

## Concept 1: Strengthening leadership and alliances for Pacific Ocean Governance through an Ocean Commission

#1	Strengthening leadership and alliances for Pacific Ocean Governance through an Ocean Commission	
1. Purpose	Provide Ocean leadership, representation, coordination and policy analysis	
2. Summary	Establishment of a Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Commission comprising a Regional Ocean Commissioner with dedicated professional support to provide the necessary high-level representation and commitment that is urgently required to ensure dedicated advocacy, attention and cohesion to ocean priorities, decisions, processes at national, regional and international levels.	
3. Background	<p>The PIROP (2002) and FPO (2010) identified the need for regional leadership and coordination on ocean issues and this need was reiterated in the PIROP-ISA, the joint CROP EDF10 “Blue-Green proposal” and in the recent World Bank PROP PCN. The Secretary General of the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS), supported by PIFS staff has been established as a part-time and interim measure. Other initiatives have also emerged providing some sub-regional leadership on ocean issues such as the Coral Triangle Initiative, and the establishment of sub-regional mechanisms addressing particular aspects such as the <i>Parties to the Nauru Agreement</i> (PNA) Secretariat and the <i>Te Vaka Moana</i> for tuna management. Given resource and coordination limitations for the interim arrangement progress on issues is carried out relatively piece-meal by individual agencies, often with little interaction and without being evaluated from the wider regional ocean policy perspective of PIROP and the FPO. Promotion of Ocean issues has relied on the good offices of a few regional leaders, subject to their availability and the availability of their advisors.</p> <p>The need for high level, dedicated, promotion of regional ocean interests and coordination of resources (including financial) mobilization as called for in the FPO has not been fully addressed by the interim Ocean Commission arrangements or other initiatives. Furthermore, many of the activities contemplated under the FPO require a coordinated high-level approach to engaging with countries, assessing and agreeing strategic ‘priority’ support and monitoring and evaluating progress.</p> <p>FPO priorities such as maritime boundaries delimitation would benefit from greater political leadership, support and commitment, as would sensible sound positions on matters relating to sustainable inshore fisheries management, a comprehensive legal and policy framework for Deep Sea Minerals (DSM), as well as issues related to high seas conservation and management. As a purely policy level institution, the OC may aspire to be independent of existing regional organizations but certainly act as a neutral broker, in terms of mandate and accountability. For operational and cost efficiencies it may be prudent to co-locate the OC in an existing agency. The main accountability of the OC would be to the Leaders and possibly through a mechanism linked to the Pacific Plan processes.</p>	
4. Policy context	<p>FPO priorities and actions:</p> <p>Other policy:</p>	<p>Actions 2a, 2b. Support actions 1a,1b, 2d, 2c</p> <p>PIROP-ISA Initiatives 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 6.2, 6.1, Regional Seas Convention and Action Plans, Noumea Convention</p>

<b>5. Objectives</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establishment of a Regional Ocean Commissioner, with dedicated professional support, to provide consistent high level representation and commitment at all levels</li> <li>2. Establishment of a Regional Ocean Alliance/ Partnership mechanism providing ocean policy coordination and implementation</li> <li>3. Engagement with PICTs at high level to determine gaps and opportunities for intervention in existing processes for sustainable use and management of coasts and ocean space (link to Concept 3)</li> <li>4. Oversight and M&amp;E of FPO related activities including a watching brief on emerging issues that may warrant regional and national level attention and consideration (e.g. High Seas)</li> </ol>
<b>6. Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Establish office, institutional arrangements and recruit Ocean Commissioner and core staff (at least two – three advisor level FTEs)</li> <li>• Define key messages and promote Ocean policy and regional Ocean interests, regionally and internationally</li> <li>• Develop, monitor and review ocean policy and implementation plans and set up ongoing M&amp;E framework</li> <li>• Identify and mobilize financial and technical resources for FPO implementation and maintain an inventory of initiatives to monitor and address gaps</li> <li>• Explore and progress donor harmonization – possibly in coordination with PIFS functional areas for facilitating Pacific Plan implementation and, improving Aid Coordination and Effectiveness</li> <li>• Establish and facilitate/coordinate an “Ocean Alliance” or partnership including regional and international agencies, donors and NGOs as well as national institutions.</li> <li>• Engage with leaders and national agencies in a process to identify needs and priorities as well as nationally appropriate mechanisms for implementation by the technical partners (see Concept 3)</li> <li>• Coordinate with CROP executives and other development partners on implementation of Ocean related work reflected in the FPO and other ocean priorities in the PIROP</li> <li>• Engage with civil society networks and the private sector and provide support, as appropriate in achieving FPO aims.</li> <li>• Organize 5-yearly Ocean Fora processes to review and develop ocean policy and identify emerging issues (SP6a). The first forum would serve to launch the Ocean alliance (and subsequent others could lead into other broader development processes such as the Pacific Plan, BPOA+20, Rio+20 etc.</li> <li>• Oversee projects that the OC could immediately play a role in e.g. Concept notes 4, 5, and 6 and lead Concept 3</li> </ul>
<b>7. Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Regional Ocean Commissioner designated</li> <li>- Regional Ocean Commission with dedicated professional support providing high level representation and commitment</li> <li>- Oceania's critical ocean and coastal issues and priorities accorded high-level, political attention and commitment at national, regional and global levels as a result of dedicated high- level leadership and advocacy</li> <li>- Open-ended and inclusive Regional Ocean Alliance/ Partnership mechanism facilitated by the Regional Ocean Commissioner with Office functions provided by the Commission, established and providing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- effective ocean policy coordination and resource mobilisation for implementation</li> <li>- facilitate regional cooperation for high seas issues</li> <li>- support for national ocean governance and policy processes, when required</li> <li>- streamlining to support achievement of national commitments to MEAs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- monitoring and evaluation of FPO related activities and initiatives</li> <li>- Inter-regional cooperation developed and fostered.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Under Concept 3 on country assessments: Gaps and opportunities determined in countries for intervention in existing processes for sustainable use and management of coasts and ocean space.</li> <li>- Ocean Commissioner (and secretariat) facilitate the Ocean Alliance</li> <li>- Coordination of networks which support implementation from communities to cabinet (nationally) and, from cabinets/councils to leaders (regionally). The forum also allows evaluation and scrutiny of the implementation and alignment with PIROP and FPO principles and is needs driven.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Stakeholders / beneficiaries</b>	The OC would be a small and neutral body although it would have a larger, virtual constituency to draw upon, through engagement and close cooperation, coordination and collaboration with all regional and national stakeholders through various bilateral, CROP, multi-lateral and open processes such as the Ocean Alliance and other functional linkages with other linkage mechanisms such as Regional Seas.
<b>9. Resourcing</b>	<p>Funding: The OC should strive to keep cost to a minimum maximizing the use of co-location and being resourced from funded initiatives on a cost-recovery basis rather than a fixed overhead.</p> <p>An Ocean Commissioner supported by a small secretariat comprising at least two/three high level policy analysts and a support staff would be able to dedicate the attention required to some of the key tasks in the FPO and the more overarching PIROP.</p> <p>Staff: Ocean Commissioner, senior policy analysts (2-3 FTE), consultants</p> <p>Operations: Meeting expenses, flights, regional forum (1)</p> <p>Duration: 5 years</p>
<b>10. Other related interventions</b>	FPO Concept #3 and coordination and monitoring component of all FPO concepts. Could constitute or include the World Bank proposed Pacific Regional Ocean Policy Coordination Unit

