



**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

**THE INTERNATIONAL WATERS PROJECT
IMPLEMENTING THE STRATEGIC ACTION PROGRAMME (SAP) FOR THE
INTERNATIONAL WATERS OF THE PACIFIC SMALL ISLAND DEVELOPING STATES**

THIRD MULTIPARTITE REVIEW

8-9 July, 2004

Apia, Samoa

SUMMARY RECORD OF DISCUSSION

1. Officials and International Waters National Coordinators from 13 countries participated in the Third Multi-Partite Review (MPR-3) for the International Waters Project that is implementing the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States. The 13 countries represented were the Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. In addition to country officials, representatives from the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) participated in the Review. A list of participants is annexed at Attachment A.

OPENING

2. The Director of SPREP, Mr Asterio Takesy delivered a welcome address (Attachment B).
3. The Hon. Tagaloa Tuala Tagaloa, Minister for Natural Resources and the Environment, Samoa, delivered a Keynote Address appended at Attachment C.
4. The Resident Representative for Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau and Samoa, Ms Joyce Yu, delivered an Opening Address and declared the Meeting open. Her address is annexed at Attachment D.
5. The official for Tonga thanked the Director of SPREP for continuing to accommodate the project. He also thank the Hon. Minster for his Keynote presentation and asked that the gratitude on the Meeting be relayed to the Government of Samoa for hosting the Meeting. He thanked Joyce Yu for the support of UNDP in implementing the Project.

SELECTION OF CHAIR

6. The MPR unanimously selected Faminau Pati Liu, Assistant Chief Executive Officer of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Samoa) to Chair the Review. The Chair welcomed participants to the meeting and thanked the Secretariat for organising the meeting.

APOLOGIES

7. Apologies were received from the Government of Nauru and from the IWP National Coordinator from Kiribati and Tuvalu.

PROCEDURAL ISSUES

8. There were no procedural issues to report.
9. The purpose of the MPR is described at Attachment E.

INTRODUCTION OF PARTICIPANTS

10. Participants introduced themselves to the meeting.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

11. The agenda adopted is presented in Attachment F. Country reports are provided in Attachment G.

12. As country reports were not presented, the representative from Niue took the opportunity to thank the UNDP and the IWP PCU for their assistance to Niue following the cyclone this year.

PROJECT STATUS REPORT

Oceanic Component

13. The Chair referred the meeting to Working Paper 1 relating to the Oceanic Fisheries Management (OFM) Component of the Project. Dr John Hampton, Manager, Oceanic Fisheries Programme at SPC, on behalf of SPC and the Forum Fisheries Agency, presented the Working Paper. The Chair invited the MPR to discuss issues raised in the presentation, in particular, any related to Phase 2 of the OFM component of the project.

14. The representative for FSM, Okean Echemes, noted that the OFM component of the Project would be ending soon. He noted the intention in the Project Document that the OFM and the ICWM components be linked. He asked what links would be maintained, if any, from this point onwards. The Project Manager for the IWP, Andrew Wright, acknowledged the intention in the design of the Project that the two components be implemented in a “complementary linked consultative contexts”. He noted that these links have not eventuated. He observed that the institutional arrangements in the region are such that the responsibilities for tuna and coastal watershed management in the region are often different. The Project Manager commented that the IWP is trying to maintain links between the two components of the project by, for example, by engaging in the CROP Marine Sector Working Group. (He noted that this group is still evolving as a means for discussing both oceanic and coastal issues at a regional level.) He also suggested that there are opportunities for continued discussion of issues common to both components through annual CROP Heads Meeting and through CROP agency governing council and technical meetings.

15. The representative for Tonga, Uilou Samani acknowledged the assistance given to a Tongan student doing doctoral studies at the University of Auckland as part of the capacity building component of the Project. He also noted that, despite the numerous studies on tuna stocks conducted in region, there remain significant difficulties in the Tongan tuna industry. He commented that more research needs to be conducted to determine the reasons for the decline in tuna catch rates which has occurred in Tonga and neighboring countries. Finally, he acknowledged the support provided by the oceanic component for national fisheries institutions.

