

Final Report

**The Pacific Regional Environment Programme
(SPREP)**

Mid Term Review of the SPREP Strategic Plan (2011 - 2015)



Prepared by

John E. Hay (Team Leader)
Teresa Manarangi-Trott (Polynesia)
Sivia Qoro (Melanesia)
William Kostka (Micronesia)

Submitted to the 25th SPREP Meeting

August 18, 2014

PO Box 440
Rarotonga
Cook Islands

August 18, 2014

Mr. Elkoga Gadabu
Chair
SPREP Meeting
Acting Secretary
Dept. of Commerce, Industry and Environment
Government Offices
Nauru

Dear Mr. Gadabu

Mid Term Review of the SPREP Strategic Plan (2011 - 2015)

On behalf of the four person Independent Review Team, I have much pleasure in providing you with a copy of our report. The report addresses the tasks we were to undertake, as specified in the Terms of Reference prepared and approved by the SPREP Meeting. We have provided the SPREP Secretariat with a copy of our report, for translation and distribution to SPREP Members and other relevant parties.

While not included as a formal recommendation, we suggest that specific steps be taken to ensure that Members and other stakeholders are fully aware of the results of the Review, and of our recommendations. This would assist them to come to the 2014 SPREP Meeting fully informed, and hence well prepared to engage in discussions on the report's findings and recommendations.

The Deputy Leader of our Team, Ms Teresa Manarangi-Trott of the Cook Islands, will be presenting our report to Members at the SPREP Meeting in September. She will be pleased to respond to questions and comments. Unfortunately I have a prior commitment that prevents me from participating in the SPREP Meeting. I send you, and the Meeting, my apologies and regrets.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if our Team can be of further assistance.

On behalf of the Team,



John E. Hay
Team Leader

Executive Summary

1. **Background.** This draft final report presents and interprets the evidence gathered by an Independent Review Team commissioned by the SPREP Secretariat to undertake the mid-term review of the SPREP Strategic Plan. Interpretation of that evidence leads to several recommendations that are designed to improve effectiveness and efficiency of implementation for the remainder of the Plan's lifetime, and to guide preparation of the next strategic plan.
2. This review was undertaken in conjunction with the second Independent Corporate Review. The Strategic Plan review involved in-depth assessments of relevant evidence, using participatory approaches. A comprehensive process of engagement with stakeholders ensured the Review Team acquired the evidence and views of key stakeholders regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of implementing the Strategic Plan, and views on preparation, content and implementation of the next strategic plan. Selection of the methods used was based on their comparative advantage to generate useful information when dealing with a specific combination of information provider and information source.
3. The first Corporate Review, conducted in 2008, recommended that SPREP improve its organizational management in such areas as strategic planning. The 2011-2015 Strategic Plan was prepared as part of a wider change management process. Consultations which informed the strategic planning process were the most comprehensive ever undertaken by the Organisation. The Plan, which was formally adopted at the 21st SPREP Meeting in September 2010, establishes four Strategic Priorities:
 - Climate Change;
 - Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management;
 - Waste Management and Pollution Control; and
 - Environmental Monitoring and Governance.
4. The Plan now provides the framework that guides: (i) SPREP's annual work programme and budget through to 2016; (ii) funding of the work programmes; and (iii) monitoring and evaluating implementation of the Plan.
5. **Assessing Effectiveness, Efficiency and Relevance.** Current reporting by the Secretariat is focussed on activities and outputs. Consequently, assessments of effectiveness conducted by the Review Team are necessarily rudimentary at best, since assessing effectiveness requires knowledge of what outcomes have been achieved. In addition, the reporting does not provide information on the ability for outcomes to be sustained beyond the SPREP investment. Thus it is impossible for the Review Team to determine whether outcomes that have been, or will be achieved, can indeed be sustained.
6. Due to the lack of the required baseline information, and because the current reports do not include information on environment and related outcomes, the Review Team's assessments of efficiency can amount to no more than qualitative judgements based on expert opinion. The assessments of relevance are more robust since they amount to determining if the Secretariat is delivering services and assistance consistent with the Strategic Plan.

7. Two targets of the climate change Strategic Priorities for 2011-2015 have been 100% achieved, with eleven targets 70%-90% achieved and one 20% achieved. While some of the targets do have an outcome dimension, all the indicators used and the results reported focus on activities and outputs.
8. Four targets of the biodiversity and ecosystem management Strategic Priorities of the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan have been 100% achieved, with seven targets 50%-80% achieved. Similarly for this Division, some of the targets do have an outcome dimension, but all the indicators used and the results reported focus on activities and outputs.
9. Eight of the eleven targets of the Strategic Priorities related to waste management and pollution control for 2011-2015 have been 50-100% achieved. Many of the targets and even some of the indicators have some outcome aspects, but to date the results are described in terms of activities and outputs.
10. Two of the targets of the environmental monitoring and governance Strategic Priorities for 2011-2015 have been 100% achieved, four 75% achieved, eight 50% achieved and two 25% achieved. All these targets are activity or output based. Some of the targets could be interpreted as outcomes, but the associated indicators ensure that results are reported only as activities and outputs.
11. Overall, while the 2015 goals for specific strategies under each of the four Strategic Priorities have a focus on delivering relevant environmental outcomes, many targets and almost all of the indicators are leading to the reporting having a focus on activities and outputs. One result is a high number of targets being achieved, or almost achieved only mid way through the life of the Strategic Plan. If the Secretariat was reporting on outcomes and impacts, achievement rates would be much lower. Thus the current approach has a tendency to exaggerate apparent effectiveness.
12. In the first three years of delivering the Strategic Plan the Divisions have, collectively, disbursed 43% of the funding they will receive over the six-year effective life of the Plan. An analysis of performance in meeting the Strategic Plan targets suggests a commendable level of efficiency.
13. An analysis of funds disbursed by the technical Divisions shows wide individual variances between budgeted and disbursed amounts. While total expenditures by a Division have varied from budgeted amounts by as much as 24%, for the four technical Divisions combined the variance is considerably less, at 6%. For some Divisions personnel costs are a very high portion of overall disbursements, and well above the average of 30% for all the technical Divisions combined. Since the budgets of Divisions tend to be dominated by project funding there is little incentive to share financial resources between Divisions in ways that would result in cost savings for administration and project management.
14. A majority of questionnaire respondents regionally, consider that SPREP is responding adequately to the prioritised needs of their country or territory. Similarly, a majority consider that the targets in the current Strategic Plan are appropriate, at least to a certain extent. Generally they need to be strengthened. This would involve a greater focus on outcomes and impacts, and the use of SMART indicators.

15. **Resourcing the Strategic Plan.** The main resourcing challenges related to implementing the Strategic Plan are heavy reliance on project-based funding. In addition, much of the work undertaken by the Secretariat has elements of being supply driven, and the distribution of financial resources across the four technical divisions is not well rationalised. Disbursements by the four technical divisions between 2011 and 2013 were proportionally as follows: Climate Change, 55%; Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management, 26%; Waste Management and Pollution Control, 10% and Environmental Monitoring and Governance, 9%. Since climate change is frequently identified as the most serious threat to the region, relatively greater expenditure by this Division may well be justified. Significantly, It is closest to achieving its Strategic Plan targets. Thus an argument could be made for proportionately less investment by this Division going forward. Based on the budget for 2014, there is little sign that such redistribution is occurring. This is not surprising, given the high reliance on project-based funding.
16. Many of the existing targets will be achieved well before 2016. But since they are activity and outputs focussed there is currently no way of telling if the associated goals will also be achieved. A logical, though not overly practical approach would be to revise the targets, taking the opportunity to make them SMART and capable of showing outcomes and impacts, as well as their sustainability in the longer term. Such improvements are important. If they are not made for the current Plan, they should certainly form an integral part of the next Strategic Plan. The Secretariat needs to be able to demonstrate that the work it is undertaking, in conjunction with Members and partners, is gaining traction in each Pacific island and country (PICT), and making a difference.
17. The alternative would be to assume, somewhat unwisely, that the goals are achieved once the current targets are achieved. Under such a scenario, available resources could then be shifted to ensure the remaining targets are achieved. Again, this would be problematic when there is a high dependency on less flexible project-based funding.
18. The Secretariat must develop a plan that enables it to manage the diversity of funding sources and the predictability of funding, as well as the distribution of funding across the Divisions. This can form part of a Business Plan. That could also include other details of how SPREP plans to go about its business. Such planning determines how successful SPREP will be in the future, in terms of delivering environmental and related benefits to the Pacific.
19. **Strategic Planning and Implementation.** There is a lack of clarity as to SPREP's focus at the operational level, as opposed to the strategic planning level, and hence in how it works. This highlights the need for an overarching framework showing how all four technical Divisions, both individually and collectively, deliver a programme of work that is in line with the strategic focus. SPREP should place greater emphasis on work programmes and activities that reflect common environmental challenges, and avoid work areas where other agencies have more capability.
20. The Review Team proposes an integrated approach designed to strengthen strategic and operational planning and implementation, as well as helping to address issues around the lack of clarity as to SPREP's focus at the operational level. Reporting on the state of the environment of PICT Members will inform reporting

on the state of the regional environment. The latter will also be informed by the Secretariat's performance monitoring and evaluation reports and associated assessments of needs. These, along with lessons learned, would be reflected in the new Strategic Plan and in the Annual Work Programmes and Budgets for SPREP.

21. There needs to be improved balance across the four Strategic Priorities in terms of funding and other resourcing. The four Strategic Priorities need to be more interconnected. This would be an important function of the proposed Strategic Planning Hub. Going forward, it will be important that the Strategic Priorities are clearly linked to outcomes that improve livelihoods and the sustainable economic development of the region - for example, tourism initiatives, food security and ocean resource management. This will be particularly relevant to the biodiversity and ecosystem management pillar, which should benefit from re-balanced funding.
22. Improving the effectiveness with which both Members and partners work with the Secretariat is key to maximising the immediate and longer-term impacts of the Strategic Plan.
23. There is overwhelming recognition that Corporate Services should be included in the next Plan and that the current four Strategic Goals are still appropriate priority goals for SPREP going forward. There is a need for the next Strategic Plan to be more outcomes, rather than outputs, focussed, with the added challenge of being able to demonstrate if the outcomes will be sustained beyond when SPREP is providing assistance.
24. A challenge for the next strategic plan will be for it to give focus and certainty to SPREP's work in the region, while also allowing some flexibility. With its targets and indicators, the current Plan effectively locks the Secretariat into a series of Work Programmes that will deliver on the many goals and associated targets in the Plan. The next Plan must enable the SPREP to reflect, in an expeditious manner, new issues, challenges and opportunities, such as those which will come on an annual basis when Leaders of PICTs identify a small number of new initiatives on which the region will focus.
25. The challenge will be even greater if the next Strategic Plan is for ten years, rather than the five years for the current Plan. For a ten year Plan the strategic goals, targets and indicators will also need to be substantially different in nature, as well as in their detail. Despite these challenges, the Review Team supports the Secretariat's preference for a ten year Plan. One major benefit would be the opportunity to work towards, deliver and document tangible outcomes and somewhat longer-term impacts.
26. Greater interconnectedness between the (four) priorities should be a feature of the next Strategic Plan. Currently the priorities are somewhat siloed. Value for money and efficiency would be further enhanced by having the priorities more closely connected. These improvements would be facilitated by establishing the proposed Strategic Planning Hub and by developing and implementing the proposed Integrated Country Programmes.
27. It is important to demonstrate, in practical ways, how the priorities in the Strategic Plan link environmental outcomes to sustainable development outcomes, and to broader economic outcomes for the Pacific region. That is, there should be a clear link that demonstrates what SPREP is delivering for the region. This could include

impacts for tourism and agriculture, and the sustainable development of the Pacific Ocean and its resources.

28. Thus all priorities in the next Strategic Plan should clearly show how each will promote sustainable economic growth in Member countries and territories. There should also be meaningful reporting of performance, to enable development partners to usefully assess each Strategic Priority's implementation against required benchmarks and aid performance frameworks.
29. Given the importance of addressing the climate change challenge, the next Plan should continue the focus in this area, but with improved coordination with SPREP Members, and with other CROP agencies and partners.
30. The next Plan should also reflect new and emerging trends and political developments, such as the environmental consequences of deep sea mineral extraction and the concept of the Blue-Green Economy.
31. **Organisational Capacity Report Card for SPREP.** In the report on the second Independent Corporate Review, the Review Team presented an organisational report card that documents the considerable improvements in SPREP's organisational capacity relative to the situation at the time of the first Independent Corporate Review. The Report Card also indicates where effort might be focused in order to enhance performance still further, including increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of delivering the Strategic Plan.

Recommendations

32. Following is a consolidated list of recommendations arising from this second mid-term review of SPREP's Strategic Plan. These recommendations should be considered and implemented in concert with those that have resulted from the second Independent Corporate Review of SPREP. In both cases, the recommendations are clear as to where the responsibility lies for their implementation - Members, the Secretariat or the entire Organisation.
1. The Secretariat should continue to enhance collaboration and strengthen cooperation with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, and other agencies that work across the region on climate change and related areas.
 2. The Secretariat should ensure that programme and project planning and implementation is more transparent, and consistent with the best practices of other development partners, including contributions by and disbursements to PICT Members being confirmed prior to final project approval, as well as being identified in the Work Programme and Budget.
 3. Strengthen the performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting process in ways that will allow the Secretariat to report annually: (i) on progress towards achieving the planned outcomes and impacts achieved, and as well as their sustainability, as a result of activities it has undertaken, either individually or through partnerships; and (ii) by Division and for SPREP as a whole, on the efficiency and relevance of the activities undertaken by each Division, and by SPREP as a whole.

4. The Secretariat should ensure that assumptions and risks are clearly identified In the Work Programme and Budget and in the performance monitoring and evaluation reports, to strengthen the overall analysis of progress and achievements in delivering the Strategic Plan.
5. With support and advice from Members, the Secretariat should ensure that there are strong linkages between relevant strategic goals in the new Framework for Pacific Regionalism and SPREP's Strategic Priorities.
6. The Secretariat should begin a dialogue with Members as to how it might increase the flexibility of the Strategic Plan, and its associated Work Programmes, so as to better reflect new and emerging issues the Organisation should address in the immediate future.
7. Consistent with the agreed monitoring and evaluation framework in the Strategic Plan, PICT Members should be more committed to monitoring and providing annual reports on their progress in implementing their components of SPREP's Work Programmes, including assessing the extent to which SPREP programming is supporting Member priorities as outlined in relevant policy and planning documents. In turn, the Secretariat should be more proactive in encouraging and supporting PICT Members to report in this way.
8. The Secretariat should prepare and implement a Business Plan that includes, amongst other considerations, provisions to manage the diversity of partnerships and funding sources, the predictability of funding, and guidance on new project funding as well as on the distribution of funding across the Divisions.
9. Further strengthen the public relations capacity of the Communications and Outreach unit of Corporate Services, and increase the use of visual and social media, other communications technologies, and French and other relevant languages to increase awareness in PICTs of the need for, and the benefits of, the assistance and other support provided by SPREP.
10. Subject to the approval of Members, the Secretariat and Members should adopt and implement as a matter of high priority the proposed integrated approach that is designed to strengthen SPREP's strategic and operational planning and implementation.
11. With the approval of Members, the Secretariat should implement relatively modest changes that will give greater clarity to the work of the technical Divisions, encourage more inter Divisional work, and achieve a more strategic approach by the Secretariat as a whole.
12. As part of preparing the next Strategic Plan, and to improve its focus on delivering and reporting on outcomes, the Secretariat should prepare an overall intervention logic which connects the intended higher-level environmental outcomes to the specific outputs of the various work streams of the Secretariat. A useful starting point would be a one page results diagram, which sets out the results chain or intervention logic, with this being supported by a more detailed monitoring and evaluation framework, with indicators, baselines and SMART targets across the different work programmes. Accountabilities for the Secretariat and PICT Members achieving targets would need to clearly laid out.

13. The next Strategic Plan should guide SPREP's activities for at least ten years, so the Organisation can work towards, deliver and document tangible environmental and related economic and social outcomes as well as somewhat longer-term impacts.
14. Members and the Secretariat should take account of wider policy and planning processes currently underway in the region, and internationally, and consider the opportunities these offer for aligning SPREP's work with wider sustainable development considerations. The Review Team recommends that, in particular, Members consider how best to align its next Strategic Plan, as well as annual Work Programmes and other action plans, with relevant aspects of the final version of the Sustainable Development Goals, with the Framework for Pacific Regionalism, and with relevant aspects of the Small Islands Developing States Conference outcome document¹. Members should instruct the Secretariat accordingly, including how future activities under each of SPREP's Strategic Priorities need to contribute directly to outcomes that improve lives and livelihoods, and the sustainable economic development of the region.