## **Concept 2: Maritime boundaries delimitation**

#2	Maritime boundaries delimitation
1. Purpose	<b>Establish jurisdictional rights and responsibilities over maritime boundaries and maintain regional and national geospatial capacity</b>
2. Summary	<b>PICs, as State Parties to UNCLOS should in their national interest, deposit with the United Nations, base-point coordinates as well as charts and information delineating their maritime zones as a requisite to establishing and securing their rights and responsibilities over large areas of ocean space. Negotiations between neighbouring States, to agree delimitation of shared boundaries is also required.</b>
3. Background	<p>The FPO designated as Strategic Priority 1 the establishment of jurisdictional rights and responsibilities over maritime zones noting that governance is built on rights and responsibilities and at the broadest scale a significant number of maritime boundaries in the Pacific are yet to be negotiated and declared. Of the approximately 48 shared boundaries that require negotiated treaties only 28 are subject to treaty and 7 of these were signed as recently as 2012.</p> <p>Regional efforts to support maritime boundary development in the Pacific Islands, has been led by SPCs Applied Geoscience and Technology Division (SOPAC Division) since 2001. The Division has built significant marine spatial data handling capacity in each participating PIC and supports these countries to develop their respective baselines (including archipelagic baselines), maritime zones and subsequent outer limits of their EEZ's in accordance with the provisions of UNCLOS (UN Convention on the Law of the Sea). The SOPAC Division also supports the technical development of shared boundary solutions which underpin treaty negotiations. An increased emphasis may be required on providing legal and political support to countries to conclude negotiations on the 20 outstanding shared boundaries.</p> <p>At the time of writing only Fiji, Nauru and Palau had declared their maritime baselines, zones and outer limits in accordance with UNCLOS and Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu have declared only their archipelagic baselines. Of these countries, three (Fiji, Solomon Is. and Papua New Guinea) are in the process of verifying / updating the data used (pre 2001) to declare their respective baselines and maritime zones with the assistance of the SOPAC Division. Thus the declaration of maritime boundaries remains a work-in-progress.</p> <p>The SOPAC Division in collaboration with its technical partners also supports PICs to claim potential extended continental shelf (eCS) territory under UNCLOS Article 76 and by February 2013, 10 PICs (Cook Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu) had submitted their respective, joint and SPLOS/183e (preliminary information) eCS claims to the UN Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf (UNCLCS). In total, approximately 2 million km<sup>2</sup> of seabed territory adjoining but beyond the 200NM limits of PIC EEZs is now subject to claim with the UNCLCS. All eCS claims will eventually be subject to technical review by a panel of experts under the UNCLCS and each country must complete their respective (and joint) claims before this technical review can occur. The countries must maintain a dedicated technical and legal team to defend these claims to the UNCLCS and each country will need to be capable of supporting the defence process at a technical and legal level for several years (the process may take 5 or more years).</p> <p>The SOPAC Division is also the regional coordinating hub for a consortium of technical / legal partner agencies who work with the Division to support PICs in boundaries development. These partners have also built significant marine geospatial data handling capacity in a number of PIC teams. AusAID funding to resource the regional workshop series which has been instrumental in building this capacity and progressing boundaries development in the region ended in late 2012.</p>