16. Dr Hampton responded that oceanic component support to national coordinators is provided in response to a needs assessment which is being undertaken as part of the design process for the Phase II component of the Project. In relation to the status of the fisheries in Tonga, Dr Hampton acknowledged the status of the fishery has caused difficulties for industry in the recent past. He observed that SPC has conducted considerable work on the issue. He considers that there is a greater understanding of why stocks have declined locally (changes in oceanography) and that SPC will continue to monitor the situation.

17. The representative for Niue, Brendan Pasisi, acknowledged the work done by FFA and SPC in the oceanic component of the Project. He also acknowledged the capacity building work conducted under the oceanic component. He asked about the scope for SPC work along side in-country scientists to build their capacity to do fisheries work through more training and attachments.

18. Dr Hampton acknowledged the need to continue to build capacity in the region. He noted that SPC is considering conducting workshops on stock assessment and statistics in order to support in-country staff in integrating and using data. He also noted the use of personnel attachments in advance of Standing Committee on Tuna and Billfish meetings and suggested that this should be considered for continuation in the future.

19. In relation to tuna stocks in Tonga, the Chair noted that Samoa also suffers from a reduction in tuna availability. He expressed hope that the oceanic component of the IWP would provide some guidance on how to deal with the problem sustainably in the future.

20. In response to concerns relating to localised decreased catch rates being reported from several countries, the representative for Niue noted that the catches of one country has the potential to affect the catches of other neighbouring countries. He noted that countries will need to work together in managing the shared stock and that this will be supported through the work of the new Commission.

21. The representative from Solomon Islands, Moses Biliki, noted that this was the first time he had attended at MPR meeting. He noted that the PCU could improve communication of information at the national level in respect of two components of the IWP in particular to environment departments and GEF focal points.

22. The representative for the SPC acknowledged that the Terminal Evaluation of the oceanic component had recommended that communications be improved. He noted that efforts to improve communications were being made. It was suggested that communications might be improved if (i) the Secretariat and SPC work closer with the GEF Focal Point and (ii) in-country governments improved coordination within and between Departments.

23. The representative for PNG, Kay Kalim, asked how the work undertaken in the oceanic component of the project related tuna abundance to oceanographic conditions. Dr Hampton noted that the work draws on satellite imagery and other oceanographic work where possible. The representative of PNG asked about the links between the oceanic component and the development of maritime law. Dr Hampton noted that this is the responsibility of SOPAC but that many boundaries in the region are yet to be agreed. He noted also that the Commonwealth Secretariat had provided boundary delimitation assistance to countries in the region.

24. The representative from the Cook Islands, Vaitoti Tupa, noted his agreement with the issues raised by the Solomon Islands in relation to improved communication at the national level in respect of the oceanic component of the IWP. He noted a lack of communication about previous activities conducted under Phase 1 of the Oceanic Component made it difficult for stakeholders in Cook Islands to endorse the Phase 2 proposal.

25. Dr. Hampton noted that the consultations taking place during PDF Phase had taken on board the comments in the Terminal Evaluation in relation to broad stakeholder communications and that increased effort was being applied to address some of the deficiencies of the past.

26. The representative for Kiribati, Rikiaua Takeke, noted that the OFM Component of the Project was reported to have contributed to improved scientific advice to member countries. He asked if this

meant that some previous advice had not been as good as expected. Dr Hampton noted that stock assessment was not a 'precise science' and that the quality of advice was improved by improving data collection and methodologies.

27. The representative for Vanuatu, Ernest Bani, asked about research undertaken on impact of climate on fish resources. Dr Hampton acknowledged that there is an active program within the SPC Oceanic Fisheries Programme that is researching oceanographic issues for the entire western and central Pacific warm pool oceanic ecosystem. He noted collaborative work undertaken by SPC with other international agencies on the long term impacts of climate change on tuna resources.

28. The representative for Vanuatu asked about the scope for the IWP to conduct work on aquarium trade in the fisheries sector. The Project Manager stated that this was not an area likely to be addressed in the IWP.

