

Report of the 21st SPREP Meeting of Officials and High Level Ministerial Segment

6 – 9 September 2010
Madang, Papua New Guinea



Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)

SPREP Library/IRC Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

SPREP Meeting (21st : 2010 : Madang, Papua New Guinea)

Report of the Twenty First SPREP Meeting, 6 – 9
September 2010, Madang, Papua New Guinea. – Apia, Samoa :
SPREP, 2011.

p. cm.

ISBN: 978-982-04-0412-0

1. Environmental policy – Oceania – Congresses.
2. Conservation of natural resources – Oceania – Congresses.
3. Environmental protection – Oceania – Congresses. I. Pacific Regional Environment Programme. II. Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). III. Title.

363.7099

Report on the 21st SPREP Meeting of Officials

and

High Level Ministerial Segment

**6 – 9 September 2010
Madang, Papua New Guinea**



Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
PO Box 240, Apia, Samoa
Telephone: (685) 21 929
Fax: (685) 20 231
Email: sprep@sprep.org
Website: www.sprep.org

Table of Contents

Officials Meeting

Opening and Introduction	1
Agenda Item 1: Official Opening	1
Agenda Item 2: Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair	1
Agenda Item 3: Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures.....	2
Agenda Item 4: Action Taken on Matters Arising from Twentieth SPREP Meeting	2
Agenda Item 5: 2009 Overview.....	2
5.1 Presentation of Annual Report for 2009 and Director’s Overview of Progress since the 20 th SPREP Meeting.....	2
5.2 Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the 2009 Annual Work Programme and Budget	4
5.3 Audited Annual Accounts for 2009.....	7
Agenda Item 6: Institutional Reform and Strategic Issues	7
6.1 SPREP Strategic Plan 2011 - 2015.....	7
6.2 ICR and EC Assessment Follow up	10
6.3 Regional Institutional Framework (RIF) Update	11
Agenda Item 7: Strategic Financial Issues.....	11
7.1 Report on Members’ Contributions	11
Agenda Item 8: Regional Conventions	11
8.1 Report on the Conference of the Parties to the Noumea Convention	12
8.2 Report on the Conference of the Parties to the Waigani Convention	13
Agenda Item 9: 2011 Work Programme and Budget	13
9.1 Island Ecosystems Programme	13
9.1.1 Regional Marine Species Programme.....	13
9.1.2 CBD COP10 preparations	14
9.2 Pacific Futures Programme	15
9.2.1 PIFACC Mid-Term Review	15
9.2.2 Review of Regional Meteorological Services.....	17
9.2.3 Directions in the UNFCCC Process	19
9.2.4 Global Environment Facility (GEF) developments and issues in the Pacific	21
9.2.5 Waste Reduction and Pollution Prevention.....	23
9.3 Consideration and Approval of Proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2011.....	24
Agenda Item 10: Corporate Services	25
10.1 New Salary Banding Model.....	25
10.2 Annual Market Data	27
10.3 Appointment of the SPREP Director – proposed revisions.....	27
10.4 Appointment of Auditors.....	28

10.5	Amendments to Staff Regulations.....	28
10.6	Report by the Director on Staff Appointment Beyond 6 years	29
Agenda Item 11: Items Proposed by Members		29
11.1	Mainstreaming Invasive Species and Biodiversity – A paper by New Caledonia	29
11.2	Streamlined reporting by Pacific Island countries to the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements – final report – A paper by Australia	30
11.3	Country Profiles – Exchange of Information by Members on year of Biodiversity	30
Agenda Item 12: Regional Cooperation.....		31
12.1	CROP Executives Meeting Report.....	31
Agenda Item 13: Statements by Observers		31
Agenda Item 14: Other Business		31
 <u>Annexes</u>		
Annex I:	List of Participants.....	32
Annex II:	SPREP Director’s Opening Remarks.....	47
Annex III:	Opening Remarks by Hon. Minister of Environment and Conservation of PNG – Hon. Benny Allen.....	50
Annex IV:	Agenda	54
Annex V:	SPREP Director’s Annual Report – Summary.....	56
Annex VI:	Observer Statements	61
 <u>High Level Ministerial Segment</u>		
Summary of Discussions		83
Agenda Item 15.1:	Welcome ceremony for Ministers	83
Agenda Item 15.2:	Introduction to Meeting	83
Agenda Item 15.3:	Environmental Financing	83
Agenda Item 15.4:	Climate Change	84
Agenda Item 15.5:	Recommendations from the Officials Meeting	86
Agenda Item 15.6:	Strategic Plan	88
Agenda Item 15.7:	Madang Communiqué	88
Agenda Item 16:	Date and venue of Twenty-Second SPREP Meeting	89
Agenda Item 17:	Close	89
Attachment I:	Opening Address by Hon. Minister of Environment and Conservation of PNG – Hon. Benny Allen	90
Attachment II:	Keynote Address by GEF	91
Attachment III:	Statement by Hon. Minister of Natural Resources and Environment of Samoa – Hon. Faumuina Tiatia Liuga	94
Attachment IV:	Madang Communiqué	98