	<p>A further proposal has been submitted to AusAID to continue this important work however the proposal is subject to a competitive process and if it fails the skills sets, capabilities and progress developed at national and regional level will be lost. It is important to note these skills are also highly relevant for priority activities such as geospatial mapping of marine resources and use, under other elements of the FPO.</p> <p>The FPO as well as needing to prioritize the on-going support and completion of work for this strategic priority area could also lend it momentum in terms of augmenting political will, at the national level, to encourage States move quickly to establish their rights and responsibilities under UNCLOS. The existing capacities at regional and national levels should also be used for supporting any upcoming spatial/boundary needs under other priority initiatives of the FPO.</p>
4. Policy context	<p>FPO priorities and actions: 1a,1b</p> <p>Other policy: UNCLOS</p>
5. Objectives	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Formalize PICs maritime boundaries to secure rights over their living and non-living marine resources</li> <li>2. Provide support to countries to defend their potential eCS claims.</li> <li>3. Develop the means to integrate this regional and national “geospatial” capacity into other FPO and national priorities that require these skills</li> </ol>
6. Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for Maritime Boundaries and eCS Workshop series.</li> <li>• Provide a legal support mechanism to support PICs in negotiating shared boundaries facilitated by the Ocean Commission to provide political emphasis.</li> <li>• Establish a regional facility to provide logistical support to PICs to continue defence of their existing eCS submissions,</li> <li>• Procure satellite imagery to support the development of accurate baseline data.</li> </ul>
7. Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PICs deposit with the United Nations, base-point coordinates as well as charts and information delineating their baselines and delimitation of their maritime zones.</li> <li>- Remaining un-finalised shared boundaries, negotiated and subject to treaty (acknowledging some locations present complex problems which may not be easily progressed).</li> <li>- PIC eCS claims supported through the defence process and where appropriate finalised.</li> </ul>
8. Stakeholders / beneficiaries	<p>Pacific Island Countries, SPC’s SOPAC Division, FFA, Geoscience Australia, UNEP GRID Arundel, Commonwealth Secretariat, Australian Attorney General’s Office, Forum Fisheries Agency, the University of Sydney and the Ocean Commission.</p>
9. Resourcing	<p>Staff: Existing partnership arrangements with various staffing implications</p> <p>Operations: Flights, New York activities, workshops</p> <p>Duration: 5 years</p>
10. Other relevant interventions	<p>Geospatial mapping skills that have been built for maritime boundaries delimitation are relevant for delivering actions for MSP, MPA and other similar initiatives. There is a significant opportunity to maintain and utilise this capacity and existing capability at both national and regional levels for continued marine spatial planning needs in PICs.</p> <p>Further development of the SPC SOPAC Division’s Geonetwork (a geospatial data archive and discovery system) improved and maintained to provide additional support PICs in their geospatial mapping and planning tasks.</p>
Notes	<p>SPC SOPAC Division to provide more information in terms of precise numbers of countries and deliverables if this is required by potential donors.</p> <p>The arrangements to date would benefit from an increased emphasis on providing policy and legal support to countries to ensure that maritime boundary issues receive the political attention they deserve and that the data generated taken to conclusion by countries. This could be a potential function of the Ocean Commission.</p>

### Concept 3: Coordination of national engagement, needs assessment and support on ocean related policy

#3	<b>Coordination of national engagement, needs assessment and support on ocean related policy</b>
1. Purpose	Provide needs-driven strategic engagement with countries to identify coastal and ocean priorities to be addressed, coordinate provision of support, monitor overall progress and to ensure that multi-sector interests, disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and environment are appropriately incorporated into sustainable development, conservation and governance actions.
2. Summary	The emphasis on needs-driven, targeted and cost effective interventions asserted by the FPO require a coordinated effort to assess the status of countries in terms of ocean related policy development and particularly implementation to be able to target initiatives appropriately. Support for ocean related policy development and implementation requires coordination and oversight of all sectors (including transport, tourism and mining) not least, to ensure that disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and environment are appropriately integrated. Such a strategic assessment and engagement would be a prerequisite for most FPO related interventions.
3. Background	<p>The FPO states that ocean governance guidance should be incorporated into existing national development policy and planning processes and, should seek to lay out specific implementation responsibilities, strategies and appropriate national budget allocations for integrated management and sustainable use of coastal and oceanic resources. This aims to offer a practical and inclusive approach to ocean and coastal issues building on existing central processes, rather than creating more 'thematic' policy documentation.</p> <p>This approach requires that countries individually assess their strengths and weaknesses and current situation with respect to an identified, desired target situation in terms of coastal and ocean policy objectives in order to allow for the determination of key areas for support and improvement. The Ocean Commission may provide a preliminary needs assessment (Concept #1) for all countries but a more comprehensive assessment and roadmap for countries requesting it would need dedicated resources.</p> <p>The needs and implementation frameworks/road maps identified with each country would be meshed with existing policy and processes such as the country coastal and inshore fishery strategies, NAPAs, JNAPs, NBSAPs and as supported by the Pacific Plan, the SPC <i>Joint Country Strategy</i>, the Apia Policy, relevant transport and tourism policy, the SPREP <i>Strategic Plan</i> and the Noumea Convention. The coordinating mechanism should allow improved prioritization and matching of needs to the variety of current and future ocean related initiatives.</p> <p>Initial engagement with countries and existing CROP and other initiatives will inform priority countries and the composition of the team working to assess country situations (ideally comprising senior national officials, relevant CROP staff and regional peers). Experiences with other review processes such as the Forum's <i>Peer Review</i> process of national development planning and budget processes will be informative.</p> <p>Assessments would focus particularly on service-delivery having identified what functions would be needed to achieve desired management by stakeholders and impact on resources and, identifying existing policies and mechanisms that could be supported or built on. This approach means that as much attention is paid to management systems as to legal and financial issues.</p> <p>Appropriate national engagement would ensure: high enough political will and</p>