¹ The Review Team suggests that the approved SIDS Conference outcome document be appended to this Report, to facilitate discussions at the 25th SPREP Meeting.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary and Recommendations	i
Table of Contents	viii
Acknowledgements	x
List of Abbreviations	xi
1. Setting the Scene	1
1.1 Introduction to the Report	1
1.2 Purpose of the Review	1
1.3 Review Scope, Process and Personnel	1
1.4 Challenges in Undertaking the Review	2
1.5 The Operating Environment - Changes, Challenges and Opportunities	3
2. Overall Progress and Achievements 2011 – 2013	5
3. Effectiveness, Efficiency and Relevance of Delivery	10
3.1 Terminology	10
3.2 Stakeholder Views on Effectiveness and Relevance	11
3.3 Effectiveness against Goals and Targets	14
3.4 Efficiency against Outputs and Outcomes	14
3.5 Relevance of Goals, Targets, Outputs and Outcomes	17
3.6 Extent to which the Secretariat is Working in Synergy with SPREP Members and Partners	19
3.7 Learning through Training and Experience	22
3.8 Recommendations	23
4. Challenges and Issues Encountered when Implementing the Strategic Plan	24
4.1 Policy and Organisational Challenges	24
4.2 Effectiveness of Member and Partner Engagement	26
4.3 Resourcing Challenges	27
4.4 Recommendations	28
5. Future Implementation and Planning	29
5.1 Strengthening Strategic and Operational Planning and Implementation	28
5.2 Relevance of Current Priorities and Targets	32
5.3 Guidance on Formulation of the Next Strategic Plan	36
5.4 Recommendations	39
6. Synergies, Linkages and Gaps with other Relevant Regional Strategic Instruments	39
6.1 Recommendations	44
7. Organisational Report Card	44

8. Summary and Consolidated List of Recommendations	44
Annexes	
1 Terms of Reference for the Reviews	51
2 List of Reports	53
3 List of Stakeholders Consulted	54

Acknowledgments

The Review Team wishes to thank the many SPREP stakeholders who gave generously of their time, knowledge and experience, in order to ensure that the Team was well informed when undertaking this review.

We also thank the SPREP Secretariat, and the Review Reference Group, for their ongoing, and substantial, support and assistance.

List of Abbreviations

AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
BEMD	Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management Division
BIORAP	Biodiversity Rapid Assessment Survey
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCD	Climate Change Division
CROP	Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMGD	Environmental Monitoring and Governance Division
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FFA	Forum Fisheries Agency
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF-PAS	Global Environment Facility - Pacific Alliance for Sustainability
ICR	Independent Corporate Review
ICRI	International Coral Reef Initiative
IRT	Independent Review Team
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
J-PRISM -	Japanese Technical Cooperation Project for Promotion of Regional Initiative on Solid Waste Management in Pacific Island Countries
LDP	Learning Development Plan
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MEA	Multi-lateral Environmental Agreement
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MTR	Mid Term Review
NEMS	National Environmental Management Strategy
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
NMEI	National Minimum Environmental Indicator
NSDP	National Sustainable Development Plan
NSDs	National Sustainable Development Strategy
PACC	Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (project)
PACSAP	Pacific Australian Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning (Programme)
PCCC	Pacific Climate Change Centre
PDS	Performance Development System
PIC	Pacific Island Country
PICT	Pacific Island Country and Territory
PIFACC	Pacific Island Framework for Action on Climate Change
PIF	Pacific Island Forum
PIMS	Pacific Island Meteorological Strategy
PMC	Pacific Meteorological Council
PMER	Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report
PRMG	Project Review and Monitoring Group
RIE	Regional Implementing Entity
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SIDS	Small Island Developing State
SMART	Specific Measurable Achievable Relevant Time-bound (indicator)

SMT	Senior Management Team
SoE	State of the Environment
SPC	Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SRDP	Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific
SPREP	Secretariat for the Pacific Regional Environment Programme
SPREP	Pacific Regional Environment Programme
TREDS	Turtle Research and Monitoring Database System
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United National Education Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
US	United States of America
USD	United States Dollar
WMO	World Meteorological Organisation
WMPCD	Waste Management and Pollution Control Division

1. Setting the Scene

1.1 Introduction to the Report

1. This draft final report presents and interprets the evidence gathered by an Independent Review Team (IRT) commissioned by the SPREP² Secretariat to undertake the mid-term review (MTR) of the SPREP Strategic Plan. Interpretation of that evidence leads to several recommendations that are designed to improve effectiveness and efficiency for the remainder of the Plan's lifetime, and to guide preparation of the next strategic plan.

1.2 Purpose of the Review

2. As specified in the Terms of Reference (Annex 1), the purpose of this review is to undertake a mid-term review of the current Strategic Plan, as called for in the Plan. Effectiveness of delivery against the goals and targets in the Strategic Plan is to be measured using indicators defined in the Plan. An assessment of the relevance of the priorities and targets identified in the Plan will guide the ongoing implementation of the plan to 2016³, and inform the formulation of the next Strategic Plan. Challenges and issues encountered in implementing the Strategic Plan, as well as synergies with SPREP Members and synergies, linkages and gaps with other relevant regional strategic instruments, are to be reviewed. Recommendations should relate to improving delivery of the Strategic Plan during 2014-2016, as well as guiding preparation of the next strategic plan.

1.3 Review Scope, Process and Personnel

3. This review was undertaken in conjunction with the second Independent Corporate Review (ICR)⁴. The MTR involved acquisition and in-depth assessments of relevant evidence, using participatory approaches. A comprehensive process of engagement with stakeholders ensured the Review Team acquired the evidence and views of key stakeholders regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of implementing the Strategic Plan, and views on preparation, content and implementation of the next strategic plan. Selection of the methods used was based on their comparative advantage to generate useful information when dealing with a specific combination of information provider and information source.
4. The agreed methodology for the review identified the following as stakeholders in the review:
 - the 21 Pacific island countries and territories (PICTs) that are Members of SPREP, including governments, civil society, the private sector, academia, and their constituent institutions and organisations;

² Unless otherwise noted, in this report "SPREP" refers to the organisation (see Annex 1) - namely, the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, rather than to part of that organization, namely the Secretariat for the Pacific Regional Environment Programme.

³ For good reasons, substantive implementation of the Strategic Plan did not commence until 2012; as a result, the Secretariat has decided that the five year Plan should continue to guide the SPREP work programme through to the end of 2016.

⁴ See the separate report, "Second Independent Corporate Review of SPREP".

- the five metropolitan Members of SPREP, including governments and partner institutions and organisations in those countries;
 - management and other staff in the SPREP Secretariat; and
 - other bilateral, multilateral, regional and international development partners, including governments, inter- and non-governmental organisations, the private sector, donors, and academia.
5. On March 20th, 2014 the Team leader, John E. Hay, was contracted to undertake the MTR, in conjunction with the second ICR. Other members of the Review Team were Teresa Manarangi-Trott (Deputy Leader, with special responsibilities for engagement with stakeholders in the Polynesian sub-region), Sivia Qoro and William Kostka (with similar responsibilities for the Melanesian and Micronesian sub-regions, respectively). As part of the review process the IRT has produced several progress reports. These are listed in Annex 2.
 6. A key report is "Stakeholder Views: A Synthesis". The information presented in that report forms an important body of evidence for the present report. The methods used by the Review Team to acquire the relevant evidence, and document views, are described in that report and in the "Planning Meeting" report. A list of stakeholders consulted is provided in Annex 3. In addition to face-to-face consultations conducted at a specially convened regional workshop, and by members of the Review Team in their respective countries and while travelling, face- to-face consultations were also conducted with numerous stakeholders in two metropolitan countries, namely Australia and New Zealand.
 7. As a starting point for longer-term engagement with stakeholders in PICTs, including the SPREP Focal Points, the IRT distributed a questionnaire that had earlier been trialled at a regional consultation workshop. This was convened as part of the stakeholder engagement process for the two reviews.
 8. Importantly, PICT Members were encouraged to use consultation processes that suited their particular circumstances. As a result, responses to the questionnaires often reflected a compilation of the views of multiple stakeholders. The IRT also used an online survey to ascertain the views of the wider stakeholder community. Both this survey and the questionnaire were sent to stakeholders who could reasonably be assumed to have a good knowledge of the work of the Secretariat, as well as the wider Organisation.
 9. Other stakeholders, including the SPREP Focal Points of metropolitan Members, international and regional partner organisations, and potential partners of SPREP, were provided with the opportunity to engage with the IRT more directly, including responding to specific questions that reflected their actual or potential relationship with the Organisation.

1.4 Challenges in Undertaking the Review

10. The main challenges related to difficulties experienced during the process of engaging with SPREP's many and diverse stakeholders. These challenges included:

- The IRT did not include a francophone, who could therefore readily engage with France and the French Territories; engagement with these stakeholders was the responsibility of the Team Leader; consultations were productive due to the cooperation of the Secretariat and SPREP's francophone Focal Points;
- Limited face-to-face consultations with Members - the regional consultation workshop in Fiji included one representative for each PICT Member attending; all were government officials, with no representation of civil society or the private sector; some PICT Members - such as FSM, Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea - were not represented at all;
- Preparation of a questionnaire that would ensure sufficient targeted information was received from all Members and other stakeholders - a prototype questionnaire was tested at the Fiji workshop; it was shown to be too long and overly complicated, and hence difficult to respond to; while most participants responded, their responses were incomplete; even though the questions were simplified, and the questionnaire shortened, it remained a very long document and hence a challenge for some respondents to complete;
- Questionnaires are not necessarily the easiest or simplest form of seeking information or responses; the IRT invested considerable time to ensure a high response rate and good quality responses; some questionnaires were completed well, others not so well; continuous prompting by IRT members was essential to ensure that it received a reasonable response rate, including sufficient responses from each of the sub-regions, in order to make appropriate assessments of SPREP's activities in each sub-region;
- Questionnaires are also subject to interpretation and therefore the level of understanding of the questions poses a challenge in itself, especially if they cannot be explained either face-to-face or by another appropriate form of communication;
- The Strategic Plan is relevant to a large number of players in each of the countries/territories; in some cases the Secretariat did not have clear understanding of who these players are, and some Focal Points did not have an overview of relevant activities in country;
- It was a challenge to ensure that the person responding to the questionnaire was the most appropriate person, was able to understand the questions, and had sufficient knowledge of the activities being evaluated;
- High mobility of in-country personnel involved in a project that is being evaluated meant that information might be missing, or not passed on, as appropriate; and
- Questionnaires and the work of the IRT were often not seen as a priority at Member level; ongoing efforts by the IRT were required, at times with support from the Secretariat, in order to ensure responses from Members and other stakeholders were provided in a timely and useful manner.

1.5 The Operating Environment - Changes, Challenges and Opportunities

11. The 2011–2015 Strategic Plan replaces the separate planning documents SPREP previously used by SPREP, namely an Action Plan and a Strategic Programmes document. The first ICR, conducted in 2008, recommended that SPREP improve its organizational management in such areas as strategic planning. The 2011-2015 Strategic Plan was prepared as part of a wider change management process, and under direction from the 2009 SPREP Meeting. Members charged the Secretariat with undertaking a consultative strategic planning process to review the achievements

under the 2005–2009 Action Plan and to develop a single, integrated plan. Consultations which informed the strategic planning process were the most comprehensive ever undertaken by SPREP.

12. The Strategic Plan serves the purposes of an action plan, as required under the 1993 Agreement Establishing SPREP. It also defines how the Secretariat will focus its work, in the context of maintaining essential Secretariat services and supporting activities that address regional environmental challenges and opportunities.
13. The SPREP Agreement requires the "action plan" to:
 - Coordinate regional activities addressing the environment;
 - Monitor and assess the state of the environment in the region, including the degree of human impacts;
 - Promote research and other programmes to protect the atmosphere, ecosystems, and species;
 - Reduce atmospheric, land-based, freshwater, and marine pollution;
 - Strengthen national and regional capabilities and institutional arrangements;
 - Improve training, and increase educational and public awareness activities; and
 - Promote integrated legal, planning, and management mechanisms.
14. As Members requested at the 2009 SPREP Meeting, the Strategic Plan is a single integrated plan that identifies the priorities, strategies and actions to be undertaken over a five year period in order to help the region balance the needs and economic aspirations of its growing population with the maintenance of healthy environments and natural systems. The Plan sets clear targets and performance indicators, and strengthens environmental monitoring as a basis for regional and national decision making.
15. The Strategic Plan was formally adopted at the 21st SPREP Meeting in September 2010. The Plan establishes four Strategic Priorities:
 - Climate Change;
 - Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management;
 - Waste Management and Pollution Control; and
 - Environmental Monitoring and Governance.
16. These Strategic Priorities address the fundamental environmental concerns of the region that have become increasingly evident over the past two decades. The Plan provides the framework that guides: (i) SPREP's Annual Work Programme and Budget through to 2015; (ii) funding of the work programmes; and (iii) monitoring and evaluating implementation of the Plan.
17. The Strategic Plan is based on a shared responsibility of Members and the Secretariat for achieving environmental goals at national and regional levels, and provides the basis for working with partner organisations, including other regional organisations and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). As a result, the Plan is designed to provide a clear, shared roadmap; it is regarded as a living document based on a long-term vision of a

Pacific with improved and sustained environmental quality, and specifies national and regional priorities for the next five years.

18. The Strategic Plan commits Members to:

- Provide overall institutional support and funding;
- Achieving targets in the four priority areas;
- Engaging in environmental monitoring to assess progress; and
- Providing annual country reports on progress, to guide decision making.

19. It also commits the Secretariat to:

- Deliver quality service to Members by expanding funding for these priorities;
- Change management and institutional strengthening to ensure that programmes are relevant and viable; and
- Work in partnership with other organisations and stakeholders that support SPREP's priorities.

20. While the Secretariat plays the lead role in implementing the Strategic Plan, achieving its goals will depend primarily on the cooperation and commitment of all Members, but also on regional stakeholders including donors, other members of the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP), NGOs, and research institutions. Its success will also depend on the engagement and support of the communities of the region.

21. As noted above, the Strategic Plan guides preparation of the detailed Annual Work Programme and Budget by the Secretariat. The Annual Work Programmes and Budgets are approved by Members. The Strategic Plan is a key component of SPREP's planning processes (Figure 1). It is important to note that another critical component, the Business Plan, has remained in draft form since 2012, and has not been implemented as an integral part of the Organisation's planning and operational processes⁵. Absence of a functioning Business Plan also impacts in understanding the critical roles that the Corporate Services Division plays in the Secretariat's institutional arrangements and policy and planning processes.

2. Overall Progress and Achievements 2011 – 2013

22. As part of a briefing for participants in the Regional Stakeholder Consultation Workshop for the MTR and the ICR⁶, the Secretariat presented a self-evaluation of progress in achieving the targets for each of the four Strategic Priorities, based on the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Reports (PMERs) for 2011 to 2013 (Figure 2). Given that this represents the half way point in implementation of the Strategic Plan, progress assessed using this measure has been substantial. Later in this report the IRT will express concerns about the way in which the percentage of targets achieved is

⁵ The Review Team is aware that a Business Plan is to be submitted at the 25th SPREP Meeting, for approval by Members. A current draft was requested, but has not been received. An assessment of the consequences of this significant gap in SPREP's planning processes may be found in the companion report on the second ICR, along with associated recommendations.

⁶ Nadi, Fiji, May 12-14, 2014

determined, and the appropriateness of the indicators themselves. However, the IRT acknowledges that the information presented in Figure 2 provides a useful overview of progress in implementing the Strategic Plan.



Figure 1. SPREP's planning and operational instruments. Note that currently the Business Plan exists only in draft form.




Figure 2. Completion levels (per cent) for performance targets for each Strategic Priority in the Strategic Plan. Source: SPREP Secretariat, May 14, 2014.

