacle' was 'economic and financial (lack of financing)'.

The next biggest challenges identified were: 'socio-economic obstacles' (such as poverty, lack of community capacity, unsustainable utilization rates), and 'institutional, technical and capacity-related obstacles' (such as lack of human resources, inadequate capacity, lack of technology transfer).

These are discussed further in section 3.5.

The lowest rated challenge was 'lack of collaboration/cooperation between partners and stakeholders', suggesting that this particular challenge was well met in the Pacific region.

**TABLE 17 – KEY CHALLENGES AND OBSTACLES TO IMPLEMENTING NBSAPS**

	Vanuatu	Fiji	Marshall Islands	Samoa	Cook Islands	Niue	FSM	Palau	Kiribati	TOTAL	portion of grades (%)
Political/societal obstacles (such as lack of political will, political instability, or difficulties mainstreaming NBSAP into other government sectors)	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	18	11%
Institutional, technical and capacity-related obstacles (such as lack of human resources, inadequate capacity, lack of technology transfer)	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	23	14%
Lack of accessible knowledge/information (such as a lack of scientific and traditional knowledge on status of biodiversity)	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	19	12%
Economic and Financial obstacles (such as lack of financing)	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	2	3	24	15%
Lack of Collaboration/cooperation between partners and stakeholders	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	16	10%
Legal/juridical challenges (such as a lack of appropriate policies and laws)	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	18	11%
Socio-economic obstacles (such as poverty, lack of community capacity, unsustainable utilization rates)	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	22	14%
Natural phenomena and environmental change (such as climate change or natural disasters)	1	1	3	3	2	3	3	2	2	20	13%

1 = this is not an obstacle

2 = this is a challenge to the implementation of our NBSAP, but it is not critical

3 = this is a serious obstacle to the implementation of our NBSAP

### 3.4.2 Support required

Following on from the above section, NBSAP coordinators were asked to list three key areas where they feel support is needed in implementing their NBSAPs. The results are shown in Table 18.

**TABLE 18  
AREAS WHERE SUPPORT IS REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTING NBSAPS**

SUPPORT REQUIRED	Vanuatu	Fiji	Marshall Islands	Samoa	Cook Islands	Niue	FSM	Palau	Kiribati	TOTAL
Institutional strengthening		X				X				2
Political will to support NBSAP		X								1
Review of NBSAP / M&E process development	X	X	X		X			X		5
baseline biodiversity data gathering and information management							X			1
collection of biodiversity specimens & equitable access and benefit sharing							X			1
develop economic valuation procedures into land and coastal zone planning							X			1
strengthening partnerships with wider stakeholders in implementing NBSAP	X		X	X					X	4
developing a workable reporting and communication strategy					X			X	X	3
capacity building for NBSAP implementation	X		X	X		X			X	5
developing funding strategies / securing financial sustainability				X	X	X		X		4

There are a wide range of areas where countries feel support is needed, and reviewing this table with a mind to specific country requests may be especially useful for support organizations such as SPREP. However, commonalities do occur, and the two areas that were most oft cited were:

- (i) Undertaking reviews of NBSAPs and assisting with the development of Monitoring and Evaluation processes (as previously discussed in section 3.2.1)
- (ii) Supporting capacity building of the relevant departments to enable effective NBSAP implementation.

### 3.5 Addressing these challenges and identifying opportunities

Therefore, in synopsis: from the questionnaire results, the interviews undertaken and from review of the associated literature, the key challenges in NBSAP development and implementation appear to be (in no particular order):

- A) Financing (fundraising)
- B) Socio-economic obstacles (such as poverty, lack of community capacity, unsustainable utilization rates)
- C) Burdensome and fragmented MEA requirements & multiple strategy development
- D) The issue of scale: limited numbers of personnel available
- E) Lack of available capacity

#### ***A. Financing (fundraising)***

Lack of financing is repeatedly cited in NBSAP related documentation (in fact most biodiversity / conservation related documentation), this despite the considerable funds made available from the Global Environment Facility, bilateral donors and other agencies.

There are two key aspects to this challenge:

- i) Managing the complex and time-consuming application processes for accessing funds.