	<p>participation (Concept #1 – Ocean Commission); all relevant sectors are contemplated such as transport, fish, conservation, non-living resources (minerals, aggregates), tourism, forestry, agriculture and pollution. Appropriate national coordinating mechanisms may already exist and would not need to be sophisticated to ensure better integration of sectors, continuity and improved coordination. The engagement would allow for particular opportunities or issues to be followed up such as high-seas or large MPAs and cash for ocean conservation initiatives.</p> <p>Ongoing support may be streamlined through existing sub-regional or agency initiatives as deemed mutually appropriate and in accordance with the matching of priority needs to available resources (as outlined in the background to the concept notes). Coordination is assumed to be overseen by the Ocean Commission and could include and be strengthened and part-financed by assuming coordination and M &amp; E of major donor initiatives such as the World Bank GOP initiative for the Pacific Island region.</p> <p>The Ocean Commission (Concept #1) would ensure tracking of support that is offered either under this initiative or under concepts 4-6 and allow for identification of progress in terms of filling gaps, meeting needs as well as shepherding any new and emerging priorities towards achieving the FPO intent. Two key areas of focus or added value are (i) ensuring due consideration of integrated national approaches to ocean and coastal management across relevant sectors such as fisheries, minerals, transport, tourism, energy and (ii) ensuring environment, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction are appropriately incorporated into sustainable development, conservation and governance actions (SP6b).</p>
<b>4. Policy context</b>	<p>FPO priorities and actions: 2c, 2d, 6b</p> <p>Other policy: PIROP-ISA Themes 1, 4, 5. Regional Seas Convention and Action Plans</p>
<b>5. Objectives</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify appropriate stakeholders and processes to engage with selected countries on coastal, marine and ocean issues through preliminary assessment carried out by Ocean Commission.</li> <li>2. Assess selected country situations with respect to achieving national and regional marine and ocean related policy outcomes and systems to ensure environmental and climate change adaptation and mitigation are appropriately incorporated into sustainable development, conservation and governance actions.</li> <li>3. Support and facilitate on-going implementation of national and regional policy development processes and coordinate appropriate regional and FPO initiatives</li> </ol>
<b>6. Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify and agree with CROP partners and other stakeholders the holistic nature of the FPO; identify existing country engagement mechanisms and partners; and, agree the most appropriate tailored approach to support each of the countries (possibly under activity in Concept 1).</li> <li>• Outline appropriate approaches to adopt for each country and phasing or staggered timing of countries; identify countries for Phase 1 of the needs assessment.</li> <li>• Approach region and individual countries at high level (eg at PIF meeting) to endorse way forward.</li> <li>• Implement in-depth country assessments through two step process which would require two missions in-country.</li> <li>• Produce country assessment which determines gaps and opportunities for intervention within existing processes for sustainable use and management of its coasts and ocean space.</li> <li>• Produce, update and review regional strategy for support of country needs</li> </ul>

	<p>based on existing and emerging initiatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate support initiatives as much and wherever feasible, including the use and support of existing networks and regional mechanisms.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Countries assess national institutions including fisheries, minerals, transport, tourism, energy and environment in terms of achieving sustainable use and management of coasts and ocean space and to avoid duplication, ensure clear roles, responsibilities, efficiency and effectiveness and to contribute to national sustainable development objectives.</li> <li>- Countries determine gaps and opportunities for intervention in their existing processes for sustainable use and management of its coasts and ocean space</li> <li>- Countries chart roadmap to rationalise and reform their Administrations to achieve sustainable, integrated ocean management and use.</li> <li>- Commence implementation of roadmaps including balanced reflection of ocean management policy and planning priorities within the national development plan and related policies.</li> <li>- Ocean priorities are adequately supported (in national budget, human resources and by responsible authorities) and donor support is harmonized.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Stakeholders / beneficiaries</b>	<p>Ocean Commission, CROPs, other technical implementing partners. Donors</p> <p>11 countries – preliminary assessment over 1 year</p> <p>3 countries/year in-depth assessment in years 2-4</p> <p>2-3 countries implementation of roadmaps from year 3</p>
<b>9. Resourcing</b>	<p>Much of this concept is required to implement others and could be partly financed from other initiatives and concepts as a coordinating and engagement/assessment service as well as from core budgets of regional organizations.</p> <p>Staff: Ocean commission staff and support consultants, implementation stage may involve country based advisers at a later stage</p> <p>Operations: implementation linked to other concepts and regional opportunities etc</p>
<b>10. Relevant intervention</b>	<p>Can be concurrent/staggered.</p> <p>Concepts 4-7 on inshore fisheries, ICM / EBM or MSP</p>