29. The representative for Palau, Theo Isamu, asked if there were likely to be any changes in staffing at the Oceanic Fisheries Programme at SPC as a result of the new Tuna Commission coming into effect next year. Dr Hampton responded that, in the early phases of the Tuna Commission, there will be a continued reliance on SPC work and that it was likely SPC will be contracted to provide some scientific advice to the Commission. He noted that the emphasis of the Phase 2 project had a more national than regional focus at this point. He suggested that the SPC-related work would assist countries function within the new framework of the Commission in a similar way that had occurred through the backstopping work that had been provided by both SPC and FFA during the Preparatory Conference. However, he noted that the work would of course be driven by the demands of the countries as well.

30. The representative from the UNDP/GEF (Apia Office), Mr. Tom Twining-Ward, commented on the issue of country ownership and endorsement of the PDF proposal by countries an issue which is of utmost importance to GEF. He noted that it was essential that proposals be circulated to all countries for consideration and endorsement before any proposals are approved by GEF.

31. The Director of SPREP, Asterio Takesy, noted some of the frustrations raised by delegates in relation to both national and regional communications. He suggested we take them on as challenges and urged delegates to do what they could to assist with improving communications, particularly between key agencies such as environment and fisheries.

OFM COMPONENT TERMINAL EVALUATION

32. Because preparations for a Terminal Evaluation for the ICWM component of the IWP will commence in 12 months, the Project Manager for the IWP started his presentation by drawing the attention of the meeting to the process for conducting a project evaluation. He noted that planning for the Evaluation took considerable time. He advised that, following a global call for Expressions of Interest only 13 tenders for consultants to undertake the work were received. He noted that the successful consultants commenced consultations in February 2004. Although evaluators did not personally visit all 14 countries, he remarked that they did consult with a variety of stakeholders from all countries.

33. He noted the objectives of the Evaluation (monitor performance, assess impact and sustainability, identify and document lessons learned, suggest for improvements in the future). The findings of the Evaluation are detailed in Working Paper 2. The Project Manager noted that the SPC and FFA had a response to the Evaluation.

34. The Chair invited the representative for SPC, Dr Hampton, to comment on the response of SPC to the Evaluation. Dr Hampton noted that the formal response was presented to the Forum Fisheries Committee meeting in Tarawa in May. He noted that the SPC generally concurs with the Evaluation. He took the meeting through each recommendation of the evaluation, noting the SPC response to each (working paper 2).

35. The Chair invited the meeting to discuss the Evaluation. The representative for UNDP/GEF (Apia Office) Tom Twining-Ward referred to recommendations on Pacific Country Dialogue

Workshops. He noted the existence of a Corporate Programme under the GEF to support country dialogue. He noted that meetings to promote such dialogue have occurred in the past. However, only a few people attended. He announced the GEF has evaluated the country dialogue programme and will implement a second program through the UNDP although it is not clear how this will work at this point. He noted the particular need for national or sub regional workshops. He noted that up to US\$8 000 per year would be available to all countries to raise awareness about GEF policies and procedures. He also noted that some countries have already utilised these funds. Finally, he commented that the best way to learn about the GEF is to use it by engaging in the process by making proposals and drawing on GEF funds.

36. The Resident Representative for Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau and Samoa, Ms Joyce Yu, noted that the Evaluation report refers in places to the sustainability of lessons learned from the IWP. She stated that the sustainability of the project is linked to country ownership. She also noted that the Evaluation remarks on the capacities of the SPC being strengthened through the Project. However, it was important not to see these outcomes as ends in themselves.

37. The representative for the Solomon Islands stated that not all the Focal Points for IWP countries were actually consulted during the IWP OFM Component Terminal Evaluation. He therefore questioned the level of understanding that the Evaluators had. The Project Manager commented that the Project evaluators had been conscious of the need to discuss the evaluation with Focal Points. He noted that the Evaluation recommends that means be explored to more actively involve GEF Focal Points in projects such as the IWP.

38. The representative for Kiribati expressed concerns about the Evaluation, suggesting that the Project had not been planned well enough. The Project Manager acknowledged that the Evaluation identified flaws in the design process for the IWP. He noted that these design flaws in the IWP had been raised in 2001 and suggested that they might be due in part to the difficulty in translating the SAP to a project. The Chair suggested that it be proposed that a follow up project take account of these flaws.