23. More specific and tangible evidence of progress is provided in the following summary, based on the PMER for 2013.
24. **Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management Division (BEMD).** This Division continues to provide technical and advisory assistance to Members to strengthen their capacity in integrated resource management, ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA), managing stressors on ecosystems, conserving the Pacific's unique natural heritage, building resilience and supporting sustainable use of the Pacific's valuable natural resources.
25. Highlights for 2013 included:
 - Convening the 9th Pacific Islands Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas, with several key outcomes adopted including a new Regional Framework for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas 2014-2020, High Level 10 Key Actions and the Laucala Declaration on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas;
 - National wetland inventory updates initiated for Palau, Kiribati and Vanuatu;
 - Biodiversity rapid assessment of Nauru's terrestrial and marine biodiversity completed;
 - EbA implementation in Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Samoa, and release of key synthesis reports;
 - Initiated expansion and coordination of Pacific Marine Spatial Planning efforts, with new projects and co-ordination workshop between projects and SPREP members;
 - Turtle Research and Monitoring Database System (TREDs) successfully installed in French Territories, and practitioners trained;

- Polynesian megapode surveys in the islands of Late and Fonualei in Tonga completed;
 - Continued implementation of the 10-country GEF-PAS Invasive Species Project;
 - National Invasive Species Strategy and Action Plans developed for Tonga, Niue and Palau;
 - Invasive Species Capacity Development Strategy endorsed by SPREP members;
 - Inter-Island biosecurity training for participants from 10 Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs)
26. **Climate Change Division (CCD).** This Division continues to provide technical and advisory assistance to Members to strengthen capacity on responding to climate change impacts and support implementation of their climate change priorities in the context of national sustainable development strategies (NSDS) and plans.
27. Highlights for 2013 included:
- As part of the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change PACC (PACC), mainstreaming of climate change into NSDS for Tuvalu, the development of climate change policies for Fiji and Solomon Islands, and integration of climate change adaptation into sector policies for all 14 Pacific Island Countries (PICs);
 - Six Members have now replicated the lessons learned from the PACC project, across sectors and into other new sectors;
 - 1st joint meeting on integrated climate change and disaster risk management as part of the preparation process for the Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development in the Pacific (SRDP) that is currently being prepared;
 - High Level Support Mechanism for Pacific Ministers and senior officials where their capacity and awareness of key relevant issues were strengthened as well as their capacity to effectively participate in negotiations related to the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC);
 - Draft of the Kiribati Joint Implementation Plan completed;
 - SPREP accredited as a Regional Implementing Entity (RIE) for the Adaptation Fund;
 - In collaboration with the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO), provided support to Vanuatu to complete their national strategic plan and Niue to complete their meteorological legislation, which has been endorsed by Cabinet;
 - Establishment of a Climate Change Services Panel through the Pacific Meteorological Council (PMC);
 - Through Pacific Australian Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning (PACCSAP) Programme, all 14 Pacific Island Meteorological Services have climate database management systems installed and operational;
 - Samoa installed its 456 KW Solar Grid connected system funded through USD 4 million from the Pacific Environment Community Fund (Japan); and
 - More than 30% of Mega Watt hours have been saved across PIGGAREP projects and 2.2 MW of Renewable Energy capacity has been installed, corresponding to 54,000 MWh energy generated.
28. **Waste Management and Pollution Control Division (WMPCD).** This Division continued to assist countries to address pollution, and to improve management of hazardous chemicals and waste through provision of technical advice as well as assistance programmes and institutional support.

29. Highlights for 2013 included:

- Receipt of over USD 13 million in additional donor financing for improved waste management in the region;
- Support to French Polynesia to improve integrated waste management and associated invasive species management practices;
- Support for improved integrated solid waste management in Tonga and Wallis and Futuna;
- Advice on the feasibility of waste to energy provided to the Cook Islands;
- An integrated atoll waste management pilot project commenced in the Republic of the Marshall Islands;
- A pilot project to improve climate change adaptation planning in the waste management sector commenced in Fiji;
- Solid waste, landfill and hazardous waste management train the trainer teaching resources developed and delivered to 68 Pacific islanders;
- Activity reporting and business planning completed for the SPREP Basel/Waigani Centre (Pacific Regional Centre);
- Recommendations on regional E-waste recycling options completed;
- Pilot E-waste management projects commenced in the Cook Islands, Kiribati and Samoa;
- Regional pilot projects designed and funded to provide model composting, air quality, PCB analysis and healthcare waste management systems;
- Standardised used oil and E-waste audit methodologies have been developed and are being progressively implemented in PICs;
- Training of 248 refrigeration and air conditioning technicians in improved management of ozone-depleting substances completed;
- Completed used oil audits in Samoa, Fiji and Vanuatu;
- Technical support to update NATPLANS provided to Nauru, Solomon Islands and Tonga;
- Technical advice and support in the maintenance and development of National Marine Pollution Prevention Legislation provided to Nauru and the Solomon Islands;
- Technical advice and support provide to the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu to complete a risk assessment methodology for ship sourced invasive species from ballast water and hull bio-fouling; and
- PACPLAN review completed and endorsed by SPREP Meeting.

30. **Environmental Monitoring and Governance Division (EMGD).** The Division provides cross-cutting support in the areas of capacity development, policy, legislation, compliance, planning, monitoring, reporting and access to finance, enabling countries to meet Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) obligations and sustainable development goals.

31. Highlights for 2013 included:

- Commenced a review of regional environmental impact assessment (EIA) guidelines;
- Continued development of EIA frameworks for deep sea minerals;

- Revised regional model for marine pollution legislation with new MEA requirements;
- Conducted environmental law review for Marshall Islands;
- Provided policy and legal review advice to Cook Islands, Nauru, Samoa, Solomon Islands and Tonga;
- National Environment Management Strategy (NEMS) endorsed by Kiribati parliament;
- Final draft of NEMS delivered to Cook Islands for internal review;
- First draft of NEMS delivered to Fiji;
- Supported Niue, Kiribati and Tonga to develop GEF-5 proposals;
- Updated all PICs on the GEF-6 replenishment meetings;
- Supported Kiribati and Fiji with GEF National Prioritization Formulation Exercise Fund;
- Conducted GEF Familiarization Training for Kiribati and Fiji;
- Approved work programme for ACP-MEAs Project phase 2;
- Regional SOE template developed and implemented in Samoa, Fiji and Cook Islands;
- Training for environmental monitoring and database management in Samoa and Tonga;
- Environmental monitoring training conducted as part of state of environment (SoE) formulation;
- National SoE data added to regional streamlined reporting framework;
- Regional framework for SoE implemented through national SoE formulation;
- SoE and National Minimum Environmental Indicators (NMEI) utilized and refined in three countries; and
- Biodiversity data for the updated regional SoE developed.

3. Effectiveness, Efficiency and Relevance of Delivery

3.1 Terminology

32. For the purposes of this review the IRT adopts the following conventional definitions:
- Effectiveness - whether, and to what extent, the intended outputs, outcomes and impacts have been achieved;
 - Efficiency - whether the outcomes have been achieved at a reasonable cost, and hence represent value for money; and
 - Relevance - whether and to what extent the activities have addressed the needs and priorities of the target groups, and are aligned with national and regional policies and priorities.
33. The IRT acknowledges that there is an unavoidable time lag between, on the one hand, funding being sourced, activities undertaken and outputs delivered and, on the other hand, outcomes being achieved. It is likely to be at least two to three years before many substantive environmental and related outcomes can be identified. However, normally there will be short-term and medium-term effects arising from the outputs delivered by a project, such as strengthened capacities and other benefits for the target groups, as part of achieving the longer-terms aims of the project. Importantly, the

ability to demonstrate outcomes and longer-term impacts depends on the necessary baseline information being in place.

34. It is clear from the summary of "highlights" (Section 2), current reporting is focussed on activities and outputs. Consequently, assessments of effectiveness conducted by the IRT are necessarily rudimentary, at best, since assessing effectiveness requires knowledge of what outcomes have been achieved. In addition, the PMERs do not provide information on the ability for achievements to be sustained beyond the SPREP interventions. Thus it is impossible for the IRT to determine whether outcomes that have been, or will be achieved, can in fact be sustained.
35. Due to the lack of the required baseline information, and because the current PMER processes do not include reporting on environment and related outcomes, the IRT's assessments of efficiency can amount to no more than qualitative judgements based on expert opinion. The IRT assessments of relevance are more robust since they amount to determining if the Secretariat is delivering services and assistance consistent with the Strategic Plan.

3.2 Stakeholder Views on Effectiveness and Relevance

36. A substantial majority of questionnaire respondents indicated that, at least in part, SPREP is responding adequately to the prioritised needs as identified in their country's national policy documents. Table 1 summarises the questionnaire responses regionally, for each of the Strategic Priorities. For each Strategic Priority the majority of respondents indicated that progress is good, but more still needs to be done.
37. The majority of questionnaire respondents regionally, considered that the targets in the Strategic Plan will be achieved in their country or territory. But in all cases respondents believed that achievement would only be to a certain extent or in some respects (Table 2).
38. In the online survey, respondents were asked whether implementation of SPREP's Strategic Plan during its first three years had been effective and efficient. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 1**Number of Responses Re Meeting the Strategic Priorities**

	Strategic Priority			
	Climate Change	Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management	Waste Management and Pollution Control	Environmental Monitoring and Governance
Actions are sufficient; no further action is needed	2	2	2	1
Progress is good but more still needs to be done	21	12	17	17
Some progress has been made but some areas remain insufficiently addressed	7	7	10	9
Actions are insufficient and more action is required	4	7	5	10
Prefer not to answer	4	9	5	6

Table 2**Responses to Question - "Will the targets be Achieved?"**

	Number of Respondents			
	CC	BEM	WMPC	EMG
Yes, but only to a certain extent and in some respects	22	22	22	22
No	6	3	9	6
Do not know	8	7	5	8
Prefer not to answer	2	5	3	7

Table 3**Views on Implementation of SPREP's Strategic Plan during its First Three Years**

	Number
I am not well Informed on this Matter	36
Effective but not Efficient	5
Efficient but not Effective	5
Both Efficient and Effective, with no Improvements Needed	1
Efficient and Effective, but further Improvements Needed	12
None of the above	3
Question was Skipped	12
Total Number of Responses	77

39. With respect to Strategic Priority 1, where the CCD has the lead, there is a continuing need for enhanced collaboration and strengthened cooperation with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) as well as with other agencies that work across the region on climate change and related areas. The recent increase in outreach is noted. SPREP

appears to be well tuned into the UNFCCC negotiations and assisting PICs in the process, including ensuring they are in a position to fulfil international obligations in the medium term.

40. The main activity has been the PACC project. With the support of SPREP, fourteen countries have benefited from this project, including climate change being mainstreamed into national policies and strategies. In addition, tangible actions have been undertaken, especially regarding coastal erosion. SPREP has demonstrated leadership in the Pacific regarding adaptation activities. Capacity building and education have been at the heart of the SPREP strategy and SPREP has succeeded to raise awareness amongst Pacific agencies and organisations on climate issues, including practices to reduce climate change impacts.
41. There would be considerable benefit in reassessing how effective efforts have been to coordinate climate change and related activities undertaken across the region, and at PICT Member level, by SPREP, and by other development partners. Such a study should consider how effectiveness of coordination is best measured. Greater emphasis could be placed on the meteorological and climate information services components of Strategic Priority 1. With particular reference to climate monitoring, there is a specific need to standardise equipment used by various project donors. SPREP should play a key role in this initiative.
42. Some Members consider that Strategic Priority 2, where BEMD has the lead, is not SPREP's strongest pillar as it is overly focused on undertaking activities and delivering outputs. Of the activities undertaken, training in the area of invasive species management, and engagement in invasive alien species work more broadly, are key strengths of SPREP's efforts. For SPREP to be more effective in delivering outcomes under this Strategic Priority even greater emphasis needs to be placed on partnering with NGOs and others. There are now many players in biodiversity and ecosystem management, and all are trying to achieve essentially the same goals. SPREP and other regional players can be most effective when guiding and supporting each others activities. Examples include SPREP putting its support behind the major initiatives, such as the Micronesian Challenge, the Phoenix Islands Protected Area and the Cook Islands Marine Park, and increasing support to learning networks such as the Pacific Invasives Learning Network and the network of the Micronesia Regional Invasive Species Council.
43. SPREP has been functioning and delivering effectively in the area of Strategic Priority 3 - Waste Management and Pollution Control. SPREP is an engaged participant in the Pacific Ocean Pollution Prevention Programme (PACPOL) and especially in the Pacific Islands Regional Marine Spill Contingency Plan (PACPLAN). SPREP also participates in the Asia-Pacific Heads of Maritime Safety Agencies (APHoMSA) forum which brings together senior maritime officials to build a strong understanding of shared maritime issues, identify and coordinate technical cooperation efforts, and represent the region's interest in enhancing international standards. Australia has worked closely with SPREP at this forum, to ensure continued attendance by PICs, by providing or arranging funding opportunities for heads of agencies.
44. With respect to Strategic Priority 4 - Environmental Monitoring and Governance - and also in relation to Strategic Priority 2, some Metropolitan Members have supported

SPREP's work on marine management. This has included: (i) support for a SPREP hosted Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) workshop, to identify Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas (a strategic plan deliverable); (ii) SPREP engagement in a United Nations General (UNGA) Regular Process workshop on state of the oceans reporting; and (iii) collaboration to design and now implement an Australian funded activity to improve ocean governance in the Pacific through means such as marine spatial planning, ocean data management and SoE reporting.

3.3 Effectiveness against Goals and Targets

45. Two targets of the CCD Strategic Priorities for 2011-2015 have been 100% achieved, with eleven targets 70%-90% achieved and one 20% achieved. While some of the targets do have an outcome dimension, all the indicators used and the results reported focus on activities and outputs.
46. Four targets of the BEMD Strategic Priorities of the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan have been 100% achieved, with seven targets 50%-80% achieved. Similarly for this Division, some of the targets do have an outcome dimension, but all the indicators used and the results reported focus on activities and outputs.
47. Eight of the eleven targets of the Strategic Priorities of the WMPCD for 2011-2015 have been 50-100% achieved. For this Division, many of the targets and even some of the indicators have some outcome aspects, but to date the results are described in terms of activities and outputs.
48. Two of the targets of the EMGD Strategic Priorities for 2011-2015 have been 100% achieved, four 75% achieved, eight 50% achieved and two 25% achieved. All these targets are activity or output based. Some of the targets could be interpreted as outcomes, but the associated indicators ensure that results are reported only as activities and outputs.
49. While the 2015 goals for specific strategies under each of the four Strategic Priorities have a focus on delivering relevant environmental outcomes, many targets and almost all of the indicators are leading to reporting focusing on activities and outputs. One result is a high number of targets being achieved, or almost achieved, only mid way through the life of the Strategic Plan. If the Secretariat was reporting on outcomes and impacts, achievement rates would be much lower. The current approach has a tendency to exaggerate effectiveness. Additionally it is not clear how the per cent completion ratings were arrived at, due to the lack implementation plans to benchmark achievements.

3.4 Efficiency against Outputs and Outcomes

50. As noted above (paragraphs 34 and 35), the nature of the PMER process is such that it is not possible to measure efficiency using outcome information. There is a dearth of outcome information in the PMERs, including just the precursors to substantive on-the-ground outcomes. Thus in order to make even qualified estimates of efficiency using the information on outputs that is available, several assumptions must be made. This is due to other critical information being nonexistent.

51. Table 4 shows actual and projected expenditures for the four technical Divisions. The estimated expenditure for all divisions in 2015 and 2016 is assumed to be 80% of the projected income for SPREP in those years. This would seem to be a reasonably valid assumption given that in 2012 and 2013 expenditure by the Divisions was 79% and 80% of total income, respectively. Based on Table 4, in the first three years of delivering the Strategic Plan the Divisions have, collectively, disbursed 43% of the funding they will receive over the six-year life of the Plan. Similar information for each Division is not available as budget projections for 2015 and 2016 are not disaggregated to this level (see Table 4).

Table 4
Actual (2011 - 2013) and Projected (2014 - 2016) Disbursements

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Climate Change	5,334,872	5,741,736	7,653,565	9,424,493		
Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management	1,595,847	3,200,767	3,655,368	3,488,187		
Waste Management and Pollution Control	827,207	1,009,673	1,413,033	3,939,078		
Environmental Monitoring and Governance	1,030,452	892,053	1,003,899	1,509,952		
Total	8,788,378	10,844,229	13,725,865	18,361,710	12,900,880	13,699,386

52. Table 5 shows the reported progress made by the end of 2013 in meeting the Strategic Plan targets. The average achievement scores are the weighted averages of the percentage progress achieved. Based on the fact that all Divisions have achieved scores in excess of the pro-rated disbursements for the same three years, that is 43%, the analysis suggests a commendable level of efficiency. But it is important to reiterate the reservations the IRT has about measuring efficiency using targets that are based almost exclusively on activities and outputs.