## Concept 4: Strategies and implementation of Inshore fisheries management

#4	Strategies and implementation of Inshore fisheries management [in Western Melanesia]	
1. Purpose	Develop and implement national strategies for effective inshore fisheries management for food security and local livelihoods based on existing strengths of communities and government agencies and explore opportunities for wider ecosystem and national interests to be addressed through joint action at provincial and national levels.	
2. Summary	Securing sustainable management of coastal / Inshore fisheries resources is a vital priority for food security and sustainable livelihoods of Pacific people. Most PICT governments now accept and recognise that community-based fisheries management, under which the community is empowered to be responsible for sustainable fisheries management within the boundaries of its traditional fishing grounds, is the most effective approach to coastal fisheries management (Apia Policy).	
3. Background	<p>Despite the recognition of promising approaches to achieving sustainable inshore fisheries management, few countries have satisfactory mechanisms for implementation and in many cases communities are provided little if any support from government.</p> <p>Experiences in some countries demonstrate that national systems of inshore fisheries management based on customary tenure are indeed feasible and even have potential to address issues of coastal and environmental management as well as climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction. The regional experiences could develop into internationally recognized examples of what are currently considered most desired, best practice approaches in <i>Rights Based Management and Territorial Use Rights in Fisheries combined with Reserves</i>.</p> <p>Improving the enabling environment and in particular the institutional mechanisms for inshore fisheries management, where these are lacking, constitutes a first priority in terms of improving food security and community resilience and, constitutes a <i>no regrets approach</i> in terms of developing government systems that can also be used to achieve other national goals in terms of climate change, disaster risk reduction and conservation. Though it is expected that legal and policy gaps will be identified experience suggests that these might only be addressed in periods considerably longer than the average project duration and more tangible impacts can be achieved through improving staff interventions and using the results of these experiences to inform policy in the longer term.</p> <p>Community resilience and livelihoods are core to this concept note but continued exploitation of high value inshore commercial species such as beche-de-mer and trochus will require management approaches that build and strengthen the wider framework of community inshore fisheries management. The manner of integration of the management of high value species will affect their successful long-term management or could potentially erode the basis for community management.</p>	
4. Policy context	<p>FPO priorities and actions:</p> <p>Other policy:</p>	<p>3a, (also 2d, 4c, 5a, 6b)</p> <p>Apia Policy, MSG Inshore Road Map and BdM, PIROP-ISA Initiative 3.1, Vava'u Declaration on Pacific Fisheries Resources, Regional Seas Convention and Action Plans</p>

5. Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess national experience and institutional opportunities to develop priority inshore fisheries management systems, targets and strategies and identify longer term constraints and means to address these.</li> <li>• Implement restructuring and build “on the job” capacity of national and provincial resource management service providers to initiate and trial key inshore management services at national and provincial scale.</li> <li>• Develop long term national approaches that incorporate as far as possible joint service delivery and integrated functions to support broader national interests in integrated management and basic ecosystem management approaches, climate change adaptation and sustainable livelihoods.</li> </ul>
6. Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assess national and decentralized legal, policy, institutional and capacity issues relating to inshore fisheries management based on customary tenure.</li> <li>- Evaluate national experiences in inshore and coastal resource management with a view to informing and developing practicable national strategies.</li> <li>- Define appropriate local/community approaches that can be supported in the foreseeable future budgetary and institutional contexts and key services and enabling factors that government could or should provide.</li> <li>- Develop an inshore fisheries management support strategy and detailed implementation plan with appropriate stakeholders at different tiers of government. Including at the earliest practicable opportunity joint coordination with other sectors, wider ecosystems interests, role of women, simple monitoring frameworks for decision-makers and broad national policy objectives.</li> <li>- Restructure as necessary and build essential capacity to trial the national inshore strategy and implementation plan at a large scale (eg Provincial) including the use of networks for peer learning and community sharing and improved data gathering and control of exports and markets.</li> <li>- Evaluate costs and benefits of trial approach, determine improved approaches and key issues to address. Design cost effective monitoring for managers. Incorporate into relevant corporate plans and strategies.</li> </ul>
7. Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment and evaluation of past experiences and institutional capacity to meet national policy priorities</li> <li>• Inshore fisheries management strategy (new or updated) and detailed implementation plan including guide to priority government services and roles (national and provincial).</li> <li>• Capacity developed through practice and on-the-job support in full scale trials that improve effectiveness of inshore fisheries management at meaningful scales (eg Province)</li> <li>• Information services developed and implemented including repository for key information resources, systems for delivery to majority of fishing communities, feedback systems and monitoring for decision-makers.</li> <li>• Inshore fisheries management strategy included in national corporate plans for comprehensive national delivery</li> <li>• Improved engagement of other national centralized institutions relevant to monitoring and enforcement such as police, courts, customs and training colleges/universities.</li> </ul>

<b>8. Stakeholders / beneficiaries</b>	<p>Stakeholders include SPC and FFA (legal support) as well as a variety of livelihoods or fisheries NGOs and networks.</p> <p>Beneficiaries to be determined by country needs assessment. However, they are likely to include Western Melanesian countries of Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and possibly Fiji and PNG. Other pertinent countries might include Kiribati and RMI. The beneficiaries might be grouped sub-regionally e.g. under the MSG as this coincides with a priority identified by the MSG Inshore Fisheries Roadmap.</p>
<b>9. Resourcing</b>	<p>Historically fisheries interventions have tended to be costly. Development of inshore fisheries strategies under the FPO are required to build on existing structures and ensure cost-effectiveness in order for the intervention to be sustained by national governments. The intervention would consist mainly of national and provincial planning and consultations, departmental and provincial restructure of work activities, networking of peers within and between countries and costs associated with information dissemination. The key resource required would be political will to develop or reform existing agencies.</p> <p>Level and extent of effort for between 3 and 5 years. Requires subregional technical/policy support and networking</p> <p>Staff: Regional / sub-regional adviser (1FTE) and 1 trainer/adviser per country</p> <p>Operations: regional or subregional support</p> <p>Duration: 5 years (3-4 years per country)</p>
<b>10. Other relevant interventions</b>	<p>Coordination on country needs and engagement including political will provided by the Ocean Commission and relevant CROP agencies. (Concept 1,3).</p> <p>Potential partner or collaborating initiatives include Worldfish/ACIAR Improving Community-based Fisheries Management in Pacific countries (Solomon Is, Vanuatu, Kiribati), NZ funded institutional strengthening projects (e.g. Solomon Islands, Tuvalu), Coral Triangle Initiative, Micronesian Challenge, WB-GOP, PACIOCEA, GEF –PAS IIB (Tonga, Cooks, Tuvalu, Nauru), MACBIO (Tonga, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji), ScicoFish, networks (LMMA, PIMPAC), and MSG .</p>
<b>11. Notes</b>	<p>Relevant interventions including various institutional strengthening initiatives and research/piloting are ongoing but all countries require some sort of interventions to take inshore fisheries management to effective national implementation.</p>