Accessing GEF funds through the implementing agencies (UNDP) has proven very complex for some member countries, and extremely time consuming, creating in some cases considerable delay to the NBSAP development process. For example, in Tuvalu, the Department of Environment are still awaiting dispersal of funds despite the application for funds being processed at the end of 2006.

- ii) Meeting the donors requirements for planned use of those funds.

From discussions held it appears that the challenge is not so much that there is not money available for biodiversity conservation / development and implementation of the NBSAPs. Rather, criticisms from member countries focus on the challenges in meeting donor requirements, and are addressed at two levels:

- There is a feeling from some sectors that funding so far made available to the Pacific region has been predominantly focused towards 'planning' rather than 'implementation', and some member countries are keen to push ahead with implementing their plans, rather than developing further plans, analyses etc. One comment from those interviewed was that "*Implementation of biodiversity conservation goals seems to have happened 'despite' the intensive planning rather than 'because' of it.*"
- Another response that emerged from interviews was that donors (the GEF in this case) have a habit of repeatedly re-inventing the 'requirements' for allocating funds in line with global priorities and global trends, rather than in response to local or regional needs. It must be remembered that the GEF is designed as an 'additional support' mechanism to countries existing processes in the key focal

areas with which it works, and is “an independent financial organization that provides grants for projects that benefit the global environment and promote sustainable livelihoods.” However, the GEF is the key donor in supporting the implementation of the various UN environmental conventions in the region, including the CBD (which makes it the primary donor for NBSAP development and implementation). Therefore it has been frustrating for some member countries to try and adapt the work that they would like to do (in order to meet their national biodiversity goals) to the work that will be acceptable to this donor (though not perhaps of such a priority nationally). This is a common complaint from recipient nations all around the world who deal with large-scale donor organizations of this type; however it remains worth highlighting here as it continues to remain a challenge.

➤ ***Identifying the opportunities***

The root causes of the challenges of accessing and acquiring funding for NBSAP development and implementation (as outlined above) may be addressed through more open dialogue between the donors and the member nations. At the SCBD and World Bank level there is an increasing push for ‘implementation activities’, and Pacific nations have the opportunity to voice their concerns and ensure funding is directed to national level priorities concurrently with those being posited as of global concern. And with more open dialogue, donors will acquire the information they need to ensure funds are directed appropriately.

It is important to remember that any financing is not ‘obligatory’ and member nations have the option to refuse funding they feel would require a re-focus away from their own national level concerns. However, it must also be borne in mind that in countries where the per capita GDP is low (the average for these countries is ~ US\$2,700, with more the 50% of these countries actually having per capita GDPs less than US\$2,000) there will always be an implicit push for accessing and securing international support funds.

Ultimately the issue of financing is one that is likely to continue to be challenging; however with the recent addition of \$100 million USD into cross-sectoral Pacific environmental concerns from GEF Secretariat, it is hoped that – once the mechanisms for application and dispersal are agreed through the GEF-PAS process – further funds will be made available to member countries.

***B) Socio-economic obstacles (such as poverty, lack of community capacity, unsustainable utilization rates)***

This is a complex and persistent challenge, and is a global as well as regional concern. This is especially true where high levels of poverty create high levels of resource exploitation, low levels of access to education or divergent employment opportunities, and where pressing humanitarian issues (over and above long term sustainable development) tend to inevitably dominate a political agenda.

In the Pacific region this is especially true for LDCs. Whilst the 'poverty / environment' nexus is well documented<sup>33</sup> it continues to pose one of the greatest challenges to sustainable development (and biodiversity conservation). It is beyond the scope of this review to explore this enormously complex and demanding subject area. Suffice to comment that poverty in and of itself does not 'inherently' lead to unsustainable practices, and many protagonists would argue that examples do exist in various parts of the world where sustainable utilization activities have been brought in line with economic growth and sustainable livelihood development.<sup>34</sup>

➤ ***Identifying the opportunities***

Many of the countries in this review address this challenge of enhancing community capacity towards the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity through clear objectives and actions already promoted in their NBSAPs. It is through the *implementation* of these activities such challenges may be alleviated.

***C) Burdensome and fragmented MEA requirements & multiple strategy development***

Not only do all of the conventions outlined in section 3.3 require considerable work in developing strategic plans and the like, but there are also reporting requirements to these conventions, and despite the considerable cross-over of issues relevant for such reports there is currently no synchronicity in these various reporting mechanisms. Whilst the production of these plans is not necessarily undertaken by the same departments as those responsible for the NBSAP, there are similar issues of limited personnel and capacity cross-sectorally (as discussed further in the next section).

On top of these national level plans, there are innumerable regional plans, strategies and protocols (some of these are listed in Annex 1, taken from the SPREP catalogue).

The reporting and planning requirements surrounding the wide range of strategies conspire to consume considerable time of the limited personnel available in government departments charged with implementing biodiversity conservation actions on the ground.

On top of this, ensuring that the objectives and actions promoted in the NBSAP remain high in the agenda can also be challenging. Multiple strategy development appears to be very real concern for this region, as different priorities and different agendas are pushed depending on the collaborating organization or donor at any given time. Considerable pressures are being levied at government departments to undertake either conflicting or duplicative assignments relevant to one or another of the numerous 'agreed strategies' in-vogue at any given time.

This leads onto the next key challenge.

---

<sup>33</sup> See: Agarwal, 1995; Praxis, 2002; DFID, 2003; Hayes & Nadkarni, 2001.

<sup>34</sup> See: Hajer, 1995; Mol & Sonnenfeld –Eds, 2000.



#### ***D) The issue of scale: Limited numbers of personnel available***

It is worth pointing out at this time the MEAs mentioned in the previous section are global in nature, and make the same requirements (or 'urge' the same processes) in nations with many millions of people, at varying levels of development, and with vastly different resources, both human and financial.

In the Pacific region the 'scales' are relatively unique in the world. Nations such as Niue, with only 1,600 inhabitants, covering a land area of only 259 km<sup>2</sup> are subjected to the same planning and strategy development processes as nations such as Indonesia – with over 240 million inhabitants and covering a land area of more than 1,800,000 km<sup>2</sup>.

Some of the lead agencies in NBSAP development and implementation have very few personnel available to undertake this activity. When their limited time is therefore further taken in associated planning processes, reporting requirements, juggling multi-strategic agendas, as well as undertaking frequent travel to participate in convention related steering committee's and workshops, this time becomes extremely restricted. For example, in the Solomon Islands the Environment & Conservation Division currently has only three full time personnel based in Honiara, and one staff member based provincially (though there are now plans underway for an additional thirteen staff). In Samoa, where NBSAP implementation is very much underway and various successes in biodiversity conservation management can be cited, this is a credit to the 17 local staff members of the Department of Environment & Conservation (one of more fully staffed departments in the region).

#### **➤ *Identifying the opportunities***

Whilst a particular issue may present various challenges it is important in any analysis to examine the counter-arguments of the 'opportunities' that might prevail from the same issue.

In this case, the challenges of 'scale' outlined in the above section can also present considerable opportunities. For example:

- The findings of this review would suggest that – compared to larger scale nations – Pacific island states have achieved high levels of stakeholder consultations in the preparation of their NBSAPs and have good opportunities to access the wider stakeholders in the subsequent NBSAP implementation processes.
- Given the relatively close-knit alliances between government departments in these small island states, there is considerable opportunity for improved synchronicity of planning; both in terms of MEA strategy development and the associated policies, plans and legislation.
- A key challenge faced by the governments of many large-scale nations is one of monitoring and collating critical biodiversity data being gathered in the field by researchers from universities, NGOs and other institutions. This is especially true where reporting processes are not well established, information flows to relevant government departments are minimal (and often overlooked by researchers) and the research is undertaken at many sites by a cross-section of groups. In the Pacific region there is considerable potential

for developing clear and relatively manageable reporting requirements with academic institutions and NGOs to ensure that research undertaken is appropriately copied to the relevant government department (and associated regional information depots, such as the SPREP library).

Such systems could be established (and already are in some cases) through developing Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with the relevant institutes or NGOs. These MOUs may not only cover the submission of research findings to the appropriate governmental bodies, but may also include requirements to report on the progress of biodiversity conservation activities being undertaken by a range of agencies (that can then easily feed into an NBSAP monitoring and evaluation process, as well as to national reporting to the SCBD).