Table 5
Analysis of Performance in Meeting the Strategic Plan Targets

	Progress to Meeting Strategic Plan Target (%)					Number of Targets	Average Achievement Score	%
	90 - 100	65 - 89	35 - 64	15 - 34	0 - 14			
Climate Change	6	8	1	1	0	16	13	80%
Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management	5	6	13	5	0	29	17	59%
Waste Management and Pollution Control	5	0	3	2	0	10	7	70%
Environmental Monitoring and Governance	2	4	8	3	0	17	10	57%

53. The above analysis does not take into account the important services that Corporate Services provides to the Divisions. In addition, the conclusion regarding efficiency assumes that the resources required to achieve the remainder of the targets, and time and funding in particular, are proportional to the resources that were required to achieve the progress made to date. This assumption of proportionality may not be valid, as the law of diminishing returns (e.g. it is far easier to achieve the first 20% of a target than the last 20%) is very likely to apply in the current case. Thus the conclusion stated above must be interpreted in this light.
54. Further, the assumption of proportionality implies that, once a target is achieved, resources will no longer be allocated to that part of the Work Programme. Rather, they will be used where targets are still to be achieved. This is unlikely to occur in many

instances, and for many reasons. The PMER for 2013 already includes a report that a target has been exceeded. Issues related to how the Secretariat plans for, and acts, when Strategic Plan targets are reached will be considered later in this report.

55. Another measure of efficiency relates more to internal operational procedures than to delivery of environmental and related support and services to PICT Members. Table 6 shows the efficiency with which the technical Divisions have disbursed funds over the period 2011 to 2013. Wide individual variances between budgeted and disbursed amounts can be identified. For any one year, individual variances are at times even larger. While total expenditures by a Division have varied from budgeted amounts by as much as 24%, for the four technical Divisions combined the variance is considerably less, at 6%. Table 6 also shows that for some Divisions personnel costs are a very high portion of overall disbursements, and well above the average of 30% for all the technical Divisions combined. Since the budgets of Divisions tend to be dominated by project funding there is little incentive to share financial resources between Divisions in ways that would result in cost savings for administration and project management.

Table 6

Financial Performance of Divisions, 2011 - 2013

	Budget	Disbursed	Difference	Disbursed	Disbursed
	2011-2013	2011-2013	%	% of Total	% Grand Total
CC					
Personnel	3,498,950	3,506,397	100%	19%	35%
Operating	17,293,149	15,207,520	88%	81%	64%
Capital	139,900	95,614	68%	1%	52%
TOTAL	20,931,999	18,809,531	90%		55%
BEM					
Personnel	3,173,048	3,642,177	115%	42%	36%
Operating	5,949,710	4,995,591	84%	58%	21%
Capital	26,850	34,856	130%	0%	19%
TOTAL	9,149,608	8,672,624	95%		26%
WMPC					
Personnel	1,011,766	1,325,197	131%	39%	13%
Operating	1,680,544	2,025,630	121%	60%	9%
Capital	23,350	21,010	90%	1%	11%
TOTAL	2,715,660	3,371,837	124%		10%
EMB					
Personnel	1,637,939	1,606,931	98%	53%	16%
Operating	1,528,772	1,417,025	93%	46%	6%
Capital	17,500	31,872	182%	1%	17%
TOTAL	3,184,211	3,055,828	96%		9%
Four Divisions					
Personnel	9,321,703	10,080,702	108%	30%	
Operating	26,452,175	23,645,766	89%	70%	
Capital	207,600	183,352	88%	1%	
GRAND TOTAL	35,981,478	33,909,820	94%		

56. Although not a measure of efficiency per se, it is relevant to consider the responses to the questionnaire with respect to delivery of outcomes. Table 7 shows that, between a third and a half of questionnaire respondents regionally, consider that SPREP has delivered the expected outcomes, at least to some extent. Surprisingly, a similar proportion of respondents chose not to answer the question.

Table 7**Responses to Question - "Has SPREP delivered the expected outcomes?"**

	Percentage of Respondents for each Strategic Priority			
	CC	BEM	WMPC	EMG
Yes	16	5	5	5
Yes, but only to some extent	24	38	31	35
No	11	24	18	26
Prefer not to answer	50	32	46	35

57. The IRT encourages SPREP, and the Secretariat in particular, to improve its reporting system and especially the PMER, to better inform stakeholders and the public of the results that have accrued as a consequence of the activities and outputs conducted. Several results should arise from the outputs delivered by the projects. The opportunity should be taken to identify both the short- and medium-term effects resulting from the outputs delivered by a project, such as improved capacities and other benefits for target group(s). These will often be a prerequisite to achieving the ultimate purpose of the project. This suggested improvement highlights the need for better coordination and consultations, with these being underpinned by a higher degree of ownership at PICT Member level.

3.5 Relevance of Goals, Targets, Outputs and Outcomes

58. Relevance, whether real or perceived, is strongly influenced by the extent to which key stakeholders have been engaged in establishing the goals and targets in the Strategic Plan. While consultations during preparation of the Plan were extensive and inclusive, it is now almost five years since they were undertaken. Needs change, personnel change and memories fade. However, over 90% of questionnaire respondents regionally, considered the current four Strategic Priorities are still appropriate priority goals for SPREP going forward, but half of the respondents believe there should be some modification to these goals.
59. The new Framework for Pacific Regionalism includes a strategic objective - Sustainable development that combines economic, social and cultural development in ways that improve livelihoods and well-being and conserve the environment. This resonates well with SPREP's own mandate and vision. This development signals additional opportunities and areas of emphasis for SPREP. Aligning to the new Regional Framework will help ensure SPREP provides increasing support to the shared initiatives of PICT Members across the region and increased collaboration with partners. This will inevitably lead to greater stakeholder engagement at both PICT Member and regional levels.
60. It is important that the Strategic Plan captures the full extent of SPREP's work/engagement in the region. If not, there may need to be extra goals to cover the full extent, or built in flexibility to accommodate new priorities. Areas for change are dependent on resources - both human and financial - being available.
61. Table 8 shows a disquietingly high portion of respondents to the questionnaire felt that consultations prior to preparation of the SPREP Work Programmes for 2012 to 2014

had been insufficient, or respondents were unable to comment on the consultations. This finding is supported by other evidence that highlights Member concerns regarding the near absence of consultations prior to a Work Programme being submitted for approval at the SPREP Meeting, as well as very limited opportunity for meaningful discussion about the Work Programme before it is approved by the SPREP Meeting.

Table 8

Responses to the Question: "Consulted prior to preparation of the SPREP Work Programmes for 2012 to 2014?"

	Percentage of Respondents
Yes, consultations were appropriate	10
Yes, to a certain extent	25
No, consultations were insufficient	29
Don't know	37

62. Perhaps of even greater concern is the small number of respondents to the questionnaire who could identify activities in the Work Programmes that had been specifically requested by the PICT Member. Table 9 shows that a majority of the questionnaire respondents indicated there had been no direct consultations, including no opportunity for requests to include items in the Work Programme that had been provided by SPREP. The IRT is concerned that the Secretariat is taking too literally the statement in the Strategic Plan that the Plan "will guide the development of detailed annual work plans by the Secretariat". The IRT acknowledges that Annual Work Programmes are reviewed and approved by Members at the SPREP Meeting, but is concerned that current processes mean that more than half the respondents felt that consultations about the Work Programmes are less than adequate.

Table 9

Ability to Identify in the Work Programmes Activities that had been Requested

	Percentage of Respondents
Yes	42
No, as no direct consultations with SPREP on the Work Programme	31
No, as no opportunities to make requests were provided by SPREP	27

63. Despite the above findings, it is important to note that a majority of questionnaire respondents regionally, consider that SPREP is responding adequately to the prioritised needs of their country or territory (Table 10).

Table 10

Responses to the Question: "SPREP responding adequately to the prioritised needs of your country or territory?"

	Percentage of Respondents
Yes	19
Yes, in part	50
No	10
Do not know	21

64. Table 11 shows that the majority of questionnaire respondents regionally, consider that the targets in the current Strategic Plan are appropriate, but only to a certain extent, and that they need to be strengthened. This would involve a greater focus on outcomes and impacts, and the use of SMART⁷ indicators.

Table 11

Responses to Question - "Are Targets Appropriate?"

	Number of Respondents			
	CC	BEM	WMPC	EMG
Yes, but need to be strengthened to some extent	19	20	16	25
Need extensive improvement	2	3	2	4
Do not know what they are	9	8	8	5
Prefer not to answer	8	6	11	8

3.6 Extent to which the Secretariat is Working in Synergy with SPREP Members and Partners

65. Table 12 shows that, to a large and likely appropriate extent, SPREP is partnering with other CROP agencies, NGOs and the like, or is combining with other activities in PICT Member countries and territories. The Climate Change Division appears to be exemplary in this regard.
66. In the online survey respondents were also asked if the Secretariat is working effectively with SPREP Members and Partners to implement the Strategic Plan. The results are presented in Table 13.

⁷ Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound.

Table 12**Responses to Question - "Is SPREP partnering or combining with other activities?"**

	Percent of Respondents			
	CC	BEM	WMPC	EMG
Yes, includes other parties	53	24	26	16
Yes, on a limited basis	18	38	38	44
No, carried out separately	11	14	5	9
Prefer not to answer	18	24	31	30

Table 13

**Views on Whether the Secretariat is Working Effectively
with SPREP Members and Partners to Implement the Strategic Plan**

	Number
Partnerships are Highly Effective	5
Effective Partnerships, but Room for Improvement	29
Need Major Improvements in Coordination and Collaboration with Members and Partners	12
Prefer not to answer	17
Question was Skipped	14
Total Number of Responses	77

67. Partners see the need for SPREP to consolidate its work, as it cannot do everything related to the environment. SPREP must engage still further, and share with partners, moving forward in an integrated manner. As a premier environmental agency, SPREP needs to work out how to engage with partners on a long-term basis. As highlighted in the report on the second ICR, SPREP needs an engagement plan so that partnerships are deliberately forged, and not opportunistic or ad hoc. It also needs to identify ways in which CROP agencies can establish full and ongoing collaboration, guided by the new Framework for Pacific Regionalism.
68. Harmonisation amongst partners is important. For the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), their work plan aligns with the SPREP Strategic Plan. UNESCO reported a good working relationship with SPREP in waste management, and in culture and heritage. The relationship is stable, and improving, but there is much more to improve. With UNESCO's recent appointment of a new programme specialist for science there are now more exchanges on disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation.
69. For the National University of Samoa, interaction with SPREP is very limited. A closer working relationship with SPREP, with considerably more and ongoing interaction, would be appropriate. The University could undertake research to provide an evidence base for environmental planning and management interventions. Other focus areas for engaging with the University could include, for example, climate change adaptation, state of the environment assessments and waste management. Collaboration might be assisted by the University and SPREP developing a MoU to help secure a better

relationship. Such a working relationship between SPREP and the University could serve as a model for relationships between SPREP and other learning and technical institutions.

70. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) has a very good relationship with SPREP. UNEP sees benefits in transparency and the positive culture at SPREP. However, an engagement plan is necessary. The main success factors for the relationship are trust and openness, facilitated by key individuals adopting the appropriate behaviours to enable a successful business relationship. The relationship between SPREP and UNEP highlights that sustainability cannot be assured when it is driven only by individuals - such relationships need to be institutionalised.
71. SPREP and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) have had a challenging relationship. There has been some attempt to re-examine the relationship. UNDP welcomes SPREP's application to become a Global Environment Facility (GEF) Project Agency⁸, and will assist as appropriate. UNDP supports SPREP having sub-regional offices, but stated that SPREP needs to be more strategic at placing staff in the sub-regions.
72. Conservation International reported a good relationship with SPREP. This continues to develop. Conservation International's Strategic Plan is aligned with the SPREP Strategic Plan.
73. The Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) does not have a very strong relationship with SPREP. Evidence suggests that SPREP sees FAO more as a potential source of funding, rather than as a technical partner. Thus FAO has been underutilized by SPREP, but FAO has reached out to SPREP to help them develop some GEF projects. Joint efforts would enhance SPREP's technical support to member countries.
74. SPREP is an official member of International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) and has designated ICRI focal points who regularly attend ICRI General Meetings and other ICRI events. Through these focal points, SPREP remains informed and engaged in ICRI's activities via regular emails and social media. SPREP has provided useful contributions to ICRI in the past decades, including to its Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network, for which it has regularly provided secondary data. SPREP's input into ICRI resolutions and recommendations, through regular attendance of its representative at General Meetings, is highly valued. SPREP is often the regional 'voice' for the Pacific, especially since it is rare for many Pacific country representatives to be able to attend ICRI meetings. Key success factors are continuity - designation of focal points for ICRI ensures continuity in representation and a tiered approach to coral reef conservation.
75. Two of several ways the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) of the United States engages with SPREP are through: (i) the Pacific Islands Global Ocean

⁸ In 2011 the GEF Council decided to implement the Pilot on Broadening the GEF Partnership. New institutions that meet the criteria are accredited to serve as GEF project implementing partners, and are called "GEF Project Agencies". These are entitled to work directly with the GEF Secretariat and Trustee to assist recipient countries in the preparation and implementation of GEF-financed projects, thus enabling them to access resources from GEF-managed trust funds directly, and to assist recipient countries in preparing and implementing GEF-financed projects.

Observing System, a regional alliance; SPREP supports the office and the Coordinator position while the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and Member States provide support for the activities undertaken by the office; and (ii) the Scientific Educational Resources and Experience Associated with the Deployment of Argo profiling floats in the South Pacific Ocean (SEREAD) Programme – SEREAD is a K-12 educational programme training teachers in the Pacific Islands in oceanographic, weather, and climate science; the Programme is implemented by New Zealand's National Institute for Water and Atmospheric Research; teachers from New Zealand develop the courses, prepare the training tools and guides, and teach the courses. SPREP Members provide in-kind support for the implementation of SEREAD.

76. The Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has an excellent track record of collaborating with SPREP in the field of waste management in the region, such as seconding JICA experts to SPREP, supporting development of the Regional Solid Waste Management Strategy, and implementing regional projects.
77. In 2002 the Ramsar Secretariat and SPREP signed their first Memorandum of Cooperation and an associated Joint Work plan 2002 – 2003. The present three-year Memorandum extends until 31 December 2015. As part of this agreement, the Ramsar Convention provides financial support for a Ramsar Officer Oceania, based at SPREP. The relationship has been successful in that the Ramsar Secretariat now has a presence in the Pacific, to promote the aims of the Convention and to support the Ramsar Contracting Parties in the region. SPREP is considered an ideal partner for the Ramsar Secretariat because it is the most relevant inter-governmental environmental organization in the Pacific, appropriate for promoting the aims of the Ramsar Convention in the region. For SPREP's relationship with the Ramsar Secretariat, transparency and accountability can be improved by providing more regular and detailed reporting on how the funds have been used and activities implemented.
78. The examples provided above highlight the effectiveness with which the Secretariat is engaging with many of its partners. The report on the second ICR has a more in depth assessment.
79. It is acknowledged that Members appear to be increasingly engaged with the Secretariat at SPREP Meetings. However, at the level of individual PICT Members, and given their whole-of government and whole-of-country roles, SPREP focal points should have capabilities and oversight across all economic, social and cultural sectors, including understanding how the environment and natural ecosystems underpin livelihoods and well-being. As noted in the report on the second ICR, delivery of SPREP's work programmes, and hence implementation of the Strategic Plan, would be very much enhanced if the roles of the focal points were strengthened in this way.

3.7 Learning through Training and Experience

80. Under the Learning and Development Policy (2011), the Secretariat recognises the need for ongoing learning and professional development of staff and is committed to providing appropriate and relevant opportunities, within budgetary constraints, to ensure there is continuing capacity building within the organisation. Staff and their Line Managers are responsible for completing the Individual Learning and Development Plan

(LDP) for each staff member during the Performance Development planning sessions. All staff are required to complete their Individual LDPs in the first quarter of the year, in line with the Secretariat's Performance Development System (PDS). The LDP includes the staff member's priority training needs for the year and is discussed and agreed between the staff member and the Line Manager.

81. A Training and Development Plan for the Secretariat is developed and issued in July each year. It is based on the Individual LDPs and is implemented subject to assessment of priority issues and availability of funds. The plan is developed by the Human Resources Unit, reviewed by the Human Resources Working Group, and approved by the Executive Management. The IRT has reviewed the Plan for 2014. It notes the 48 categories of training and development needs that are identified, based on individual PDPs, but is concerned at the small number that have been, or will be, addressed in 2014. For example, there appears to be no response to any of the seven "scientific" related training and development needs identified in the Plan. The report of the second ICR addresses this point.
82. The Work Programmes show that, of all the Divisions, the CCD has the most effort devoted to learning, through such activities as supporting the monitoring and evaluation of lessons learned from the implementation of the PIFACC, and documenting and replicating lessons learned from adaptation efforts in the region, including through the PACC project. However, neither the Work Programmes, nor the Learning and Development Policy, make reference to the learning that occurs when implementing the Work Programmes being documented and shared within the Secretariat, including between the Divisions. It is unlikely that whole-of-Secretariat learning will be substantive without there being a formal mechanism which encourages ongoing and inclusive professional discourse and other learning opportunities. Again, the report of the second ICR addresses this point.