## Concept 5: Implementing Integrated Coastal Management/Ecosystem-based Management

#5	Implementing Integrated Coastal Management / Ecosystem-based Management [in Polynesia and Micronesia]	
1. Purpose	To achieve sustainable island life, develop and implement integrated coastal resource management arrangements at nationally significant scale including community, district, provincial and national government and other stakeholders.	
2. Summary	The FPO encourages PICTs to implement integrated coastal resource management arrangements drawing on the strengths and traditions of community, district, provincial and national levels of government to achieve sustainable island life. Community and local efforts should be supported and coordinated at provincial and national levels and wider ecosystem and national interests are incorporated into joint action.	
3. Background	<p>The rights based management regimes that customary tenure affords the PICTS forms the vital core to achieving sustainable livelihoods at the local level. However, there are numerous impacts and threats that go beyond the local level and will eventually need to be addressed to secure local sustainability and the interactions between community or stakeholder interests will need to be overseen to ensure acceptable societal outcomes. The upscaling and coordination of local management at sub-national and national scale to afford integrated (coastal) management (ICM) is a key next step to the development of local management systems in a number of countries to ensure that national policy outcomes are achieved and wider interests of society are taken into account.</p> <p>Promising pilot ICM experiences have emerged in some countries particularly where the appropriate community level groundwork in terms of local management has been carried out. Countries which have substantially achieved national systems to support local or co-management of fisheries or other resources should be supported in developing national systems of ICM as envisaged by the FPO.</p> <p>While these approaches will make important use of any available data, and indeed will identify priority data requirements, the vital component is nationally and sub-nationally legitimate convening abilities, cross-sectoral engagement and appropriate participatory processes for communities, various levels and agencies of government and private sector stakeholders. Thus ICM approaches should be driven by the appropriate and effective national processes (which may include NBSAPs and SOE reporting needs) guided by prior experiences and existing structures and identify priority data gaps and communicate these to data providers. Data collection is particularly costly and can easily prove far more costly than the actual management and decision making processes, particularly as these may be expected to start out as simple as possible to ensure functionality and sustainability. Linkage should be made to capacity building support for these efforts, including SPREP strategic plan goals of enhancing State of Environment reporting, as well as building capacity for environmental monitoring.</p> <p>Target countries would be identified from the national assessments coordinated by the Ocean Commission based on their progress on local management and other readiness criteria.</p>	
4. Policy context	FPO priorities and actions:	3a, (also 2d, 4c, 5a,b 6b)
	Other policy:	PIROP-ISA Init. 3.1, Regional Seas Convention and Action Plans, SPREP strategic plan 2011-2015, Convention on Biological Diversity
5. Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review current national approaches to ICM with regards to national capacity and needs and share experiences with other countries</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen national institutional structures for ICM and promote discussions and policy/institutional development or consolidation</li> <li>• Implement a subnational ICM approach with a view to subsequently taking it to national implementation</li> </ul>
<b>6. Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National evaluation of approaches to upscaling successful local management, achieving ICM or large scale EBM as well as current progress in policy development and institutional mechanisms for integrated management. Ascertain existing relevant data and clear gaps. Build on existing evaluations, policy and groups.</li> <li>- Establish or strengthen an appropriate Integrated Coastal Management Committee or similar cross-sector and multi-stakeholder group to lead activities at national level and finalize initiative design. Ensure that as well as environment and fisheries, sectors such as climate change, disasters, tourism and transport are appropriately included.</li> <li>- Support provision of information and debate to achieve better joint understanding of ICM and its implications for governance at the various levels by national, subnational and community stakeholders.</li> <li>- Design or agree a nationally appropriate, decentralized model for ICM that will likely be sustainable within foreseeable institutional budgets and support arrangements, that is cost-effective, meets as many national policy priorities as feasible (e.g. fisheries, environmental impact procedures, climate change, pollution, disaster risk reduction). Ensure the definition of targets, indicators, and assumptions (particularly relating to policy and institutional outcomes) to enable evaluation of the model.</li> <li>- Define and utilize existing national or regional networks and capacity-building mechanisms to ensure staff and other stakeholders will receive “on the job” training and support, peer exchanges and sharing of lessons learned.</li> <li>- Engage with target subnational area stakeholders to define implementation strategy and timeline.</li> <li>- Implement ICM at sub-national scale through relevant meetings and consultation processes. Incorporate best practice and simplest most cost efficient tools in terms of mapping and monitoring</li> <li>- Identify emerging priority information and data needs and liaise with regional and international FPO partners for support. Identify priority targeted research areas and communicate to partners.</li> <li>- Regularly monitor, evaluate and review progress and inform national and regional policy through policy briefs, draft legislation, articles and peer exchanges.</li> <li>- Where effective mechanisms exist at some scales, support development of nationally appropriate linkage mechanisms, such as protected area networks to assist in building capacity and leveraging further funding opportunities for integrated management approaches.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New or updated national ICM policy and roadmap</li> <li>• Sub-national ICM implemented and evaluated</li> <li>• Implications for national implementation of ICM assessed including performance relating to climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction strategies and integrated in national ICM policy.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Stakeholders / beneficiaries</b>	<p>Potential support agencies include USP, SPC and SPREP.</p> <p>Beneficiary countries (subject to appraisal and assessment) include Samoa, Fiji, Tonga, New Caledonia. 3-5 countries. 3-5 years each depending on countries</p>
<b>9. Resourcing</b>	<p>Staff: National coordinator, national support staff (2 FTE/country), Regional adviser (1 FTE)</p>

	Duration: 5 years Operations: costs decrease as countries start to contribute and assume functions
10. Other relevant interventions	PACIOCEA, GEF-ADB CTI (Fiji, SI, Van, PNG), GEF –PAS IIB (Tonga, Cooks, Tuvalu, Nauru), MACBIO (Tonga, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji), GEF-PAS Invasives Project
Notes	Further info: Lane 2006 (Van, SI, Fj), Kinch 2010 (PNG), EDF10 Blue-green National and regional networking would particularly contribute to this initiative



## Concept 6: National systems and services for building community resilience

#6	National systems and services for building community resilience
1. Purpose	Develop and improve government service delivery, with a community focus, to achieve island resilience through joint coordination and integration of resource management, environmental, climate change and disaster risk management sectors and service delivery
2. Summary	Community-based approaches are central to resilient development. So far experiences in community-based resource management, disaster risk management and climate change adaptation have not been integrated into viable national strategies in the Pacific. There is a need to develop integrated approaches that are cost-effective, simple and practicable and that can achieve sufficient national coverage at low enough cost to be sustained in foreseeable country financial and capacity contexts.
3. Background	<p>Government policy priorities commonly identify community based approaches as key to delivering services and achieving national desired outcomes in a variety of sectors such as fisheries, environment, climate change and disaster risk reduction and response. The cost involved and the coverage achieved by addressing these policy priorities on a sectoral basis means that for many countries the majority of communities will not receive adequate government services and support.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to identify priority services that PICT populations require across all these sectors, joint service delivery mechanisms that increase coverage and reduce the number of interventions required, and evaluate the most appropriate and cost effective responses or actions that community or government should consider. While individual sectors have promoted particular technologies, tools and methods (such as mangrove planting, marine protected areas, sea walls, solar energy) their relevance and benefit/cost in the context of country-wide implementation need to be assessed in the light of decades of experience.</p> <p>The development of joint service delivery or integration of key functions should also lead to discussions about most appropriate financing arrangements including appropriate government budgets but also private sector contributions and cost/benefit sharing opportunities (e.g. polluter or beneficiary pays).</p>
4. Policy context	<p>FPO priorities and actions: 6b, 3a, 5a, b, c (also 2d, 4a,c)</p> <p>Other policy: PIROP-ISA Init. 3.1, Regional Seas Convention and Action Plans, Hyogo Framework, other CCA, DRM policies</p>
5. Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priorities, opportunities and potential systems for integrated public sector service delivery that match the likely national budgetary and human resource scenarios are defined through national strategic and institutional planning.</li> <li>• Best Applicable Technologies are evaluated based on national and regional past projects and experiences (priorities include critically assessing soft options such as mangrove planting, establishing MPAs or hard/engineered options such as sea walls, groynes, ecosystem based adaptation options).</li> <li>• Appropriate service delivery at a realistic scale (such as province) with a focus on refining cost-effectiveness and meeting priority needs is tested and refined.</li> <li>• Policy and practice approaches for building community resilience that are appropriate and affordable for country-wide implementation are developed.</li> </ul>
6. Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Government stakeholders define minimum and essential services that should be delivered to build community resilience country-wide.</li> <li>- Develop a model service delivery mechanism that is in accord with likely</li> </ul>

	<p>budgetary and human capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Test and improve the model through implementation at provincial level (or similar governance unit).</li> <li>- National and regional evaluation of main applicable technologies and practice (concurrent)</li> <li>- Government stakeholders assess experiences in implementation and Best Applicable Technology to develop national guidance for improved government service delivery, with a community focus, to achieve island resilience.</li> </ul>
<b>7. Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An improved service delivery mechanism relating to achieving cost-effective community and national resilience tested and proposed for adoption as national policy in 3 countries</li> <li>• Service delivery and Best Applicable Technology options reviewed and disseminated for consideration by all PICTs.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Stakeholders / beneficiaries</b>	<p>Regional, national and sub-national networks (multi-sectoral in nature and initially to include productive sectors as well as disaster risk management/ climate change (emphasis on adaptation) and environment. Beneficiaries include government at all levels as well as the public that they are mandated to serve. Target countries would likely include a selection of the larger countries with predominantly rural populations.</p>
<b>9. Resourcing</b>	<p>Staff: Regional adviser, national adviser in each country, consultants or shared review team.</p> <p>Duration: 3-5 years</p> <p>Operations: country and regional support and review team/consultants</p>
<b>10. Other relevant interventions</b>	<p>All resource management, climate change and disaster risk reduction interventions. A number are already exploring integrated approaches but this concept provides the testing ground.</p>