### ***E) Lack of available capacity***

As well as having limited numbers of personnel in the necessary departments to undertake development and implementation of NBSAPs on top of the myriad of tasks demanded of these departments, another key challenge is capacity. This can be in terms of individual capacities of staff members (the skills training required), through to the institutional capacity (of the overall organisational performance and functioning capabilities) up to systematic capacity (considering the overall policy, regulatory and accountability frameworks within which institutions and individuals operate).

#### **➤ *Identifying the opportunities***

The issue of capacity building is currently being addressed through the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) process, that aims to *"provide countries with the opportunity to take the lead in articulating their own capacity needs and priorities with respect to the global environment taking into account the three global conventions on biodiversity, climate change and desertification/land degradation."*<sup>35</sup>

In other words this initiative is designed to help government agencies identify where capacity is lacking in trying address implementation of not only NBSAPs (and the CBD principles) but also the concurrent needs of climate change and land degradation.

The NCSA process aims to identify capacity needs at the individual level, the institutional level and at systematic levels.<sup>36</sup>

Such capacity assessments have been / are being done thematically: firstly undertaking a stock-take of the 'status quo' in the particular areas connected to biodiversity conservation (CBD), climate change (UNFCCC) and desertification (UNCCD); followed by a thematic assessment within each of these realms, and finishing with a cross-cutting assessment of all three arena's, after which an action plan to address these capacity needs is developed.

Table 19 shows the status of the NCSA process in the region.

---

<sup>35</sup> GEF (2001) A Guide for Self-Assessment of Country Capacity Needs for Global Environmental Management. P.1

<sup>36</sup> *ibid*, p.5

**TABLE 19 – STATUS OF NCSA PROCESS IN THE REGION**

	STATUS OF NCSA PROCESS			NCSA ACTION PLAN COMPLETED?
	CBD Thematic Stocktake report completed?	CBD Thematic Assessment completed?	Cross-Cutting Assessment completed?	
Vanuatu	Y	Y	Y	<i>unknown</i>
Fiji	N	N	N	N
Marshall Islands	underway	N	N	N
Samoa	Y	Y	Y	underway (compl Dec 07)
Cook Islands	Y	underway	N	N
Niue	Y	underway	N	N
FSM	underway	underway	underway	N
Palau	Y	Y	underway	N
Tonga	Y	Y	Y (draft)	underway (compl Dec 07)
Kiribati	Y	Y	underway (compl. Sept 07)	underway (compl. Nov 07)
PNG	Y	N	N	<i>unknown</i>
Nauru	N	N	N	N
Solomon Islands	Y	Y	Y	Action Plan is in draft form
Tuvalu	N	N	N	N

So far only Samoa, Tonga, Kiribati and Solomon Islands have reached the stage of action plan development. In many countries a criticism leveled at the NCSA process is that it has been lengthy, time consuming and difficult to undertake – precisely because of the capacity challenges existing and the over-burdening of key personnel.

However, it is hoped that once all countries have finalized this process they will be better equipped to confront and address their capacity needs. Additionally the action plans will provide support organizations such as the CROP and bi-lateral agencies with clear information with regards to the areas in need of tangible institutional assistance, and will identify the key training needs for relevant departments and agencies.

Of course the production of the NCSA action plans are only the *'beginning'* of addressing the capacity needs (and not an end result in themselves). Therefore it is important that there is follow through from the relevant donors and associated agencies, as well as the SCBD, in ensuring the needs identified, and mechanisms promoted to address these needs, are supported.

A further opportunity in addressing capacity is therefore through developing partnerships to provide support to government departments. Given the range of support organizations existing in the Pacific<sup>37</sup> there would appear to be considerable opportunity for developing and enhancing further partnerships with government departments to both provide technical backstopping, training and key-post financial support (where appropriate).<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Including the CROP agencies and NGOs

<sup>38</sup> Key-post support basically means assisting governmental departments to maintain 'key people' and 'key positions' within their divisions, where core funding from overstretched government treasuries fail to meet the existing needs. This is especially relevant in the conservation industry where relatively affluent NGOs and other organizations can offer higher levels of salaries and benefits to individuals from governmental departments; causing a 'brain-drain' and loss of key personnel of high importance in these small and overstretched departments and divisions. To resist such opportunities on an individual level takes considerable commitment and dedication to ones post, and such enticements need to better understood by the larger and more affluent organizations that are the beneficiaries of these personnel shifts.