39. The representative for Tonga stated it was unacceptable to acknowledge design flaws in the Project and simply state that it would not happen again. He remarked on the scarcity of money to do this kind of work. He acknowledged that lessons had been learned but was unconvinced that the problem would not happen again. He stated that the Secretariat had to exert best efforts to ensure that this would not happen again not only within the international waters focal area but across all areas of GEF support.

40. In relation to the design flaws for the IWP, the Chair emphasised that efforts would be made to ensure that flaws did not develop again. The representative for UNDP/GEF (Apia Office), Tom Twining-Ward, acknowledged that the Project Document for the IWP was flawed but noted that it had been developed over a long period of time with substantial input from Pacific island countries. He reminded the meeting that the purpose of the Inception Report was to identify flaws that may have developed over time. He also noted that revisions have been made to the Project periodically throughout implementation to respond to emerging areas of interest in the GEF such as more robust monitoring of Project impacts.

41. The representative for the Cook Islands acknowledged the concerns of the Solomon Islands and Tonga but noted that the GEF had approved the Project and suggested that countries use this as a lesson for better design processes and documentation in the future.

Coastal Component

42. The Project Manager provided an update on the ICWM component of the Project (Working Paper 2). The Chair invited comments or observations from the meeting. The representative for Kiribati registered appreciation for the Project, in particular for the post graduate scholarship which he considered to be valuable.

43. The representative for Marshall Islands acknowledged the support of the SPREP, UNDP and the PCU in the RMI project. He noted that the project is progressing well although there are still some challenges.
44. The representative for Vanuatu acknowledged the progress that had been achieved during the last 12 months by the Project. He thanked the National Coordinators for their efforts on behalf of the Project. The representative for PNG applauded the PCU for bringing together the National Coordinators to exchange experiences with Project implementation and to share lessons that were being learned. She noted the dialogue between the PCU and SOPAC and other regional agencies on areas of common interest. She suggested National Coordinators should be encouraged to contact other agencies directly without having to rely on the PCU to do this for them.
45. The representative for Tonga reiterated the value of the scholarship scheme under the IWP. The representative for Tuvalu, Enate Evi, commented that some misconceptions about the Project remain in Tuvalu, particularly in relation to what the Project can fund. He asked about the scope for the PCU, UNDP or GEF to fund infrastructure and capital items.
46. The representative for Fiji, Tevita Dawai, expressed appreciation for the effort being put into developing the IWP in Fiji, stating that the Department of Environment found the results very encouraging. Nevertheless, he was concerned about mechanism for channeling the funds through to Fiji as this takes time. He asked if the process could be improved.
47. The representative for Niue stated it was good to see some outputs coming out of the Project now and noted the enthusiasm of the villagers in Niue for getting the project underway. He observed that everyone has been engaged in the Project. He stated that Niue was interested in the 2003 Mid Term Evaluation report comments on sustainability and, to that end, wanted to ensure that the Project was fully integrated with Lead Agencies. He would like to see increased effort on this issue at a national level.
48. The representative for Palau requested that the UNDP, the PCU, National Coordinators and Lead Agencies consider the issue of funds for the Project post 2006 so that processes can be put in place to help countries afterwards. The representative for Fiji remarked on the continuity of staffing, noting it was not clear how the Project should be sustained after 2006 in Fiji.
49. Ms Joyce Yu responded that this was something for governments to answer and that the UNDP could not set in-country priorities for work. She remarked that the GEF was unlikely to continue to support the Projects after 2006 and that governments would need to consider funding arrangements to keep Project activities moving.
50. The Assistant Resident Representative for the UNDP/GEF (Apia Office), Ms Easter Galuvao suggested that links be established with other projects and activities to support continuity and sustainability through partnerships. The Chair noted that these issues may take time as governments need to plan for projects strategically and to ensure that projects are linked to country priorities.
51. The representative for Niue acknowledged the need for partnerships but reiterated the need for capacity building. He noted that the IWP had significant financial resources to address a range of priority issues that countries had been unable to address to date because of a shortage of funds. It was important to maximise this opportunity to ensure meaningful outcomes were achieved by the Project.
52. The representative from the Cook Islands stated that concern about the future of National Coordinators following the Project is a national issue. He observed that the Cook Islands have already approached the government to take on the National Coordinator following the Project and have budgeted for it. He urged other government officials to consider a similar response.
53. The representative for FSM noted the delays in the FSM project in IWP but stated that the government is committed to the Project, noting the project is a significant development for the state of Yap. He wondered about the scope for providing more resources to implement the Project. Regarding partnerships, he encouraged the Project to actively research partnership opportunities –

citing the developing partnership between the Yap project and The Nature Conservancy as an example. He encouraged the Project to search out additional partnership opportunities with other SPREP projects or with projects being implemented by other regional organisations. He appealed to SPREP and UNDP to demonstrate flexibility in relation to the need for fast tracking Project activities.

54. The representative for the Solomon Islands noted that the IWP project site is located at Marovo Lagoon and that the Project is collaborating/partnering with other agencies involved there. These include the University of Queensland and UNESCO. He noted the time remaining on the Project and noted the need to prioritise work. Nevertheless he considered that the greatest value from the project would come from community level work. Therefore he requested the PCU to put a greater emphasis on community work in the time remaining. Regarding continuity and sustainability of the Project post 2006, he noted that countries had to consider this. On the other hand, he also noted that the Oceanic Component had entered a second phase and therefore wondered if the IWP would enter a second phase also?

55. The Chair noted that it is the responsibility of national governments to ensure the continuity and sustainability of Project activities. He commented that this puts pressure on countries to generate lessons learned and apply them. The Chair proposed acceptance of the ICWM report.

Issues arising from the MTE

56. The Chair noted that the Mid Term Evaluation was discussed the previous year at the MPR in Tonga. He invited the meeting to consider issues arising from the Evaluation and the Record of the Second MPR which considered the Mid Term Evaluation Report. The representative for Niue noted that the evaluation had made some recommendations regarding institutional capacity building with Lead Agencies, NTFs etc. He asked for clarity on how the project was addressing these recommendations.

57. The Project Manager noted that capacity building has only occurred in a direct sense where Lead Agency staff have been involved in training workshops etc. He also noted that National Coordinators have been involved in training/capacity building in social marketing, participatory planning processes and economics. He also noted the scholarship scheme for the Project. He noted the importance of government agencies being involved in IWP processes and that the reviews of institutional arrangements for the focal issue or issues of concern being supported by the Project was also addressing capacity issues. The representative for Niue clarified that he was concerned that the work of the IWP might end after the Project finishes unless relevant agencies are engaged in the IWP process and understand how it works. He asked that the PCU consider this, particularly in relation to the work of National Task Forces.

58. The Meeting noted the report relating to responses and action taken in relation to the Mid Term Evaluation and MPR2 discussion and decisions.

Annual Progress Report/Project Implementation Report

59. The Assistant Resident Representative for the UNDP/GEF (Apia Office), Easter Galuvao, provided some background on the Annual Project Report and the Project Implementation Review report. She observed that efforts have been made to harmonise and simplify these reports so they have now been merged. She remarked that the meeting should review the report since it will be submitted to the GEF Secretariat as part of the Portfolio Performance Reports which is presented to the GEF Council Meeting. The Chair invited comments on the report from the floor.

60. The Resident Representative for Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau and Samoa, Joyce Yu drew the attention of the meeting to remarks in the report on the MPR and invited suggestions on how to improve MPRs. The Project Manager noted that the PCU was trying to find ways to ensure that future meetings were more output orientated so that they were more useful. He noted that the meeting would be explicitly considering lessons learned to date later in the agenda. He expected that the next MPR would be even more focused on output and achievements.

61. The Chair reminded the meeting of the importance of the report and proposed that participants take home the report to review and then provide input to the UNDP/PCU as necessary by the end of July. This proposal was accepted by the meeting. (Kiribati noted that it would have some national holidays in between but would try to make this deadline anyway. Palau noted that they had an arts festival during this time as well.)

FINANCIAL REPORT

62. The Project Accountant, Mr Rama Vaa, presented a summary of the Project budget. The presentation included total expenditure on the Project to date by item, agency and country as well as information on proposed budget revisions. The Chair invited comments from the floor.

63. The Resident Representative for Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau and Samoa, Joyce Yu, remarked that some costs presented in the regional component were not actually of direct benefit to countries. She suggested that, in the future, the PCU provide information on a programmatic level so that countries can see how funds generated benefits at the national level. The Project Accountant commented that the PCU would be presenting information in a more programmatic sense, as per the new Peoplesoft Atlas management system adopted by the UNDP.

64. The representative from the Cook Islands noted that 45 per cent of the Project's funds have been used and two years remain in the Project. He stated that the PCU needs to adopt some flexibility in dispersing future funds. The Project Manager expected the majority of funds would be fully dispersed by the conclusion of the Project noting the extent to which Project spending has accelerated in recent years. He noted planned national-level expenditure on reviews and baseline work etc. He suggested that if surplus funds are evident in the next MPR, that the re-assignment of those funds be discussed then.

65. The representative for Tonga queried the budget allocation to UNDP, stating that it was large compared to the money spent on participating countries. The Project Manager noted that this money represented the fees to UNDP as stipulated in the Project Document and administration expenses such as UNDP support (eg., participation at the MPR) and the evaluations. The representative from the UNDP/GEF (Apia Office), Tom Twining-Ward, reiterated the 3 per cent fee from UNDP but also noted that UNDP fees now are not covered in budgets. He noted that UNDP receives this fee from the GEF the same as other GEF Implementing Agencies, The World Bank and UNEP. The Resident Representative for Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau and Samoa, Ms Joyce Yu, noted that this fee does not reduce the funding made available to countries in the Project. The representative for the Cook Islands acknowledged that the fees for UNDP are on top of country allocations and suggested countries remain aware of that. The Chair remarked that the slow draw down on funds reflects the slow implementation of countries at the start of the Project and that countries need to "fast track" activities now.

66. The representative for the Solomon Islands asked what would happen if countries designed Project activities that exceeded the available budget. The Project Manager acknowledged this issue and stated that the PCU discusses this in detail with the UNDP. He commented that, as provided for in the MoU signed by all participating countries, budget resources will be allocated on a demonstrated needs basis. He noted that some countries will have greater needs and expenses than others. He also noted that funds may be reallocated between countries and between budget lines.

67. The representative from Fiji asked whether the PCU visits the sites in some countries. The Project Manager stated that this was the case, and noted that the annual report from the PCU which lists country visits by the PCU in the last 12 months.

68. The representative for Tuvalu noted that a request from Tuvalu for funds for infrastructure had been turned down because it was capital intensive. He asked why the money cannot be used for these items. The Project Manager responded that the Project was not intended to be an infrastructure Project and that solutions supported by the Project are intended to be low cost or no cost thus increasing the potential for outcomes being sustained beyond the life of the Project.

69. The meeting noted the financial report from the PCU.

REPORT OF THE 4TH NATIONAL COORDINATOR'S MEETING

70. The Chair provided a brief summary of the meeting, noting in particular the recommendation from the National Coordinators that an additional National Coordinators' meeting occur in November 2004. The purpose of this meeting would be to consider among other things, replication strategies and refinement of monitoring plans. His statement to the Meeting is annexed at Attachment H.

71. The representative from Tonga perceived that the report clearly reflected the work the National Coordinators have done in the last year. He stated that he supported the proposal for an additional meeting of national coordinators. He perceived that this would be valuable given the need for monitoring in the next two years. He considered that the MPR next year would then be in a better position to assess progress with Project implementation if an additional NCM was supported.

72. The representatives for Vanuatu, Cook Islands, Palau and Fiji seconded the proposal for an additional meeting. The representative from FSM expressed some reservations, noting that implementation of the Project on Yap was behind schedule and that there was a need to focus on actual implementation activities at the community sites. The representative from Niue supported the idea for an early meeting on the understanding that good justification existed. He noted the desire of National Coordinators to follow up on the monitoring and evaluation plans and noted that the PCU may have other issues to suggest as the target for the Meeting as further justification. He also noted the costs of having such another meeting so suggested that this be a one-off as it takes a lot of time, resources and effort to organise such a meeting.

73. The Chair for the meeting noted that countries needed to consider the costs for such a meeting and to ensure national projects prioritised their activities so that such meetings did not compromise outputs at the national level. He asked if the PCU could advise the cost of such a meeting and where would be the cheapest location. UNDP stated that UNDP had no view on whether another meeting should occur but he was concerned that an objective of the meeting would be to finalise monitoring plans. He drew the attention of the meeting to the recommendations from the Mid Term Evaluation on the role of the PCU and how much help the PCU is supposed to give countries. He reiterated that the Project still had a long way to go in terms of meeting some of its objectives so he asked the meeting to ensure that countries are making national implementation of projects their priority.

74. As an indication of costs, the Project Manager stated that a one week meeting in Samoa would cost between US\$45 000-50 000. He noted that this money would have to come from in-country budgets as the PCU does not have the money to fund the meeting itself. The Chair suggested that such a meeting could discuss in-country project priorities as well as the log frame for the Project.

75. The representative for the Cook Islands noted the needs for National Coordinators to be proactive with their projects and the value of the meeting but noted the cost of the meeting and that it would have to come from in-country budgets. It was agreed that PCU would assess the logistical and cost issues of such a meeting in consultation with National Coordinators in order to make a cost effective decision.

76. The Chair noted that the NCM had also considered refinements to the existing Project Logframe. The Project Manager indicated the changes related to the use of common terms proposed by the UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. He noted that the changes did not alter the objectives or outcomes for the Project – but were intended to provide improved clarity in the horizontal logic.

77. The meeting endorsed the Logframe as adopted by the National Coordinator's Meeting (Attachment I).

LESSONS LEARNED

78. The Social Assessment and Participation Specialist (CAPS), Dr Natasha Stacey, presented on lessons learned relating to the Project. She noted that lessons learned are a principle interest of the Project and noted how lessons learned relate to best practice and replication of activities elsewhere.

79. The CAPS noted that the PCU had started compiling information on lessons learned to date. She noted that the PCU had asked UNDP and GEF about the format for lessons learned but apparently no generic format exists. The CAPS noted that the lessons learned identified so far fall into a number of key areas including management and administration, SAP formulation and IWP project implementation. She noted there is variety of options for how to format lessons, depending on who the audience is. She suggested that it would be good to come up with lessons in a medium other than just reports (eg., programs, educational material, video etc.).

80. The CAPS noted the need to have lessons learned material well advanced by early 2006 and that options for documenting and formatting this can be discussed with stakeholders over the next 12 months.

81. The Resident Representative for Cook Islands, Niue, Tokelau and Samoa, Ms Joyce Yu, suggested that the Project produce a number of outputs detailing lessons learned including CD ROMs and cartoon booklets, for example rather than just one key document, although all outputs would need a common theme or appearance to link the products. She noted that this would be a reflection of the Project Communications Strategy.

82. The representative for PNG noted that there are a number of focal areas being addressed and it would be good to have those areas addressed separately.

OTHER BUSINESS

Follow-up initiatives

83. The representative from Cook Islands urged the PCU, SPREP and UNDP to make special effort to develop an approach to support efforts to develop additional follow up medium sized or full size projects for integrated coastal and watershed management that could build on the achievements of this Project beyond 2006.

84. The Chair noted that this issue had been discussed several times during the Meeting. He supported the view expressed by the representative from Cook Islands and urged UNDP and SPREP to give additional attention to this matter.

85. The representative from PNG urged increased effort at the national level to also pursue funding opportunities beyond the IWP. She drew the attention of the Meeting to a South Pacific Regional Action Plan for Integrated Coastal Watershed Management that was developed by SOPAC in 2003.

86. The UNDP Resident Representative noted that it is not unusual for the GEF to support second phase projects. She advised that medium size projects lend themselves well to national execution where as a regional project is more likely to be a full size project. It was important that the results and lessons of this Project be applied to that purpose. She noted that the UNDP/GEF Small Grants Programme was also expanding in the region and it also offered an opportunity for accessing continued GEF support. The SGP is currently in its inception phase in Fiji, Samoa and Vanuatu. She continued that under the International Waters Focal Area of the GEF national projects are rare. However, she noted opportunities existed in other Focal Areas such as Biodiversity and Land Degradation.

87. The UNDP Resident Representative also noted the scholarship scheme for the IWP and expressed enthusiasm for it.

88. The Director of SPREP expressed confidence in UNDP and national and regional the Project implementation partners to achieve significant outcomes – as already demonstrated in the OFM Component of the Project. He noted that the Coastal Component was also now starting to produce encouraging results and that additional effort, at both regional and national levels, is required to realise its potential. He suggested that any follow up regional initiative will require close cooperation among CROP agencies with an interest in coastal and watershed management.

Solomon Islands initiative

89. The representative from Solomon Islands advised that the Project in Solomon Islands has received a request to address community concerns at the Solomon Islands border with PNG. He advised Solomon Islands communities at the border were concerned that the tailings waste from a PNG copper mine are reported to be impacting the quality of coastal waters in Solomon Islands. He appealed to UNDP and SPREP to respond with some flexibility should a formal approach from Solomon Islands relating to this matter eventuate. The representative from PNG requested to be kept informed of developments in relation to this matter.

NEXT MEETING

90. The representative from Palau requested additional information on the purpose of holding the NCM and MPR Meetings back-to-back. The Project Manager responded that this initiative was implemented in response to recommendations flowing from the South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Project where technical officers responsible for implementation and officials attending the MPR had limited opportunities to interact on technical implementation issues and higher level administrative issues.

91. The representative from Samoa requested that additional time be allocated to the NCM. The experience of NCM4 was that three days was too short to accommodate all the issues that required discussion among National Coordinators.

92. The representatives from Kiribati and Niue supported the objective of back-to-back NCM and MPR meetings. They considered that it did serve the purpose of raising awareness among a broader range of stakeholders for Project implementation issues in respect to both policy and administrative issues and practical issues associated with actual Project implementation.

93. The representative from PNG recommended that NCM5 focus on technical issues and that it would not require the participation of officials.

94. Taking into account financial considerations the venue and date for the will be determined by UNDP in consultation with SPREP. Any offer by participating countries to offer financial support for such Meetings, and thus limiting the impact of these Meetings on the Project budget, would be gratefully received.

SUMMARY RECORD

95. The Third Multipartite Review adopted this Summary Record of Discussion.

CLOSE OF MEETING

96. The Resident Representative for UNDP expressed appreciation to the Chair for his guidance during the Meeting. She also thanked National Coordinators and Officials for their active contribution to the Meeting and the high caliber of discussions. She also expressed gratitude to SPREP and the PCU for their efforts dedicated to successful implementation of the Project. She advised UNDP would note the outcomes of the MPR paying particular tribute to the achievements of the OFM Component of the Project. In relation to the next two years she urged a focus on best practices, documentation of results and national activities that will contribute to global environmental benefits.

97. The Director of SPREP noted that obvious progress had been achieved over the last 12 months. However, he noted that a considerable amount remained to be done. He assured the Meeting that SPREP is committed to the successful implementation of the remainder of the Project. He was encouraged by the efforts of the Project to address the root causes for the region's environmental problems at both the regional and national level. He noted that to successfully achieve this continued effort to build national capacity remained a priority

98. The Project Manager expressed appreciation to the SPREP Secretariat for the administrative and logistical support provided over the last 12 months particularly in relation to this Meeting. He

expressed special appreciation to the staff of the Finance and Administration Section. He thanked the UNDP Resident Representative and the staff of the UNDP Office in Apia for their support.

99. The Chair thanked everyone for their participation in the meeting. He acknowledged the work of the UNDP and SPREP in supporting the project and the need to ensure a successful project.

100. The Chair declared the meeting closed.