## Concept 7: Marine Spatial Planning at multiple scales

#7	Marine Spatial Planning at multiple scales
1. Purpose	<b>PICTs explore and build on marine spatial planning mechanisms for improved EEZ management and support needs-driven data acquisition to achieve sustainable economic development, maintaining intact ecosystems.</b>
2. Summary	<b>Utilize existing experience and progress as a basis for defining next steps in meeting EEZ-wide marine spatial planning needs in a phased approach which is tested in countries that are or have already been assessed as having a priority need and, have the absorptive capacity and capability for such approaches.</b>
3. Background	<p>Developing a cohesive framework for identifying, accessing and using available data in the sustainable development, management and assessment of ecosystem condition, is an on-going goal and challenge for PICTs.</p> <p>One key element of this challenge is the process of incorporating appropriate, simple and cost effective Marine Spatial Planning at different scales to suit emerging country needs. Much progress has been made in cost-effective community based approaches at local and to some extent sub-national scale but less has been achieved at national scale to support national decision making in relation to multiple resource use, and at a regional scale, to inform and provide an integrated (multi-sectoral) framework.</p> <p>The FPO sees to develop and strengthen appropriate security and enforcement mechanisms and spatial planning systems that guide multiple use for sustainable economic development while maintaining ecosystem integrity and biodiversity of coastal and ocean areas. These higher order management systems would aim to provide the fundamental basis for the use of spatial management tools in a nested fashion drawing from experiences in strict traditional closures, locally managed areas and large multiple use managed and protected areas. Aspects such as cross border security, food security, monitoring control and surveillance are fundamental for effective management systems.</p> <p>The FPO however recognises that capacity building, data collection and provision and planning have often proven excessively costly due to being poorly targeted and not aimed at meeting basic and simple needs (4a).</p> <p>The considerable relevant, though scattered, experience and progress should be the basis for defining next steps in meeting EEZ-wide marine spatial planning needs in a phased approach which is tested in countries that are or have already been assessed as having a priority need and, have the absorptive capacity and capability for such approaches.</p> <p>As a planning tool for national development priorities it is essential to ensure that the initiative is led and supported by the appropriate regional and national bodies to ensure that all economic interests (such as transport, industry, tourism) are appropriately engaged (5b) as well as civil society.</p> <p>Management systems should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximize self-reliance by using traditional and emerging community approaches</li> <li>• Seek the most cost-effective means to sustain management</li> <li>• Draw from successful experiences using combinations of tools such as processes for dialogue and action by resource owners and users, large and locally-managed marine areas, zone based management and other measures</li> </ul>
4. Policy context	<p>FPO priorities and actions: 3b, 4a, 5a,b, (also 2d, 4c, 6a,b)</p> <p>Other policy: PIROP-ISA Init. xx 2.1, Regional Seas, Noumea Convention, Convention on Biological Diversity</p>
5. Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop guidance and information on multiple approaches, appropriate to different scales and absorption capacities, for the implementation and trial of</li> </ul>

	<p>MSP in countries that meet preconditions of functioning basic resource management systems (e.g. Cook Islands, Tonga, New Caledonia, French Polynesia, Nauru, Fiji (?), Samoa)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigate and develop support mechanisms for data storage and handling, to allow spatial planning process to be used nationally in decision making.</li> <li>Review experience and design phase two for next appropriate countries and refine potential for targeted national support.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Activities</b>	<p>Phase 1 – assessment of existing data holdings, expertise and tools based on FPO criteria of cost effectiveness, simplicity in approach and being targeted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage through OC</li> <li>Identify existing data in collaboration with other ongoing efforts</li> <li>Identify available data elsewhere and, or data that may be needed</li> <li>Inventory location – etc</li> </ul> <p>Phase 2 - For up to 3 countries at national/EEZ scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work with countries who ‘demand’ involvement</li> <li>Document and evaluate</li> <li>Develop guidance</li> </ul>
<b>7. Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National scale Marine Spatial Planning supporting integrated and sustainable resource management in at least 2 countries.</li> <li>Regional scale support, presenting and synthesizing key information, to support targeted management decision making for sustainable and integrated ocean management.</li> <li>Framework for Marine Spatial Planning at regional and national scales that addresses generic regional questions based on public data layers, and more specific questions at a national level including country-specific coastal and potentially sensitive information.</li> <li>Develop communication products explaining Marine Spatial Planning approaches, outcomes, uses and tools to support integrated resource management at community, sub national, national and regional scales.</li> </ul>
<b>8. Stakeholders / beneficiaries</b>	<p>Countries and territories that may express an interest <u>and</u> qualify for involvement in Phase I in terms of existing resource management implementation systems include: Cook Is, Palau, Fiji, Tonga, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, and Nauru. Beneficiaries include all traditional and long-term users and uses, as well as potential new users and uses of a country’s coastal and ocean areas.</p>
<b>9. Resourcing</b>	<p>Country and subnational region (eg island group): Support technical components of establishment of large scale Marine Spatial Planning (depending on scale probably would not cover all community consultations).</p> <p>Development of a national and regional web based and centralized data system for marine planning at sub-national, national and regional scales (to build with additional national and subnational scale efforts).</p> <p>Staff: Overall coordinator, Database manager, national coordinators</p> <p>Duration: 5 years</p>
<b>10. Other relevant interventions</b>	<p>PACIOCEA, GEF –PAS IIB (Tonga, Cooks, Tuvalu, Nauru), MACBIO (Tonga, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Fiji, Kiribati).</p>
	<p>NOTE – the FPO concepts are predicated on ensuring support is matched to existing capacity – most likely SI, PNG, Vanuatu will not be ready to implement data driven or technically more complex management until some basic resource management systems are in evidence</p>