3.8 Recommendations

83. The following recommendations are based on findings that will not be further elaborated in subsequent sections of this report:
 1. The Secretariat should continue to enhance collaboration and strengthen cooperation with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, and other agencies that work across the region on climate change and related areas.
 2. The Secretariat should ensure that programme and project planning and implementation is more transparent, and consistent with the best practices of other development partners, including contributions by and disbursements to PICT Members being confirmed prior to final project approval, as well as being identified in the Work Programme and Budget.
 3. Strengthen the performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting process in ways that will allow the Secretariat to report annually: (i) on progress towards achieving the planned outcomes and impacts achieved, and as well as their sustainability, as a result of activities it has undertaken, either individually or through partnerships; and (ii) by Division and for SPREP as a whole, on the efficiency and relevance of the activities undertaken by each Division, and by SPREP as a whole.

4. The Secretariat should ensure that assumptions and risks are clearly identified In the Work Programme and Budget and in the performance monitoring and evaluation reports, to strengthen the overall analysis of progress and achievements in delivering the Strategic Plan.
5. With support and advice from Members, the Secretariat should ensure that there are strong linkages between relevant strategic goals in the new Framework for Pacific Regionalism and SPREP's Strategic Priorities.

4. Challenges and Issues Encountered when Implementing the Strategic Plan

4.1 Policy and Organisational Challenges

84. Policy related challenges face SPREP, and especially the Secretariat, at a number of levels. External relations, including SPREP's comparative advantage, and how these affect SPREP's planning processes, are complicated by the breadth and cross-cutting nature of the Organisation's formal mandate to protect and improve the Pacific's environment and related systems, and to ensure these support sustainable development. The multiple and vaguely defined functions of the Secretariat, as listed in the SPREP Agreement, have challenged the Organisation over its 20 year history, and will continue to do so going forward.
85. Preparation of the Strategic Plan, and its approval in 2010, was a turning point for SPREP, ensuring it changed from an Organisation which lacked clarity and commitment as to how it might fulfil its mandate, to one that now has a clear strategic vision, along with a roadmap as to how it will be achieved, through its own efforts, as well as working with partners. But despite the clarity that comes with the specific strategies, goals, targets and indicators of the Strategic Plan, and the reinforcement that results from having well-linked Annual Work Programmes, Budgets and PMER processes, operationally SPREP still suffers from a combination of highly dynamic push and pull factors that simultaneously limit its ability to undertake tasks that are clearly within its mandate while also at times driving SPREP beyond its core business and competencies. These factors include project officers seeking funding opportunities to ensure continuing employment, coordinating work in areas that could be considered outside the SPREP mandate and where there is limited capacity to provide the required support, and undertaking activities that are more appropriately performed by Member governments an their local partners.
86. The increased transparency, accountability and harmonisation, within both SPREP and the wider development partner community, have gone a long way to bringing these constraints and diversions under control. But continued diligence and coordination are required if SPREP is to reap the full benefits of its improved planning processes. SPREP must also move rapidly to complete the suite of planning instruments, by developing and implementing a Business Plan that guides its internal operations and external relations. As a priority, the Business Plan must address SPREP's continuing high reliance on project-based funding, albeit that this dependency has declined significantly in recent years. Importantly, uncertainties about the continuity of the core funding it does receive represent a huge risk to the Organisation, even in the near term.

87. Another policy challenge that is relevant to the Strategic Plan is its static nature. The Plan effectively locks the Secretariat into a series of Work Programmes that will deliver on the many goals and associated targets in the Plan. As noted above, the certainty the Strategic Plan brings to the Organisation is advantageous, but it comes at a cost. The new Pacific Framework for Regionalism has significant implications for the way SPREP will do business in the future. It lays out new regional procedures to Identify, or reaffirm, priority regional initiatives on an annual basis, through a multi-step process. Leaders of Pacific island countries and territories will identify a small number of regional initiatives for the region to focus on, and provide directions on further policy development, implementation, and reporting. The Secretariat should also consider the institutional implications of doing business somewhat differently.
88. As a recent UNEP report⁹ notes, Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are especially vulnerable to a range of new and emerging environmental issues that pose additional threats to their sustainable development. As an organisation that provides technical and other assistance to many SIDS and small island territories, both the Secretariat and the Organisation as a whole must be dynamic and proactive. SPREP must have a Strategic Plan that is consistent rather than at odds with these attributes. The Secretariat needs guidance from Members and development partners as to how this might best be achieved in ways that meet their needs.
89. At another level, SPREP faces policy challenges in terms of its own governance, with major implications for the efficacy of the Strategic Plan. The current procedures governing how the Annual Work Programmes and Budgets are prepared, and subsequently approved at the SPREP Meeting, along with the annual PMER, are far from inclusive processes as far as Member engagement is concerned. This limits ownership of the procedures, as well as the outcomes of the SPREP Meeting. A serious down-stream consequence is the inability of the Annual Work Programmes to align with the evolving needs and processes of PICT Members and to deliver assistance that adds value to the efforts of the Members themselves, as well as those of their other development partners. This problem is confounded by PICT Members not monitoring and providing annual reports on their progress, consistent with the agreed monitoring and evaluation framework in the Strategic Plan. The Secretariat should be more proactive in encouraging and supporting PICT Members to report in this way. This process would be helped considerably if every review of a relevant policy or plan conducted by a PICT Member considered the extent to which SPREP programming is supporting Member priorities as outlined in relevant policy and planning documents.
90. At an internal level, the Secretariat also faces policy challenges that influence the strategic planning process. In order to give clarity to its programming and delivery, the Secretariat aligned its institutional structures with the Strategic Priorities agreed by Members. This was a rational decision. But the divisional approach comes at a significant cost. While there are several examples of coordination and cooperation between two or more Divisions, there are many more examples of the "silo effect" associated with the current institutional arrangements. These extend beyond just the technical Divisions, to include the Corporate Services Division. Many of these examples are unintended, rather than being in any way deliberate. But the dominance of project-

⁹ UNEP 2014. Emerging issues for Small Island Developing States. Results of the UNEP Foresight Process. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Nairobi, Kenya, 68pp.

based funding does tend to decrease the permeability of the "walls" that come between the Divisions. The Secretariat needs to consider ways to break down the "walls" and decrease the "silo effect" that currently reduces the effectiveness of the Secretariat.

91. Also at an internal level, the Secretariat has invested heavily in preparing numerous policies that govern and guide its operations. The efforts and results are commendable. Most have the potential to make an enormous contribution to the effectiveness and efficiency with which the Strategic Plan is implemented. The resulting improvements at PICT Member level have already been documented. Full and effective implementation of these policies now and into the future is a challenge. The Internal Auditor and the Independent Audit Committee play key roles in ensuring this occurs, and that lessons are learned and applied in the process. The companion ICR has raised concerns about the ability of the Internal Audit Framework to ensure compliance with the full suite of relevant policies.

4.2 Effectiveness of Member and Partner Engagement

92. In this and our other reports, the IRT has presented evidence that shows the need to improve the effectiveness of Member and partner engagement in order to maximise the immediate and longer-term impacts of the Strategic Plan. In summary, the key areas needing attention are:
- SPREP's first ever Strategic Plan 2011-2015 is not supported by either an implementation plan or by a Business Plan; rather, the Annual Work Programme and Budget have been used as the overarching means to carry-out the activities required to meet the goals of the Strategic Plan; there is still a need for the proposed Business Plan, to accompany the Strategic Plan, and guide the development and implementation of the Annual Work Programme, as was the original intention;
 - Ensuring that delivery of the Annual Work Programme at subregional and country/territory level, and monitoring effectiveness, are undertaken as a joint responsibility of the relevant Member and the Secretariat, often working in partnership with others who can add value to the activities being undertaken;
 - The need for more, and ongoing opportunities for Members, and their constituencies such as NGOs, community leaders and the private sector, to engage in the process of preparing and implementing the Annual Work Programme;
 - The ability to work with Members and other stakeholders jointly, including development partners, to identify current and emerging opportunities for the Work Programme to reflect and address the needs of multiple Members, and of the region as a whole; and
 - To know when and how to work with partners in order to add value to the joint work of the Secretariat and Members, and to be able to demonstrate the benefits of this value add to Members and other stakeholders.
93. Addressing these key areas has both governance and operational implications. These have been considered in the companion report on the second ICR, and will also be discussed further in Section 5.

4.3 Resourcing Challenges

94. The main resourcing challenges related to implementing the Strategic Plan have also been identified in this and the IRT's other reports. They, and some of their implications, can be summarised as follows:
95. **Heavy reliance on project-based funding.** This is not only a risk to the continuity of those initiatives that require longer-term investment in order to achieve the required results, but also influences how the Secretariat works on a day to day and an extended basis, including contributing to the "silo effect", staff concerns about job security in project-funded positions, and to the loss of institutional memory.
96. **Needs for better linkages between donor priorities and those of SPREP and its Members.** The Secretariat, and Members at large, work hard to ensure that the Strategic Plan and the resulting Work Programmes are needs (i.e. demand) driven. But as indicated above, much of the Work Programme is implemented through projects. Many donors are constrained by their development aid priorities and mandate, rather than being free to always be consistent with the region's agenda, as laid out in the Strategic Plan. This does not imply that all projects that have aspects of being supply driven are not in the best interests of Members and the region as a whole. Donors are sometimes more in tune with such considerations as emerging issues, new methodologies and innovative technologies.
97. **Distribution of financial resources across the four technical divisions.** Table 6 shows that disbursements by the four technical divisions between 2011 and 2013 were proportionally as follows: CCD, 55%; BEMD, 26%; WMPCD, 10% and EMGD, 9%. Climate change is frequently identified as the most serious threat to the region; hence relatively greater expenditure by this Division may well be justified. It is closest to achieving its Strategic Plan targets (Table 5), perhaps suggesting that there should be proportionately less investment by this Division going forward. Based on the budget for 2014, there is little sign that any redistribution is occurring, given the follow budget allocations, as a percentage of the total budget for the four technical divisions - CCD, 51%; BEMD, 19%; WMPCD, 21% and EMGD, 8%.
98. Now that the Strategic Plan is into its third to last year of implementation, one might expect at least an emerging inverse relationship between the budget allocated to a given Division, and progress in achieving the targets of the relevant Strategic Priority. Figure 3 shows just the opposite, namely a positive relationship. The continuing dominance of the CCD is a reflection that several substantial projects continue into 2014, and new sources of funding have also been secured for at least 2014. The proportional increase in the WMPCD budget reflects the substantial EU funding of waste management interventions in the region.
99. Development of rational, transparent and accountable systems for needs-driven budget allocations for the Divisions is an urgent priority for the Secretariat, as highlighted in the report on the second ICR. Resource mobilization needs to be balanced between divisions and across the region. Some countries, territories and Divisions are receiving significantly more programming, funding, and SPREP staff time than are others. This needs to be better rationalised by way of a broad and transparent overall strategy that

enables the Secretariat to set and work to clear operational priorities. Importantly, the strategy must not constrain the ability of the Secretariat to respond appropriately to the requests and needs of PICT Members. Such a strategy should form part of the strengthened Business Plan recommended by the IRT.




Figure 3. Relationship between the budget allocated to a given Division in 2014, and reported progress (2013) in achieving the targets of the relevant Strategic Priority. A change towards an inverse relationship would be expected at this stage of implementing the Strategic Plan.

100. The Secretariat should develop a plan that also enables it to manage the diversity of funding sources and the predictability of funding, as well as the distribution of funding across the Divisions. This can form part of a Business Plan. It could also include details of how SPREP plans to go about its business. Such planning determines how successful SPREP will be in the future, in terms of delivering environmental and related benefits to the Pacific.

4.4 Recommendations

101. The following recommendations are based on findings that will not be further elaborated in subsequent sections of this report:
 6. The Secretariat should begin a dialogue with Members as to how it might increase the flexibility of the Strategic Plan, and its associated Work Programmes, so as to better reflect new and emerging issues the Organisation should address in the immediate future.
 7. Consistent with the agreed monitoring and evaluation framework in the Strategic Plan, PICT Members should be more committed to monitoring and providing annual reports on their progress in implementing their components of SPREP's Work Programmes,

including assessing the extent to which SPREP programming is supporting Member priorities as outlined in relevant policy and planning documents. In turn, the Secretariat should be more proactive in encouraging and supporting PICT Members to report in this way.

8. The Secretariat should prepare and implement a Business Plan that includes, amongst other considerations, provisions to manage the diversity of partnerships and funding sources, the predictability of funding, and guidance on new project funding as well as on the distribution of funding across the Divisions.

5. Future Implementation and Planning

5.1 Strengthening Strategic and Operational Planning and Implementation

102. A lack of clarity as to SPREP's focus, and how it works at an operational level, highlights the need for an overarching framework showing how all four technical Divisions, both individually and collectively, deliver a programme of work that is in line with the focus and is robust in dealing with the push and pull factors referred to earlier. Thus SPREP should place greater emphasis on work programmes and activities that reflect the common environmental challenges faced by PICT Members, while avoiding areas where other agencies have more capability. For example, SPREP has an important role to play in ocean resource management. In this respect it should integrate with, but not encroach on, the work of SPC and FFA. As discussed in the report on the second ICR, SPREP has a clear mandate to deliver on the protection, improvement and sustainable development of the Pacific regional environment, including its natural ecosystems. Any challenges about working to, and fulfilling this mandate are more about SPREP's partners and other stakeholders having an equally clear understanding of the origins and credibility of this mandate, and about the roles that SPREP must and does play in delivering to its mandate. Evidence presented in this and the companion ICR report highlights the need for the Secretariat to do much more, and be smarter about addressing these challenges. In order for SPREP to better understand how it can contribute further to sustainable development in the region, it needs to be more inclusive and work more cooperatively in the region.
103. How to prioritise and focus the efforts of SPREP was raised by stakeholders, in many different ways. This included noting that Members have competing interests.
104. Although SPREP's interventions are positive, achieving the resulting outcomes is partly a responsibility of Members. Whether the modalities of joint country strategies and or other agreements as used by SPC, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) provide relevant models for formalising the SPREP inputs for PICT Members, and the roles and responsibilities of individual Members, was a question often raised by stakeholders. It needs to be addressed as a priority.
105. Related to this is the environmental monitoring and reporting capacity that is being developed in Member countries and territories through the work of the EMGD, and specifically how SoE reports might form the foundation and mandate for SPREP activities in Member countries and territories.

106. As noted in Section 4.2, the Secretariat needs to strengthen its engagement and partnering with PICT Members, NGOs and with the private sector, including with sub-regional initiatives. In parallel, the Secretariat also need to further strengthen the public relations capacity of the Communications and Outreach unit of Corporate Services, and increase the use of visual and social media, other communications technologies, and French and other relevant languages. This will, in part, help increase awareness in PICTs of the need for, and the benefits of, the assistance and other support provided by SPREP. Sponsorship should be explored by the Secretariat.
107. There is support for the Secretariat adopting results-based and multi-year approaches to planning, budgeting and reporting. Multi-year planning, budgeting and reporting is essential, as in reality very few projects and programmes are short-term. They are all logically inter-connected. Multi-year budgeting of programme funds provides better leverage for accessing additional funding from other sources, and assists in providing continuity to the work that is important both to SPREP and its partners.
108. But an assessment of results-based management in the United Nations Development System ¹⁰ noted that “Results-based management is a system, and for it to be implemented effectively, all elements of the system must work. If one aspect of the system is weak, it lessens the overall effectiveness of results-based management. The relevant resources, workable management and accountability systems, and knowledge management must be in place to support results-based management”.
109. Given this, a comprehensive approach will be needed if SPREP is to implement such a change. Importantly, the UN report also noted: “The introduction of results-based management or major changes to existing results-based management approaches is not cost-free or cost neutral. Resources must be committed to support implementation. Introducing results-based management cannot be done as a narrow technical exercise. Failing to take into account the institutional and change management issues runs the risk of undermining the initiative”.
110. The IRT proposes an integrated approach designed to strengthen strategic and operational planning and implementation. This is conceptualised in Figure 4.

¹⁰ Bester, A., 2012: Results-Based Management in the United Nations Development System: Progress and Challenges. A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, for the Quadrennial Comprehensive Policy Review. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York, 65pp.




Figure 4. Proposed integrated approach designed to strengthen SPREP's strategic and operational planning and implementation.

111. The key features of the proposed approach are:

- Many of the components already exist as parts of SPREP's planning and operational processes; the proposed approach simply ensures these components are better integrated into an overall system;
- The strategic and operational planning and implementation processes are informed by, and contribute to, the new Framework for Pacific Regionalism;
- Reporting on the state of the environment of PICT Members will inform reporting on the state of the regional environment; the latter will also be informed by the PMER process and associated assessments of needs which, along with lessons learned, will be reflected in the new Strategic Plan and in the Annual Work Programmes and Budgets for SPREP;
- The Business Plan will be strengthened and operationalised, and will guide the flow of resources and use of partnerships to implement the Annual Work Programme;
- The Business Plan will also guide the flow of resources and use of partnerships, to implement a new modality - the Integrated Country Programme;
- The Integrated Country Programmes are negotiated three to five year agreements between SPREP and each of its PICT Members, informed by the PMER process and associated assessment of needs, and the regional and Member-level SoE reporting; each agreement will describe the services and other assistance SPREP will provide to the PICT Member, the roles and responsibilities of the PICT Member to ensure

- the assistance provided by SPREP is used to good effect by working with in-country and sub-regional systems, stakeholders and partners; monitoring and evaluation of the Integrated Country Programmes will be undertaken as part of the PMER process;
- The Secretariat's contributions to each Integrated Country Programme will be facilitated by a staff member of the Secretariat; each staff member will have responsibility for a whole-of-Secretariat relationship with a given PICT Member, or group of PICT Members, such as the French Territories;
 - Each PICT Member will identify a relationship manager for SPREP who will facilitate implementation of the Integrated Country Programme, ensuring a whole-of-country approach to the delivery and uptake of SPREP's assistance; the relationship manager will not be a new position in government; rather the role might be performed by the SPREP focal point, or by an official who reports to that Focal Point;
 - The mutually agreed Integrated Country Programme will inform, and be informed by national and sectoral development policies and plans; and
 - The PMER and needs assessment processes will inform the SoE processes for each PICT Member and, in turn, the updating of the national and sectoral development policies and plans.

5.2 Relevance of Current Priorities and Targets

112. It is important that the Strategic Plan captures the full extent of SPREP's engagement with Members, and its work in the region. If not, there may need to be extra goals to cover the full extent. As a general observation, while the current priorities are considered to be broadly relevant, most targets are neither SMART nor consistent with the need to report outcomes and, ultimately, impacts, as well as providing evidence of their sustainability of the SPREP investments have ceased.
113. The targets and indicators for Strategic Priority 1 are not SMART. But they are broad enough to allow for a wide range of activities to be included. Whether this necessarily is a good thing, only time will tell. Since six of 16 targets are within 10% of being achieved there is a need to either consider modifying the targets or allocating resources elsewhere.
114. The goal under Strategic Priority 2 Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management, "by 2015 all Members have improved ecosystem management, and are implementing conservation strategies to decrease the rate of terrestrial and marine biodiversity and habitat loss and degradation, including implementation of relevant conservation Multilateral Environmental Agreements and regional activities", is still an appropriate priority for SPREP. However, and for example, one the targets for this goal "by 2015, implementation of the Regional Wetlands Action Plan coordinated in collaboration with all partners", and the key performance indicator for this goal, "the extent to which the Regional Wetlands Action Plan is implemented", might not be appropriate for measuring/evaluating performance against this goal. The current Regional Wetlands Action Plan only includes activities from 2011 to 2013, while the Strategic Plan covers the period from 2011 to 2016.

115. With regard to wetlands, the Strategic Plan states that the Regional Wetlands Action Plan for the Pacific Islands 2011-2013 is one of the existing thematic strategies. The focus of the Strategic Plan should be on the implementation of these thematic strategies. It is important that there are mechanisms in place for SPREP to report on the implementation of the Regional Wetlands Action Plan in order to provide an accurate measure of how effective and efficient the Secretariat has been in meeting the above goal in the Strategic Plan over the last three years.
116. Since five of ten targets under Strategic Priority 3, Waste Management and Pollution Control, are within 10% of being achieved, there is a need to either consider modifying the targets or allocating resources elsewhere. Some of the targets under other strategic goals are overly ambitious given the current availability of funding. An example is the need for a monitoring capability in order to demonstrate improvements in coastal marine water quality. The Strategic Plan is poorly linked to the current three areas of core business under the Strategic Priority, namely the management of solid and hazardous waste, and of marine and terrestrial pollution. Many of the targets in the Strategic Plan related to this work are not particularly relevant. Substantial additional resources would be required in order to realign the current the work programme to the strategic goals in the current strategic plan. An example would be commencing work in wastewater management.
117. The overall completion rate for meeting the strategic plan targets is lowest for Strategic Priority 4, Environmental Monitoring and Governance. This is consistent with it being the newest of the four technical Divisions. Currently the Division finds it difficult to report on some of its activities because they don't have a natural fit in the Strategic Plan, and hence in the PMER process.
118. Some of the targets and indicators for this Strategic Priority need revising. The new Division lacked the benefit of prior experience when they were being developed. Recent experience has highlighted gaps and duplications. The EMGD provided the IRT with proposed changes to the content of the Strategic Plan related to Strategic Priority 4. While the IRT supports the suggested changes to the strategic goals, it urges that the proposed targets and indicators be further revised to take into account the findings of this review, and particularly in relation to the need for all targets and indicators to be SMART and able to provide evidence related to effectiveness and efficiency, and the sustainability of outcomes in the longer term.
119. There needs to be improved balance across the four Strategic Priorities in terms of funding and resourcing. The four Strategic Priorities also need to be more interconnected. Going forward, it will be important that the Strategic Priorities are clearly linked to outcomes that improve livelihoods and the sustainable economic development of the region. For example, tourism initiatives, enhancing food security and oceans resource management have environmental dimensions in terms of the use of environmental assets as well as ensuring long-term sustainability. Such linkages are particularly relevant to the biodiversity and ecosystem management pillar, which should benefit from re-balanced funding.
120. The relatively new EMGD has resourcing challenges, including those related to staffing. The Division now has the identity and reputation to carry out work. Support is being

sought internally and by Members. Given the expected funding, over the medium term the Division will achieve the relevant priorities and targets in the Strategic Plan. The main constraints and challenges include a number of targets in the Plan needing to be changed - some are not SMART. Suggestions have been made as to how best to revise the current Strategic Plan to better and more equitably reflect the Division's current functions. Essential immediate needs are to have a dedicated sustainable development adviser and, in the longer term, an addition to the legal/policy team.

121. Mainstreaming issues are of importance to the EMGD, as well as pulling together thematic areas as outlined in the national environmental management strategy (NEMS), and for the NEMS to link with the national sustainable development plan (NSDP). The NEMS, or similar country documents, should be the primary instrument for mainstreaming within the environment sector, and also include all multilateral environment agreement (MEA) plans. Increased partnering with partners should include relevant NGOs and the private sector. There needs to be a wider scope of capacity building to better define the work of the Division, to include more than monitoring and reporting.
122. If the system proposed in Figure 4 is implemented expeditiously it will result in major improvements in effectiveness and efficiency. The main delay will come in negotiating the Integrated Country Programmes. If Members accept the proposal, the Secretariat should give this task the highest priority. Going into the negotiations it will be important for all parties to have modest intentions and ambitions. It will be better to start small and allow the Integrated Country Programmes to evolve and mature over time. Early discussions regarding the Integrated Country Programmes should also include discussions regarding the new Strategic Plan.
123. The IRT also proposes (Figure 5) that the Secretariat make some relatively modest changes, to give greater clarity to the work of the technical Divisions, and to encourage more inter Divisional work and a more strategic approach by the Secretariat as a whole. The need for the Secretariat to be more learning focused is also addressed. The proposed institutional strengthening would also enable the integrated approach presented in Figure 4 to be implemented in a more effective and efficient manner.




Figure 5. Proposed institutional strengthening of the Secretariat. The relatively minor and more substantive changes are shown in red.

124. Key features of the proposed changes are:

- Most of the changes are relatively modest, but have the potential to deliver significant benefits;
- The name of the current Climate Change Division be changed to reflect its widening role in managing both current and anticipated weather- and climate-related risks, as exemplified by the major role in implementing the Strategy for Climate and Disaster Resilient Development (SRDP) that is currently under preparation. This will replace the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change (PIFACC), which ends its term in 2015;
- Existing and important functions of the Division need to be given greater prominence; these are coordinating weather and climate services through the Pacific Islands Meteorological Strategy (PIMS) and the Pacific Islands Meteorological Desk, and supporting PIC negotiators in their work related to the UNFCCC and other relevant MEAs;
- The name of the current Environmental Monitoring and Governance Division be changed to reflect its work the entire environmental management spectrum, and not just monitoring;
- The existing and important reporting and assessment functions of the Division also need to be given greater visibility;

- The roles and responsibilities of the SPREP Member Relationship Managers have already been discussed in Section 5.1 and captured in Figure 4; and
- An important new feature of the Secretariat's institutional arrangements, the Strategic Planning Hub, would bring together existing staff, and enable them to work together in more synergistic ways; the Hub would also bring together, and strengthen, many existing but relatively weak functions, such as strategic planning, regional SoE reporting, PMER processes, and knowledge management; it would also formalise new functions, such as a whole of SPREP (Secretariat and Members) PMER process, thereby adding value to the existing Divisional PMER processes, as well as strategic environmental management and environmental foresighting; the proposed Hub would incorporate, but go well beyond the Project Review Monitoring Group (PRMG) that would have involved senior management staff to oversee project design and coordination supported by the Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor.

125. **Identification of Priorities and Targets that Require Focused Support.** Many of the existing targets will be achieved well before 2016. But since they are activity and outputs focussed there is currently no way of telling if the associated goals will also be achieved. The most logical, though not overly practical approach would be to revise the targets, taking the opportunity to make them SMART and capable of showing outcomes and impacts, as well as their sustainability in the longer term.
126. The alternative would be to assume, unwisely, that the goals are achieved once the current targets are achieved. Under such a scenario, available resources could then be shifted to ensure the remaining targets are achieved. This would be problematic when there is a high dependency on less flexible project-based funding.

5.3 Guidance on Formulation of the Next Strategic Plan

127. Regionally, three quarters of questionnaire respondents believed that Corporate Services should be included in the next Plan - over 50% consider it should have been included in the current Plan. Thus the absence of Corporate Services in the current Plan needs to be rectified.
128. Over 90% of questionnaire respondents regionally, consider the current four Strategic Priorities are still appropriate priority goals for SPREP going forward, but half of the respondents believe there should be some modification to these Priorities. Making such changes would be dependent on the required resources - both human and financial - being available.
129. There is a need for the next Strategic Plan to be more outcomes, rather than outputs, focussed, with the added challenge of being able to demonstrate if the outcomes will be sustained once SPREP assistance ceases. Preparation of the next SPREP Strategic Plan would be a useful point at which to develop a more detailed results framework.
130. The information provided in the PMER is very detailed in terms of specific inputs, outputs and tasks undertaken by the Secretariat. However, it is very process focused, and structured around the different work areas. Ideally, the PMER under a new Strategic plan would have a greater results focus and contain information detailing the

extent to which this work has contributed to broader environmental outcomes, as well as sustainability beyond SPREP investment.

131. Thus greater focus on results in new Strategic Plan, particularly outcomes, is desirable. This suggests the need to develop an overarching outcome framework, which logically connects higher-level environmental outcomes to the specific outputs of the different work streams of the Secretariat. A useful starting point is a one page results diagram, which sets out the results chain or intervention logic - this would be supported by a more detailed monitoring and evaluation framework, with indicators, baselines and SMART targets across the different work programmes. It would also be important that the accountabilities for achieving targets between SPREP and partner countries are clearly set out.
132. Development of a detailed framework as described above requires a new set of reporting systems, processes and templates to support a robust collection of results. It is suggested that a 'roadmap', or similar, is developed and used to support the preparation of the framework, which clearly sets out tasks, responsibilities and timeframes. Relevant Members can offer assistance, support, and example templates, where required. Preparation of the next SPREP Strategic Plan would be a useful point to develop this more detailed results framework. The framework should guide implementation and facilitate reporting that is based on consultations. From conceptualisation there is a need to clearly identify, for example, the organisational and implementation procedures. Any assumptions that have to be made would have a bearing on achieving results.
133. A challenge for the next Strategic Plan will be for it to give focus and certainty to SPREP's work in the region, while also allowing some flexibility. As noted above, the current Plan effectively locks the Secretariat into a series of Work Programmes that will deliver on the many goals and associated targets in the Plan. The new Plan must enable the SPREP to reflect, in an expeditious manner, new issues, challenges and opportunities, so as those which will come on an annual basis when Leaders identify a small number of initiatives for the region to focus on.
134. The challenge will be even greater if the next Strategic Plan is for ten years, rather than the five years for the current Plan. For a ten year Plan the strategic goals, targets and indicators will also need to be substantially different in nature, as well as in their detail. Despite these challenges, the Review Team supports the Secretariat's preference for a ten year Plan. One major benefit would be the opportunity to work towards, deliver and document tangible outcomes and somewhat longer-term impacts.
135. Greater interconnectedness between the (four) priorities should be a feature of the next Strategic Plan. Currently the priorities are somewhat siloed. Value for money and efficiency would be further enhanced by having the priorities more closely connected.
136. It is important to demonstrate how the priorities in the Strategic Plan link environmental outcomes to sustainable development outcomes, and to broader economic outcomes for the Pacific region. That is, there should be a clear link that demonstrates what SPREP is delivering for the region. This could include impacts for

tourism, agriculture and fisheries, and the sustainable development of the Pacific Ocean and its resources.

137. Thus all priorities in the next Strategic Plan should clearly show how each will promote sustainable economic growth in Member countries and territories. There should also be meaningful reporting of performance, to enable development partners to usefully assess each Strategic Priority's implementation against required benchmarks and aid performance frameworks.
138. Given the importance of addressing the climate change challenge, the next Plan should continue the focus in this area, but with improved coordination with with SPREP Members, and with CROP agencies and other partners.
139. The next Plan should also reflect new and emerging trends and political developments, such as the environmental consequences of deep sea mineral extraction, as well as the regional implications following the recent Washington Oceans Conference. The concept of the Blue Economy is gaining traction amongst SIDS, spearheaded by Seychelles, a possible front runner for the AOSIS chair. Members might wish to consider whether SPREP is well positioned, and ready to play a leading role, should this become a strategic priority.
140. There is a need for more measurable strategic plan goals for action on climate change, so that reporting can accurately reflect achievement/progress towards them, from set baselines. Concerning mitigation, several actions have taken place, but the potential of renewable energy is important and policies and actions towards low carbon development should be enhanced.
141. With respect to climate change threats, SPREP activities could be increased, for example in areas such as ocean acidification, and especially in regards to disaster risk reduction and management. A focus toward resilient development pathways in crucial sectors where SPREP has a comparative advantage, should be the priority for SPREP in its next Strategic Plan.
142. The revised Strategic Plan could reflect the new priorities outlined under the PIMS 2012 – 2021. This would make reporting easier. PIMS priorities are covered in the Strategy, but the targets need to be revised. The PIMS is a vital component to underpin most climate change work, and it is therefore important for SPREP to have a major role in supporting national meteorological services through PIMS and the Pacific Meteorological Desk.
143. Current Strategic Priorities on biodiversity and ecosystem services should be strengthened by giving even more attention to the Strategic Plan of the CBD and its Aichi Targets, including the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on genetic resources. Further efforts to achieve Aichi Target 11 on marine protected areas are advocated by at least some Members. Assessment of the BEMD's Strategic Plan shows a number of targets do not meet the SMART criteria, and need to be changed and made more realistic. There is a need for further discussion with FFA and SPC on MPAs and how these can assist fisheries management - there are differing views on the role and

effectiveness of MPAs in the Pacific islands region and further dialogue is required, including in terms of how MPAs can support and promote sustainable fisheries.

144. Changes that would strengthen targets and indicators are required for both the Environmental Monitoring and Governance Division and the Waste Management and Pollution Control Division. These must better reflect the work of both these Divisions. The current Strategic Plan is poorly linked to the three areas of core business for the Waste Management and Pollution Control Division, namely solid waste, hazardous waste and marine and terrestrial pollution.

5.4 Recommendations

145. The following recommendations are based on findings that will not be further elaborated in subsequent sections of this report:
 9. Further strengthen the public relations capacity of the Communications and Outreach unit of Corporate Services, and increase the use of visual and social media, other communications technologies, and French and other relevant languages to increase awareness in PICTs of the need for, and the benefits of, the assistance and other support provided by SPREP.
 10. Subject to the approval of Members, the Secretariat and Members should adopt and implement as a matter of high priority the proposed integrated approach that is designed to strengthen SPREP's strategic and operational planning and implementation.
 11. With the approval of Members, the Secretariat should implement relatively modest changes that will give greater clarity to the work of the technical Divisions, encourage more inter Divisional work, and achieve a more strategic approach by the Secretariat as a whole.
 12. As part of preparing the next Strategic Plan, and to improve its focus on delivering and reporting on outcomes, the Secretariat should prepare an overall intervention logic which connects the intended higher-level environmental outcomes to the specific outputs of the various work streams of the Secretariat. A useful starting point would be a one page results diagram, which sets out the results chain or intervention logic, with this being supported by a more detailed monitoring and evaluation framework, with indicators, baselines and SMART targets across the different work programmes. Accountabilities for the Secretariat and PICT Members achieving targets would need to clearly laid out.
 13. The next Strategic Plan should guide SPREP's activities for at least ten years, so the Organisation can work towards, deliver and document tangible environmental and related economic and social outcomes as well as somewhat longer-term impacts.

6. Synergies, Linkages and Gaps with other Relevant Regional Strategic Instruments

146. Members and the Secretariat need take account of wider processes currently underway.

147. **Framework for Pacific Regionalism.** Under the new Framework for Pacific Regionalism, three of the eight Pacific regional values to be reflected and upheld in all policy making are of particular relevance to SPREP, namely:
- Sustainable economic development for a better quality of life for all Pacific people;
 - The enduring integrity of Pacific environments, including the vast ocean and land resources; and
 - Effective, enduring, and sustainable partnerships with each other and with others beyond the Pacific islands region.
148. The goal of the Framework is to enhance and stimulate economic growth, sustainable development, good governance and security for Pacific countries through regionalism. The goal leads to four strategic objectives. These are:
- Economic growth that is sustainable, inclusive, and pro-poor;
 - Sustainable development that combines economic, social and cultural development in ways that improve livelihoods and well-being and conserve the environment;
 - Good governance for transparent, accountable and equitable management of all resources; and
 - Security to ensure stable and safe human and political conditions for all.
149. Policy Statements will be developed to support each strategic objective, articulating for each objective the path to deeper integration, the long-term regional goal, intermediate regional goals, and time-bound Strategic Priorities. It will be important for SPREP to be fully engaged in preparing the relevant policy statements, with the lead being taken by the Secretariat, through its Strategic Planning Hub. The Secretariat should also maintain oversight of the preparatory work for other Statements, in order to ensure that the enduring integrity of Pacific environments is never compromised and to also to contribute SPREP's experience and wisdom to the preparation of all Statements.
150. Where relevant SPREP should also ensure it plays a key role in the process of identifying a small number of initiatives for the region to focus on, including policy development, implementation and reporting.
151. **Sustainable Development Goals.** The Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals has proposed 17 action oriented goals that are global in nature and universally applicable. They take into account different national realities, capacities and levels of development and respect national policies and priorities. They build on the foundation laid by the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), seek to complete the unfinished business of the MDGs, and respond to new challenges. The goals constitute an integrated, indivisible set of global priorities for sustainable development. The associated targets, 169 in all, are defined as aspirational global targets, with each government to set its own national targets guided by the global level of ambition, but taking into account national circumstances. The targets will be further elaborated through indicators focused on measurable outcomes. The goals and targets integrate economic, social and environmental aspects and recognize their interlinkages in achieving sustainable development in all its dimensions.

152. The proposed goals are as follows:

1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere
2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture
3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote life-long learning opportunities for all
5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable, and modern energy for all
8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation
10. Reduce inequality within and among countries
11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable
12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
14. Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development
15. Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss
16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels
17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development

153. While all 17 goals have some relevance to SPREP, especially when placed in the Pacific content, Goals 7, 13, 14, 15 and 16 are particularly relevant. Assisting PICT Members to achieve these Goals will require that SPREP embraces its mandate and delivers where it

has a strong comparative advantage and capability. This is all about SPREP delivering environmental outcomes that increased the ability to improve livelihoods and ensure the sustainable economic development of all PICT Members, and the region at large. The Review Team recommends that Members consider how best to align its next Strategic Plan, as well as annual Work Programmes and other action plans, with relevant aspects of the final version of the SDGs.

154. **Outcomes of the Small Islands Developing States Conference 2014.** The draft outcome document of the upcoming third International Conference on Small Island Developing States (SIDS) recognises that managing the natural resource base of economic and social development is one of the overarching objectives of, and essential requirements for, sustainable development. It also reaffirms the need to achieve sustainable development by promoting the integrated and sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystems that support, inter alia, economic, social and human development while facilitating ecosystem conservation, regeneration and restoration and resilience in the face of new and emerging challenges. The SIDS Conference will result in an approved outcome document of relevance to the Secretariat and Members. The Review Team again recommends that Members consider how best to align SPREP's next Strategic Plan, as well as annual Work Programmes and other action plans, with relevant aspects of the SIDS Conference outcome document. Given that the SIDS Conference will take place prior to the 2014 SPREP Meeting, the Review Team suggests that the approved SIDS Conference outcome document be appended to this Report, to facilitate discussions at the SPREP Meeting.
155. **Establishment of the Government of Japan-funded Pacific Climate Change Centre on the SPREP Campus.** PICT Members requested SPREP to develop the Pacific Climate Change Centre (PCCC) to:
 - Ensure a more effective and coordinated approach to climate change in the Pacific region;
 - Strengthen the resilience of Pacific countries to climate change and natural disasters;
 - Ensure better partnerships between countries donors and regional agencies to address climate change; and
 - Greatly improve the level of scientific advice and capacity building for Pacific Island countries on climate change.
156. In early June 2014, SPREP received advice regarding confirmation of Japan's decision to establish the PCCC at SPREP. The initial stage, recruitment of a JICA expert to be based in SPREP for PCCC planning, is already under way.
157. As recommended in the ICR report, the IRT urges that a cost-benefit analysis of this initiative be undertaken as a matter of urgency, in order to ensure that all initial and ongoing costs are identified, and that the initiative is not generating additional financial risk.
158. **Our Ocean Conference.** In June 2014, the US Department of State hosted the “Our Ocean” Conference. It brought together individuals, experts, practitioners, advocates, lawmakers, and the international ocean and foreign policy communities to gather

lessons learned, share the best science, offer unique perspectives, and demonstrate effective actions.

159. The conference resulted in an Our Ocean Action Plan that calls on nations and other stakeholders to take international action to end overfishing in the ocean; prevent illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing; reduce nutrient pollution to the marine environment; reduce marine debris; stem the increase in ocean acidification; create worldwide capability to monitor ocean acidification; create more marine protected areas; and protect coastal ecosystems that provide critical services. Among a set of international commitments made at the conference to protect the ocean, Palau, Kiribati and the Cook Islands announced new commitments to protect the marine environment. U.S. President Obama announced a commitment to protect some of the most precious U.S. marine landscapes. His Administration is considering how it might enhance protection near the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument in the South-Central Pacific Ocean. This contains some of the most pristine tropical marine environments in the world.
160. Some key issues and implications for SPREP from the Our Oceans conference include¹¹:
- The focus of the conference on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs), marine debris, and ocean acidification links with SPREP's expertise and current areas of emphasis; the conference outcomes highlight opportunities for the Secretariat and Members, including the United States, to work more closely together, and with other partners; there is a need for SPREP to better promote its role in these areas, at the national, regional and international levels; and
 - Funding opportunities from both government and foundations sources for these areas are likely to increase in the future; some announcements that are directly relevant to SPREP include: (i) the possibility of increased support from the United States; (ii) support from actor and environmental activist Leonardo DiCaprio of USD 7 million to support ocean conservation programmes, on top of his previous grant of USD 3 million to support sharks, marine mammals, and the protection of key ocean habitat in the Eastern Pacific; and (iii) the Government of Norway support for programmes to address marine debris. SPREP should develop project concepts/proposals in marine conservation and management, in the areas of its mandate, and promote them.
161. Other regional and international initiatives of specific relevance to SPREP include:
- increasing emphasis on integrated responses to climate change and disaster risks, as guided by the proposed SRDP;
 - the Green Climate Fund soon becoming operational;
 - Aichi Targets 2020; and
 - UNFCCC negotiations and the global climate agreement.

6.1 Recommendation

14. Members and the Secretariat should take account of wider policy and planning processes currently underway in the region, and internationally, and consider the

¹¹ Based, in part, on the DG's US Duty Travel Report, 2014.

opportunities these offer for aligning SPREP's work with wider sustainable development considerations. The Review Team recommends that, in particular, Members consider how best to align its next Strategic Plan, as well as annual Work Programmes and other action plans, with relevant aspects of the final version of the Sustainable Development Goals, with the Framework for Pacific Regionalism, and with relevant aspects of the Small Islands Developing States Conference outcome document . Members should instruct the Secretariat accordingly, including how future activities under each of SPREP's Strategic Priorities need to contribute directly to outcomes that improve lives and livelihoods, and the sustainable economic development of the region.

7. Organisational Report Card

162. In its report on the second ICR, the IRT presented an organisational report card that documents the considerable improvements in SPREP's organisational capacity relative to the situation at the time of the first ICR. The Report Card also indicates where efforts might be focused in order to enhance performance still further. including increasing the effectiveness and efficiency of delivering the Strategic Plan,

8. Summary and Consolidated List of Recommendations

163. This report presents and interprets the evidence gathered by an Independent Review Team commissioned by the SPREP Secretariat to undertake the mid-term review of the SPREP Strategic Plan. Interpretation of that evidence leads to several recommendations that are designed to improve effectiveness and efficiency for the remainder of the Plan's lifetime, and to guide preparation of the next strategic plan.
164. This review was undertaken in conjunction with the second Independent Corporate Review. The current review involved acquisition and in-depth assessments of relevant evidence, using participatory approaches. A comprehensive process of engagement with stakeholders ensured the Review Team acquired the evidence and views of key stakeholders regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of implementing the Strategic Plan, and views on preparation, content and implementation of the next strategic plan. Selection of the methods used was based on their comparative advantage to generate useful information when dealing with a specific combination of information provider and information source.
165. The first Independent Corporate Review, conducted in 2008, recommended that SPREP improve its organizational management in such areas as strategic planning. The 2011-2015 Strategic Plan was prepared as part of a wider change management process. Consultations which informed the strategic planning process were the most comprehensive ever undertaken by the Organisation. The Plan was formally adopted at the 21st SPREP Meeting in September 2010. It establishes four Strategic Priorities:
- Climate Change;
 - Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management;
 - Waste Management and Pollution Control; and
 - Environmental Monitoring and Governance.

166. The Plan provides the framework that guides: (i) SPREP's annual work programme and budget through to 2015; (ii) funding of the work programmes; and (iii) monitoring and evaluating implementation of the Plan.
167. Current reporting by the Secretariat is focussed on activities and outputs. Consequently, assessments of effectiveness conducted by the Review Team are necessarily rudimentary, at best. In addition, the reporting does not provide information on the ability for achievements to be sustained beyond SPREP investment. Thus it is impossible for the Review Team to determine whether outcomes that have been, or will be achieved, can indeed be sustained.
168. Due to the lack of the required baseline information, and because the current reports do not include information on environment and related outcomes, the Review Team's assessments of efficiency can amount to no more than qualitative judgements based on expert opinion. The assessments of relevance are more robust since they amount to determining if the Secretariat is delivering services and assistance consistent with the Strategic Plan.
169. Two targets of the climate change Strategic Priorities for 2011-2015 have been 100% achieved, with eleven targets 70%-90% achieved and one 20% achieved. While some of the targets do have an outcome dimension, all the indicators used and the results reported focus on activities and outputs.
170. Four targets of the biodiversity and ecosystem management Strategic Priorities of the 2011-2015 Strategic Plan have been 100% achieved, with seven targets 50%-80% achieved. Similarly for this Division, some of the targets do have an outcome dimension, but all the indicators used and the results reported focus on activities and outputs.
171. Eight of the eleven targets of the Strategic Priorities related to waste management and pollution control for 2011-2015 have been 50-100% achieved. Many of the targets and even some of the indicators have some outcome aspects, but to date the results are described in terms of activities and outputs.
172. Two of the targets of the environmental monitoring and governance Strategic Priorities for 2011-2015 have been 100% achieved, four 75% achieved, eight 50% achieved and two 25% achieved. All these targets are activity or output based. Some of the targets could be interpreted as outcomes, but the associated indicators ensure that results are reported only as activities and outputs.
173. Overall, while the 2015 goals for specific strategies under each of the four Strategic Priorities have a focus on delivering relevant environmental outcomes, many targets and almost all of the indicators are leading to the reporting having a focus on activities and outputs. One result is a high number of targets being achieved, or almost achieved only mid way through the life of the Strategic Plan. This has a tendency to exaggerate effectiveness.
174. In the first three years of delivering the Strategic Plan the Divisions have, collectively, disbursed 43% of the funding they will receive over the six-year life of the Plan. An

analysis of performance in meeting the Strategic Plan targets suggests a commendable level of efficiency.

175. An analysis of funds disbursed by the technical Divisions shows wide individual variances between budgeted and disbursed amounts. While total expenditures by a Division have varied from budgeted amounts by as much as 24%, for the four technical Divisions combined the variance is considerably less, at 6%. For some Divisions personnel costs are a very high portion of overall disbursements, and well above the average of 30% for all the technical Divisions combined. Since the budgets of Divisions tend to be dominated by project funding there is little incentive to share financial resources between Divisions in ways that would result in cost savings for administration and project management.
176. A majority of questionnaire respondents regionally, consider that SPREP is responding adequately to the prioritised needs of their country or territory. Similarly, a majority consider that the targets in the current Strategic Plan are appropriate, at least to a certain extent. Generally they need to be strengthened. This would involve a greater focus on outcomes and impacts, and the use of SMART indicators.
177. The main resourcing challenges related to implementing the Strategic Plan are heavy reliance on project-based funding, much of the work undertaken by the Secretariat has elements of being supply driven and the distribution of financial resources across the four technical divisions not being well rationalised. Disbursements by the four technical divisions between 2011 and 2013 were proportionally as follows: Climate Change, 55%; Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management, 26%; Waste Management and Pollution Control, 10% and Environmental Monitoring and Governance, 9%. As climate change is frequently identified as the most serious threat to the region, relatively greater expenditure by this Division may well be justified. Since that Division is closest to achieving its Strategic Plan targets, an argument could be made for proportionately less investment by this Division going forward. Based on the budget for 2014, there is little sign that this redistribution is occurring.
178. Many of the existing targets will be achieved well before 2016. But since they are activity and outputs focussed there is currently no way of telling if the associated goals will also be achieved. The most logical, though not overly practical approach, would be to revise the targets, taking the opportunity to make them SMART and capable of showing outcomes and impacts, as well as their sustainability in the longer term.
179. An alternative would be to assume, unwisely, that the goals are achieved once the current targets are achieved. Under such a scenario, available resources could then be shifted to ensure the remaining targets are achieved. This would be problematic when there is a high dependency on less flexible project-based funding.
180. The Secretariat must develop a plan that enables it to manage the diversity of funding sources and the predictability of funding, as well as the distribution of funding across the Divisions. This can form part of a business plan. It could also include details of how SPREP plans to go about its business. Such planning determines how successful SPREP will be in the future, in terms of delivering environmental and related benefits to the Pacific.

181. There is a need for an overarching framework showing how all four technical Divisions, both individually and collectively, deliver a programme of work that is in line with the focus. SPREP should place greater emphasis on work programmes and activities that reflect common environmental challenges, and avoid areas where other agencies have more capability. For example, SPREP has an important role to play in ocean resource management. In this respect it should integrate with, but not encroach on, the work of SPC and FFA.
182. The Review Team proposes an integrated approach designed to strengthen strategic and operational planning and implementation. Reporting on the state of the environment of PICT Members will inform reporting on the state of the regional environment. As proposed in the report on the second ICR, the latter will also be informed by the Secretariat's PMERs and associated assessments of needs. These, along with lessons learned, would be reflected in the new Strategic Plan and in the Annual Work Programmes and Budgets for SPREP.
183. There needs to be improved balance across the four Strategic Priorities in terms of funding and resourcing. The four Strategic Priorities need to be more interconnected. Going forward, it will be important that the priorities are clearly linked to outcomes that improve livelihoods and the sustainable economic development of the region - for example, tourism initiatives, food security and oceans resource management. This will be particularly relevant to the biodiversity and ecosystem management pillar, which should benefit from re-balanced funding.
184. It is important that Corporate Services be included in the next Plan. The current four Strategic Goals are still considered to be appropriate priority goals for SPREP going forward. There is a need for the next Strategic Plan to be more outcomes, rather than outputs, focussed, with the added challenge of being able to demonstrate if the outcomes will be sustained once SPREP assistance ceases.
185. A challenge for the next strategic plan will be for it to give focus and certainty to SPREP's work in the region, while also allowing some flexibility. The current Plan effectively locks the Secretariat into a series of Work Programmes that will deliver on the many goals and associated targets in the Plan. The new Plan must enable the SPREP to reflect, in an expeditious manner, new issues, challenges and opportunities, so as those which will come on an annual basis when Leaders identify a small number of initiatives for the region to focus on.
186. Greater interconnectedness between the (four) priorities should be a feature of the next Strategic Plan. Currently the priorities are somewhat siloed. Value for money and efficiency would be further enhanced by having the priorities more closely connected.
187. It is important to demonstrate how the priorities in the Strategic Plan link environmental outcomes to sustainable development outcomes, and to broader economic outcomes for the Pacific region. That is, there should be a clear link that demonstrates what SPREP is delivering for the region. This could include impacts for tourism, agriculture and fisheries, and the sustainable development of the Pacific Ocean and its resources.

188. Thus all priorities in the next Strategic Plan should clearly show how each will promote sustainable economic growth in Member countries and territories. There should also be meaningful reporting of performance, to enable development partners to usefully assess each Strategic Priority's implementation against required benchmarks and aid performance frameworks.
189. The next Plan should also reflect new and emerging trends and political developments, such as the environmental consequences of deep sea mineral extraction and the concept of the Blue Economy.
190. To provide an overview of the considerable improvements in SPREP's organisational capacity relative to the situation at the time of the first Corporate Review, and to provide a point of reference against which future progress can be measured, the Review Team prepared an organisational capacity report card for SPREP. It highlights the tremendous improvements in SPREP's organisational capacity and overall performance, as well as indicating where effort might be focused in order to enhance performance still further.

Recommendations

191. Following is a consolidated list of recommendations arising from this second mid-term review of SPREP's Strategic Plan. These recommendations should be considered and implemented in concert with those that have resulted from the second Independent Corporate Review of SPREP. In both cases, the recommendations are clear as to where the responsibility lies for their implementation - Members, the Secretariat or the entire Organisation.
-
1. The Secretariat should continue to enhance collaboration and strengthen cooperation with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community, and other agencies that work across the region on climate change and related areas.
 2. The Secretariat should ensure that programme and project planning and implementation is more transparent, and consistent with the best practices of other development partners, including contributions by and disbursements to PICT Members being confirmed prior to final project approval, as well as being identified in the Work Programme and Budget.
 3. Strengthen the performance monitoring, evaluation and reporting process in ways that will allow the Secretariat to report annually: (i) on progress towards achieving the planned outcomes and impacts achieved, and as well as their sustainability, as a result of activities it has undertaken, either individually or through partnerships; and (ii) by Division and for SPREP as a whole, on the efficiency and relevance of the activities undertaken by each Division, and by SPREP as a whole.
 4. The Secretariat should ensure that assumptions and risks are clearly identified In the Work Programme and Budget and in the performance monitoring and evaluation reports, to strengthen the overall analysis of progress and achievements in delivering the Strategic Plan.

5. With support and advice from Members, the Secretariat should ensure that there are strong linkages between relevant strategic goals in the new Framework for Pacific Regionalism and SPREP's Strategic Priorities.
6. The Secretariat should begin a dialogue with Members as to how it might increase the flexibility of the Strategic Plan, and its associated Work Programmes, so as to better reflect new and emerging issues the Organisation should address in the immediate future.
7. Consistent with the agreed monitoring and evaluation framework in the Strategic Plan, PICT Members should be more committed to monitoring and providing annual reports on their progress in implementing their components of SPREP's Work Programmes, including assessing the extent to which SPREP programming is supporting Member priorities as outlined in relevant policy and planning documents. In turn, the Secretariat should be more proactive in encouraging and supporting PICT Members to report in this way.
8. The Secretariat should prepare and implement a Business Plan that includes, amongst other considerations, provisions to manage the diversity of partnerships and funding sources, the predictability of funding, and guidance on new project funding as well as on the distribution of funding across the Divisions.
9. Further strengthen the public relations capacity of the Communications and Outreach unit of Corporate Services, and increase the use of visual and social media, other communications technologies, and French and other relevant languages to increase awareness in PICTs of the need for, and the benefits of, the assistance and other support provided by SPREP.
10. Subject to the approval of Members, the Secretariat and Members should adopt and implement as a matter of high priority the proposed integrated approach that is designed to strengthen SPREP's strategic and operational planning and implementation.
11. With the approval of Members, the Secretariat should implement relatively modest changes that will give greater clarity to the work of the technical Divisions, encourage more inter Divisional work, and achieve a more strategic approach by the Secretariat as a whole.
12. As part of preparing the next Strategic Plan, and to improve its focus on delivering and reporting on outcomes, the Secretariat should prepare an overall intervention logic which connects the intended higher-level environmental outcomes to the specific outputs of the various work streams of the Secretariat. A useful starting point would be a one page results diagram, which sets out the results chain or intervention logic, with this being supported by a more detailed monitoring and evaluation framework, with indicators, baselines and SMART targets across the different work programmes. Accountabilities for the Secretariat and PICT Members achieving targets would need to be clearly laid out.
13. The next Strategic Plan should guide SPREP's activities for at least ten years, so the Organisation can work towards, deliver and document tangible environmental and related economic and social outcomes as well as somewhat longer-term impacts.
14. Members and the Secretariat should take account of wider policy and planning processes currently underway in the region, and internationally, and consider the opportunities these offer for aligning SPREP's work with wider sustainable development considerations. The Review Team recommends that, in particular, Members consider

how best to align its next Strategic Plan, as well as annual Work Programmes and other action plans, with relevant aspects of the final version of the Sustainable Development Goals, with the Framework for Pacific Regionalism, and with relevant aspects of the Small Islands Developing States Conference outcome document¹². Members should instruct the Secretariat accordingly, including how future activities under each of SPREP's Strategic Priorities need to contribute directly to outcomes that improve lives and livelihoods, and the sustainable economic development of the region.

¹² The Review Team suggests that the approved SIDS Conference outcome document be appended to this Report, to facilitate discussions at the 25th SPREP Meeting.

Annex 1

Terms of Reference for the Reviews

Scope of Reviews

1. Second Independent Corporate Review

Assess the overall performance of the Secretariat over the last 5 years, and in particular the progress undertaken to address the recommendations of the 2008 1st ICR endorsed by the 19th SPREP Meeting, with specific reference to:

- The Secretariat's performance over the last five years against stated objectives, 2011-2015 Strategic Plan, and other SPREP Member mandates and directives.
- SPREP's corporate systems and processes and their effectiveness.
- The impact of SPREP activities in achieving environmental outcomes and how this is integrated into work programmes and contributes to national and regional development.
- A participatory/consultative process with members and key stakeholders of the quality of services provided in terms of timeliness, quality of technical and advisory services, and results of capacity building support.
- The level of financial and technical resources that the Secretariat needs to service its members, deliver its strategic priorities and support its core functions.
- Related current regional initiatives and analysis of implications for the role/mandates of SPREP in the region as a CROP organisation, including the consistency of mandates relative to SPREP strategic priorities.
- Developing a revised job description for the Director General, taking into account the feedback from members at the 24th SPREP Meeting.
- Recommendations for moving forward

2. Mid-term Review of SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015

In conjunction with the 2nd ICR, undertake a mid-term review of the current strategic plan as required in the plan. Specifically to assess:

- The effectiveness, as measured by agreed indicators defined in the plan, of delivery against the goals and targets in the Strategic Plan.
- The relevance of the priorities and targets identified in the Strategic Plan to guide the ongoing implementation of the plan to 2015, and to inform the formulation of the next Strategic Plan.
- Challenges and issues encountered in implementing the Strategic Plan, including effectiveness of member and partner engagement.
- Extent to which the Secretariat is working in synergy with SPREP members to achieve the agreed priorities and targets of the plan and sustainable outcomes.
- Identify and review synergies, linkages and gaps with other relevant regional strategic instruments, with particular regard to formulation of the next Strategic Plan.
- Recommendations for improving delivery of the Strategic Plan during 2014-2015, including identification of any priorities and targets that require focused support (technical, financial, collaboration, etc) to ensure their achievement.

Specific Tasks: Consultant

The specific tasks of the consultancy shall include, but will not necessarily be limited to:

- (i) Consult with Pacific Island countries and Territories (PICTs) and Partners/ donors in participatory approaches and ensuring that relevant and adequate information is received;
- (ii) Travel to Australia and New Zealand to consult with relevant Government officials with a view to soliciting their views;
- (iii) Provide a synthesis of key inputs from consultations with SPREP Members, partners and donors;
- (iv) Consult and work closely with the SPREP secretariat in finalising key inputs in the development of a draft report;
- (v) Provide the SPREP Secretariat with a draft report containing recommendations to Members and the SPREP Secretariat
- (vi) Provide assistance and/or clarification of the report to SPREP Members at the 25th SPREP Meeting in Tonga from 29 September - 3 October 2014, as required.

Specific Tasks: SPREP

SPREP will provide support to the Consultant in the implementation of the Agreement including, but not limited to the following actions:

- (i) supplying requested documentation, and other information, in a timely manner, consistent with the agreed timetable
- (ii) dealing with all logistics and related matters for the Regional Workshop;
- (iii) providing feedback on draft reports in a timely manner; and
- (iv) establishing and operationalising the SPREP Steering Committee and the Review Reference Group.

Deliverables

The Deliverables under this Agreement are:

- 1 A report of the Second Independent Corporate Review of SPREP
- 2 A report of the Mid-Term Review of SPREP Strategic Plan 2011 -2015

Annex 2

List of Reports

Report on Planning Meeting

Mid Review Report

Report on Views of Stakeholders

Draft Final Reports

Final Reports

Annex 3

List of Stakeholders Consulted

Polynesia Sub-region

American Samoa

- NOAA National Weather Services
- Dept of Commerce (Coastal Zone Mgmt
- Dept of Marine and Wildlife

Cook Islands (ES, OPM, CC, DRM)

- National Environment Service
- Office of the Prime Minister
- Cook Islands Climate Change and Disaster Management Division
- Ministry of Marine Resource
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Marine Park NGO
- Te Ipukarea Society
- Cook islands Marine Park
- Natural Heritage
- Shark Conservation
- Kakiore Project
- Marine Resources
- National Council of Women
- Meteorological Service
- Red Cross
- Disaster Management
- Maureen Hilyard (consultant for NES)
- Teina McKenzie Marine Park
- Cook islands Chamber of Commerce

Niue Government

Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources

Tokelau

Tonga

- Tonga Civil Society
- Tonga Development Trust

Tuvalu

- EKT - Tafue Lusama
- Kaupule Funafuti - Uluao Lauti
- TANGO
- TNCW

USP Cook Islands

Nat. Univ. Samoa (4 individuals)

PIPSO

Pacific Legislatures for Population and Governance (PLPG INC)

UNDP MCO Samoa

Micronesia Sub-region

FSM:

- Office of Environment and Emergency Management – SPREP (GEF, etc...) Focal Point and assistant
- Department of Resources and Development – CBD and Micronesia Challenge Focal Point
- Department of Foreign Affairs – SPREP Focal Point
- College of Micronesia – FSM Marine Lab
- Pohnpei State EPA – State SPREP Focal Point
- Chuuk State EPA – State SPREP Focal Point
- Yap State EPA – State SPREP Focal Point
- Kosrae Island Resources Management Authority – State SPREP Focal Point

Palau:

- Office of Environmental Response and Coordination - SPREP Focal Point
- Bureau of Agriculture - Invasive Species Expert/Coordinator
- Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism – Micronesia Challenge Focal Point and staff
- Palau Community College Natural Resources & Environmental Education Division
- SPREP Stakeholders Meeting Participant

RMI:

- Office of Environment Planning and Policy Coordination – SPREP and Micronesia Challenge Focal Point
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Micronesia Challenge Assistant to the Focal Point
- Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority
- Marshall Island Environment Protection Agency
- College of the Marshall Islands Office of the Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs
- TROIKA member and SPREP Fiji Stakeholders Meeting Participant

CNMI:

- CNMI Department of Environmental Quality – SPREP Focal Point
- SPREP Stakeholders Meeting Participant

Guam:

- Guam EPA – SPREP Focal Point and assistant
- Guam Water Works – Micronesia Challenge Focal Point
- Ayuda Foundation – MCT Board member/community advocate
- University of Guam Marine Lab – Micronesia Challenge support group

Kiribati:

- SPREP Stakeholders Meeting Participant
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Environment – SPREP Focal Points

Nauru:

- SPREP Focal Point/TROIKA/SPREP Stakeholders Meeting Participant

Other Stakeholders:

- Micronesia Challenge Steering Committee Members
- Micronesians in Island Conservation Peer Learning Network Members – 25 environmental leaders in the Micronesia Sub-region from government and NGOs
- Pacific Islands Managed and Protected Areas Community and Micronesia Locally Managed and Protected Areas Network – on the ground conservation and environment project managers from government and NGOs
- The Nature Conservancy Micronesia Program management
- SPC North Representative and staff
- Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission head and staff
- Island Conservation Pacific Staff
- Global Island Partnership (GLISPA)
- RARE Micronesia Staff
- Pew Charitable Trusts Micronesia Shark Campaign staff

Melanesian Sub-region

University of Papua New Guinea

National University of Fiji Schools of Agriculture, Fisheries and Animal Science

Fiji University

South Pacific Tourism Organisation (SPTO)

Fiji School of Medicine (FSM)

Pacific Disability Forum (PDF)

Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International (FPSI)

Pacific Islands News Association (PINA)

Pacific Council of Churches (PCC)

Pacific Youth Council (PYC)

Pacific Foundation for the Advancement of Women (PACFAW)

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale (GIZ)

Pacific Regional NGO's (PRINGO)

Pacific Islands Association of Non Government Organisations (PIANGO)

Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG)

United Nations Development Programme Multi - Country Office (UNDP MCO) Fiji

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) – Solomon Islands

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) - Vanuatu

Fiji

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ministry of Environment

Ministry of Local Government and Housing

Solomon Islands

Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Ministry of Environment Conservation and Meteorology

Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock

Ministry of Fisheries

National Disaster Centre

Meteorological Services

Vanuatu

Department of Foreign Affairs
Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources
Department of Environment Protection and Conservation
Papua New Guinea
Department of Foreign Affairs
Department of Environment Protection and Conservation

French Territory Members

French Polynesia
New Caledonia
Wallis and Futuna

Metropolitan Members and their Governmental and Relevant NGO Constituencies

Australia
France
New Zealand
United States of America
United Kingdom

SPREP

Secretariat - SMT, administrative and programme staff, Review Liaison Committee, Review Reference Group, Troika

Non-member Countries

Japan
China

Regional and International Organisations

ACFID
Act for Peace
Adaptation Fund Board
Asian Development Bank
Australian Volunteers
Basel Convention Regional Centre for Asia and the Pacific
BirdLife Int.
Care
Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre
Caritas
Commonwealth Secretariat
Conservation International
European Union
Food and Agriculture Organisation
Global Environment Facility
Greenpeace

Int. Coral Reef Initiative
Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission
International Maritime Organisation
International Whaling Commission
Island Conservation
IUCN
Live and Learn
NOAA
OceansWatch Int
Oxfam
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
Pacific Meteorological Council
Red Cross
Secretariat for the Basel Convention
Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity
Secretariat for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
Secretariat for the Convention on Migratory Species
Secretariat for the Ramsar Convention
Secretariat for the Rotterdam Convention
Secretariat for the Stockholm Convention
Secretariat for the UNFCCC
Secretariat of the Pacific Community
SIDSNet
TEAR
UN Habitat
UNEP
UNESCO
UNICEF
UNITAR
University of the South Pacific
VOICE
VSA
Water Aid
Wetlands International
WHO
WMO
World Bank
World Vision
WVI
WWF

Individuals

Harold Hillman
HE. Dr. Leiataua Kilifoti Eteuati
Neville Koop
Pene Lefale
Peter Adams