Opening and Introduction

1. The Twenty-first SPREP Meeting (21SM) was convened in Madang, Papua New Guinea from 6 to 10 September 2010. Representatives of the following SPREP countries and territories attended: American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), Fiji, France, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States of America (USA) and Vanuatu. Observers from a range of regional, international and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) also attended.

A list of participants is contained in **Annex I**.

Agenda Item 1: Official Opening

2. The 21SM was officially opened on Monday 6 September, 2010. Master of Ceremony, Mr Kosi Latu, Deputy Director of SPREP, welcomed delegates to the 21SM and invited Mr Robert Rage to open the Meeting with a prayer. Mr Rage reminded delegates of their role in managing their natural environment and encouraged them to bear this in mind during their deliberations.

3. Mr David Sheppard, Director of SPREP, welcomed delegates and partners to the Meeting, noting that the full agenda reflected a busy and active past year and ambitious future plans designed to refocus the organisation to better serve the SPREP Members.

4. The Director drew attention to the new Strategic Plan to guide the organisation's work over the next five years and invited Members to provide guidance on the Plan and the SPREP vision during the week.

The Director's address is contained in **Annex II**.

5. The Chief Guest and keynote speaker, Minister for Environment and Conservation of Papua New Guinea, Hon Benny Allen MP, welcomed all delegates to Papua New Guinea and to the 21SM. He observed that this was a special meeting as it was the first time it was being hosted in PNG. The Minister acknowledged the regional coordinating role of the Secretariat but urged the organisation to be more visible and participatory at the national level in order to better assist countries with addressing their national needs.

The Minister's keynote address is contained in **Annex III**.

Agenda Item 2: Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair

6. The current Chair of the SPREP Meeting, Kiribati, represented by Mr Farran Redfern, called the meeting to order and advised on the Rules of Procedure for the SPREP Meeting.

7. The Meeting, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, **confirmed** Papua New Guinea, represented by Dr Wari Iamo, as Chair and Tonga, represented by Mr Asipeli Palaki, as Vice-Chair.

8. The outgoing Chair thanked the Secretariat for its support to Kiribati over the past year, noting that Kiribati had enjoyed working with the Secretariat on several issues. He acknowledged the positive progress made in implementing the recommendations of the last SPREP Meeting.

9. PNG took the Chair and thanked the Meeting for his election to Chair. He noted the full agenda and outlined a list of ground-

rules to help ensure a smooth meeting. He then called the Meeting to order.

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures

10. Various representatives requested clarification on a number of agenda items to which the Secretariat responded.

11. On Agenda Item 6.1 on the Strategic Plan, the Director advised that the informal meeting held in the previous week had proposed that a working group be established on this matter. Major discussion on the Plan would be deferred until the working group had met. All key issues discussed at the informal meeting had been summarised and provided to delegates together with all written comments received earlier.

12. On Agenda Item 15, relating to the High Level Segment, the Director advised that the Secretariat was acting on recommendations from the 20SM which had directed that (a) the Ministerial meeting be part of the SPREP meeting; and (b) the Ministerial meeting focus only on those issues of major importance and be more strategic. As a result, two key issues of environmental financing and climate change had been identified for discussion at the High Level Segment. Rather than formal recommendations, roundtable discussions would be held. A communiqué would be developed from the officials' segment to the high level segment.

13. The Meeting:

- **adopted** the Revised Agenda (contained in **Annex IV**) and its proposed hours and programme of work;

- **noted** that an open-ended working group on the Strategic Plan would be established; and
- **appointed** an open-ended Report Drafting Committee comprising of a core group of representatives from American Samoa, Australia, FSM, France, New Zealand, PNG, Tokelau and USA, with the Vice-Chair (Tonga) chairing the Committee.

Agenda Item 4: Action Taken on Matters Arising from Twentieth SPREP Meeting

14. The Director referred to a summary of the 29 actions undertaken in response to requests from the 20SM for follow-up. He noted that considerable progress was made against every item, and that many items had been completed.

15. The Cook Islands extended its thanks to the Secretariat, and indicated it would be in a position to work further with SPREP on asbestos management in 2011.

16. The Meeting:

- **noted** the paper and actions taken by the Secretariat on the decisions of the 20SM.

Agenda Item 5: 2009 Overview

5.1: Presentation of the Director's Annual Report for 2009 and Overview of Progress since the Twentieth SPREP Meeting

17. The Director tabled the Annual Report for 2009 and presented his overview of progress since the 20SM. He referred to the past year and a half as a period of change for both the Pacific environment and for the work of the Secretariat. The Director

highlighted progress against four guiding principles:

- the improved delivery of tangible services to and engagement with Members, and increased investments in areas of priority to Members;
- the change management process to improve the Secretariat's internal processes, which has continued into the strategic planning consultations of 2010;
- strengthened partnerships with other regional organisations and donors' growing confidence and levels of investment in SPREP; and
- improved links between policy and practical in-country work and science.

The full text of the Director's summary is available as **Annex V**.

18. Tonga called on the Secretariat to focus more on improving service delivery to national governments. The representative suggested that the other three guiding principles were less significant, as they relate to the internal processes of the Secretariat. He also suggested that Member countries should have a more proactive role in evaluating the performance of the Secretariat, as their views were more important than the reviews by external groups such as the European Commission (EC). The Secretariat confirmed that while the external reviews were a feature of recent years, in coming years under the new Strategic Plan the focus will be on mainstreaming the reforms endorsed by Members and improving service delivery. Furthermore, the three principles were crucial components in ensuring that the Secretariat was enabled to carry out its increased support to Members.

19. France commended the internal reforms which have improved the efficiency

of the Secretariat and resulted in improved staff morale. The representative noted that the report was clear evidence that SPREP is headed in the right direction.

20. PNG acknowledged the efforts of SPREP to consult Members on their priority needs for assistance and requested that capacity building consider tailor made approaches that accommodate the different circumstances of different countries.

21. Samoa welcomed the achievements, but noted that there were also many aspects of the Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report (PMER) – particularly in leveraging financial assistance from donors – that showed no activity. Samoa suggested that this might be because SPREP has, in the past, built the capacity of Members to access these resources and that Members are therefore no longer requesting this assistance of the Secretariat.

22. New Caledonia congratulated the Secretariat for responding to the Independent Corporate Review (ICR) and EC assessment by integrating the recommendations into its operations. New Caledonia also welcomed the well-framed Strategic Plan and vision, which would improve the transparency of SPREP's work and its links with scientific and technical input. The representative welcomed the opportunity for territories to contribute, particularly on cross-cutting issues such as climate change and biodiversity.

23. Tuvalu emphasised the importance of delivering on-ground activities, particularly relating to protecting vulnerable populations from the adverse impacts of climate change. While assessments and legislative support were important there was a need to ensure that these resulted in action on the ground.

24. French Polynesia commended the report and advised they were extremely satisfied with the progress of the Secretariat.

25. The Meeting **adopted** the 2009 Annual Report.

5.2: Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report (PMER) on the 2009 Work Programme and Budget

26. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the Secretariat presented a summary of progress with the implementation of the SPREP work programme, through its internal Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report (PMER) for 2009. The PMER provides a tool for the Secretariat to identify emerging issues and challenges and make necessary adjustments in its work programme. The Secretariat advised that capacity development, education and communication and knowledge management are cross-cutting areas that support the delivery of work under the two programme areas in addition to having specific activities under the work programme and budget. