



**SPREP**  
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional  
Environment Programme

*The Pacific environment, sustaining our livelihoods and natural heritage in harmony with our cultures.*

PO Box 240, Apia, Samoa  
E: [sprep@sprep.org](mailto:sprep@sprep.org)  
T: +685 21929  
F: +685 20231  
W: [www.sprep.org](http://www.sprep.org)

24SM/Officials/WP.6.4  
Page 1



## Twenty Fourth SPREP Meeting of Officials

17<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup> September 2013  
Apia, Samoa

### AGENDA ITEM 6.4: Review of SPREP, including review of the SPREP Strategic Plan

#### Purpose of the Paper

1. The purpose of the paper is to decide on a process for undertaking a review of SPREP since the Independent Corporate review of SPREP (ICR), and also a review of the SPREP Strategic Plan.

#### Background

2. The Independent Corporate Review (ICR) was undertaken by an independent expert team<sup>1</sup> in 2008 and reported to the 2008 SPREP Meeting (SM). The ICR noted a number of deficiencies in the management of SPREP at that time and made a number of recommendations. The 2008 SM adopted, with some amendments, the recommendations of the ICR report and directed the Secretariat to report annually on progress towards implementation. The ICR provided a broad framework for the change management process at SPREP that has been implemented since 2009.
3. It is standard practice with CROP agencies to undergo a 5 year review period and, in line with this principle, major reviews were undertaken last year of the SPC and PIFS. Given that it is now 5 years since the ICR was adopted by the SPREP Meeting it is considered timely and appropriate that a review of SPREP, focussed on developments since the ICR, should be undertaken in 2014.
4. The SPREP Strategic Plan 2011 - 2015 was endorsed by the 2010 SPREP Meeting, which noted the Plan had been developed in the preceding 12 months following the most extensive process of consultation with members, donors and partners in the history of SPREP. Section 3.4 of the Strategic Plan noted that a mid-term consultative review of the Strategic Plan should be undertaken half way through the period of the Plan, in 2013. Given that the Plan effectively commenced in January, 2012 with the adoption of new structure of SPREP, the half way period of the Plan is in 2014.

<sup>1</sup> John E. Hay, Tererei Abete-Reema, Catherine Bennett, Russell Nari, Bruno Peaucellier and Joe Reti

5. There are thus 2 reviews due in 2014. The view of the Secretariat is that these two reviews should be combined and implemented in 2014, with necessary preparatory work undertaken in 2013. It is considered logical to combine these reviews for two reasons. First, to reduce costs: if they were done separately then this would be very expensive for SPREP (cost estimated at US\$ 120K per review, while it is estimated that a combined review would cost US\$ 150K). Second, there are obvious linkages between both reviews given that both subjects are clearly inter-related.

6. A draft Terms of Reference for consideration by SPREP members is attached as Annex A to this paper. Work under this TOR includes: (a) engagement of independent consultants, including SPREP Member representatives; (b) implementation of sub-regional consultation workshops; (c) extensive consultation with SPREP Members, partners, donors and staff; (d) preparation of a report to the 2014 SPREP meeting.

7. The budget for the combined review is estimated at US\$ 160K, based on the costs for the consultation and preparation of the Strategic Plan in 2010 which was US\$ 150K. At present the Secretariat has earmarked an amount of US\$ 100K for this review in the 2014 budget and we are seeking additional support, including from "Metropolitan" Members of SPREP.

8. The Meeting is invited to:

- **approve** the implementation of the review of SPREP, including review of the SPREP Strategic Plan, in 2014;
  - **approve** the attached Terms of reference for this Review;
  - **direct** the Secretariat to ensure the Review is considered by the 2014 SPREP Meeting; and
  - **consider** and **advise** on additional options for funding the balance of the budget for the review.
-