## 4. CONCLUSION

This review has shown that the status of NBSAP development and implementation in the selected Pacific member countries is varied; from some countries still awaiting funding to begin their NBSAP development process, to others that are busy undertaking implementation activities.

In terms of actionable planning – the What, Where, When, Who, Why and How of strategy development – different countries have met these six criteria to different extents. None have covered them in their entirety, but all have identified the key concerns of relevance to their nation and have made appropriate commitments within their NBSAPs to address these concerns.

In terms of strategic planning, a common omission from NBSAPs in the region is a monitoring and evaluation protocol with appropriate targets, indicators, timescales and prioritizations. Assistance from support organizations to help member countries is to address this issue and support national level NBSAP reviews is also one of the key requests emerging from the region.

This regional review has also shown a wide range of challenges member nations are experiencing in both developing and implementing their NBSAPs, and in mainstreaming concerns for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity cross-sectorally. It also highlights a range of opportunities available to member countries in addressing these challenges.

It is important to remember that this review was conducted within a limited time-frame. The information presented is – as far as it has been possible to verify – accurate as of September 2007. However, with regards to the status of MEA planning, NCSA analyses and the like these are continuing processes that will develop in the coming weeks and months, and it will be important to ensure this information is regularly updated to reflect the current status of activities.

NBSAPs are not static documents, and are not designed to be produced once and then followed verbatim or set aside as a new set of principles comes into fashion. A national biodiversity strategy and action plan should be a dynamic, responsive 'process' that is articulated through document production but that accepts changes, addendums, additions and alterations as the needs arise. For example, in the future undertaking of individual NBSAP reviews, there is no reason why an addendum implementation plan (detailing the answers to the six key strategic principles), or M&E protocol cannot be added. And as objectives and actions are met and achieved, the NBSAPs can be renewed and re-assessed to address the remaining challenges to biodiversity conservation observed.

Ultimately the conservation of biological diversity in any member nation must be domestically driven, and 'ownership' over the NBSAP – and the subsequent activities undertaken to achieve the actions in the NBSAP – must be secured at the national level. The NBSAP is the bedrock framework for planning the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in any country, and must not be 'lost' in the 'paper rain' created by conflicting agendas and externally driven requirements.

However, regional support organizations and international institutions have a key role to play in providing technical backstopping for the government departments concerned, especially in assisting with implementation, and it is hoped that the key areas identified in this review may provide guidance for future discourse on the direction such support could take.

## **Acknowledgements**

Thanks goes to all the NBSAP coordinators and associated Governmental personnel from member countries who participated in this review. Thanks also to the Island Ecosystem Programme team at SPREP (especially Kate Brown-Vitolo, Ana Tiraa and Theresa Fruean-Afa) for all their support and advice, and to Julius Kaberere and the team at COMSEC for facilitating this work.

## **Contacts**

Secretariat of the Pacific Regional  
Environment Programme (SPREP)  
PO Box 240. Apia, Samoa  
Tel: +685 21929  
Fax: +685 20231  
[www.sprep.org](http://www.sprep.org)

The Commonwealth Secretariat  
Marlborough House, Pall Mall,  
London SW1Y 5HX, UK  
Tel: +44 (0)20 7747 6500  
Fax: +44 (0)20 7930 0827  
[www.thecommonwealth.org](http://www.thecommonwealth.org)

Eleanor Carter  
Environment & Development (E&D) Consulting  
Email: [carter.ed.consulting@gmail.com](mailto:carter.ed.consulting@gmail.com)

## FURTHER REFERENCES

**NBSAP WG** (2005) *Report of the NBSAP Working Group Meeting, Alotau, PNG*. July 2005.

**Agarwal, B.** (1995) *Gender, Environment and Poverty Interlinks in Rural India: Regional Variations and Temporal Shifts, 1971-1991*. Discussion Paper prepared for United Nations Research Institute for Social Development

**DFID** (2003) *Linking Poverty Reduction and Environmental Management*. Prepared jointly as a contribution to the World Summit on Sustainable Development at Johannesburg. DFID, EC, UNDP and The World Bank

**Hajer, M. A.** (1995) *The Politics of Environmental Discourse – Ecological Modernisation and the Policy Process*, Oxford.

**Hayes, A. and Nadkarni, M.V.** (2001) Eds. *Poverty, environment and development: studies of four countries in the Asia Pacific Region*. UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. Bangkok

**Mol, A.P.J. & Sonnenfeld, D.A.** (Eds.) (2000) *Ecological Modernisation Around the World. Perspectives and Critical Debates*. London/Portland (Or.): Frank Cass.

**Praxis** (2002) *Poverty-environment Nexus in India: Situation Analysis and Strategy for Change*. Paper prepared for UNDP, India

**Roundtable report** (2007) *Review of the action strategy for nature conservation in the Pacific island region 2003-2007; Reports of the Roundtable: Prepared for the 8<sup>th</sup> Regional Conference on Protected Areas and Nature Conservation, Report 2: Recommendations for strengthening the action strategy and enhancing its implementation*

**Schuster, C. & Reti, J.** (2001) *PIC NBSAP preparation checklist*. WWF/SPREP

**SPREP** (2004) *Report of the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation Management Group Meeting*. Samoa April 27<sup>th</sup> – 29<sup>th</sup> 2004

**SPREP** (2006) *NBSAP working group, preliminary findings. Notes from workshop*.

**SPREP** (2006) *Report back on countries priorities for the next twelve months. Notes from workshop*.

**Tabunakawai, K.** (2002) *NBSAP review*. Roundtable for Nature Conservation. Facilitator Paul Chatterton. Notes from Workshop.

**Thomson, L.A.J.** (2006a) *Review of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans for Fiji and Niue –With reference to treatment of forest biodiversity, Especially forest genetic resources*. SPRIG 2 Milestone 59.

**Thomson, L.A.J.** (2006b) *Review of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans for Samoa and FSM –With reference to treatment of forest biodiversity, Especially forest genetic resources*. SPRIG 2 Milestone 75.

**Tortell, P.** (2007) *IN DRAFT: Review of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Region, 2003-2007: Report of the Roundtable to the 8<sup>th</sup> Regional Conference on Protected Areas and Nature Conservation*.

## ANNEX 1

Examples of some of the multi-strategic plans active in the Pacific region.

- Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region, 2003-2007 (2002)  
see also Roundtable for Nature Conservation website
- Aid and the Environment - building resilience, sustaining growth [An environmental strategy for Australian aid]
- Asian Development Bank Pacific Regional Environment Strategy 2005-2009
- Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States (1994)
- Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations [FAO]. FAO and SIDS: challenges and emerging issues in agriculture, forestry and fisheries (2004)
- Global Environment Facility: Country Support Programme - GEF Focal points in the Pacific
- Mauritius Strategy for the further implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island States (2005)
- NZAID Pacific Regional Environment & Vulnerability Strategy
- The Pacific Plan (various docs) see Implementation Strategy (2006)
- Pacific WSSD Regional Assessment (2002) and Pacific Position Paper: Further Implementation of the BPoA and New and Emerging Concerns (2004)
- Reducing Vulnerability of Pacific ACP States through Island Systems Management [SOPAC]
- Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme Action Plan [SPREP] [2005-2009]; Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme Strategic Programmes [SPREP] [2004-2013]
- Type II Pacific Umbrella Partnerships / Initiatives launched by Pacific Leaders at the World Summit for Sustainable Development 2002
- United Nations Environment Programme Asia-Pacific website (various docs.) see also UNEP Regional Seas Global Strategy
- World Conservation Union [IUCN] Strategy for Oceania (2003)
- Asian Development Bank Pacific Strategy 2005-2009 (2004)
- AUSAID Pacific Regional Aid Strategy 2004-2009 (2004)
- European Union Pacific Strategy (2006; 3.9mb)
- Forum Fisheries Agency Strategic Plan 2005-2020 (2004)
- Global Environment Facility [GEF] Operational Strategy
- Global Sustainable Energy Islands Initiative
- Sustainable development priorities for South Pacific: civil society position [UNEP] (2004)
- United Nations Development Programme Pacific Centre website (various docs.)
- United Nations Millennium Development Goals website (various docs.) and Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Website and Reports
- World Bank Pacific Regional Strategy (2006-2009) (2005) see also World Bank Pacific website
- Asia-Pacific Water Forum (approach, priority themes and key result areas) [SOPAC et al.]
- The Bellagio Blueprint for Action on Pacific Sea Turtles (2004) see also 2007 meeting update
- Bird Conservation Priorities and Draft Avifauna Strategy for the Pacific Islands Region [SPREP] (2001)
- Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005-2015
- Education and Communication for a Sustainable Pacific : guiding framework 2005 - 2007 [SPREP] 2005)
- Framework for South-South Co-operation on Biodiversity [CBD] (2006)
- Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (1995)
- Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters (HFA) [UNISDR] and Strategic National Action Plan [SNAP] template [UNISDR]
- Land Resources Division - Strategic Plan 2005-2008 [SPC]
- Invasive species in the Pacific: a regional strategy [SPREP] (2000) / Invasive species in the Pacific: a technical review and draft regional strategy [SPREP] (2000)
- International Coral Reef Action Network Pacific Programme (ICRAN) (2001-2005)
- Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change 2006-2015 [SPREP] (2005)
- The Pacific Island Global Climate Observing System (PIGCOS) : action plan (2002) [WMO / SPREP]



- Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project (PIGGAREP) (2007) [UNDP / GEF / SPREP] (2002)
- Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy and Implementation Framework for Strategic Integrated Action (2005; 746kb) [MSWG of CROP] - see also SPC Regional Ocean Policy website
- Pacific Ocean Pollution Prevention Programme - PACPOL
- Strategy and Workplan [SPREP] (1999;)
- Pacific Regional Action Plan on Sustainable Water Management [SOPAC] (2002)
- Pacific wastewater : framework for action (2001) and Policy statement (2001; 24kb) [SOPAC / SPREP / PWA / UNEP/GPA]
- Plan d'Action National de l'IFRICOR [Initiative Francaise Pour Les Recifs Coralliens] Deuxieme phase 2006-2010
- Protocol Concerning Co-operation in Combating Pollution Emergencies in the South Pacific Region (2001)
- Protocol for the Prevention of Pollution of the South Pacific Region by Dumping (1986)
- Regional Framework for the Protection of Traditional Knowledge and Expressions of Culture [SPC] (2002)
- Regional Marine Species Programme Framework 2003-2007 [SPREP]- includes action plans for dugong, marine turtle, and whale and dolphin.
- Regional Maritime Programme - Strategic Plan 2006-2010 [SPC]
- Regional Seas Strategic Directions for 2004-2007 [UNEP]
- Regional Strategy to Address Marine Pollution from World War II Wrecks [SPREP / ACPOL / SOPAC](2002)
- Regional Strategy to Comply with the Montreal Protocol in Pacific Island Countries [UNEP / SPREP] (2002)
- Regional Wetlands Action Plan for the Pacific Islands [SPREP] (1999)
- Renewable energy technology support programme for the Pacific Islands [SPREP] (2005)
- Shipping-related Introduced Marine Pests in the Pacific Islands: a regional strategy (2006) [SPREP / IMO]
- Solid Waste Management Strategy for the Pacific Region (2005) and Action Plan (2006) [SPREP]
- SPREP / RAMSAR Memorandum of Understanding (2006) and Joint Work Plan (2002-2003) \*Convention on Wetlands
- Strategic Action Plan for the Development of Meteorology in the Pacific region 2000 - 2009 [SPREP / Bureau of Meterology] (1.18mb)
- Strategic Action Programme for International Waters of the Pacific Islands Region (1998; 605kb) SPREP] see also IWP Terminal Report (2007)
- Strategic Plan of the Coastal Fisheries Section 2003-2005 [SPC]
- Strategic Plan of Actions for the Conservation of Western Pacific Leatherback Turtle Population and their Habitats in the Bismarck Solomon Seas Ecoregion (2007)
- Type II Pacific Umbrella Partnerships / Initiatives launched by Pacific Leaders at the World Summit for Sustainable Development 2002 - see SPREP 2004 update
  - Capacity Building through Education and Training for the Sustainable Use and Management of Natural Resources and the Environment in the Pacific (2002- 2012) \*archive document not current
  - Mainstreaming conservation of Biodiversity and associated traditional knowledge in the Pacific Islands (2003-2007)
  - Pacific Islands Adaptation Initiative (2003-2015)
  - Pacific Islands Waste Management Initiative (2003-2012)
  - Planning for Sustainable Community Lifestyles in the Pacific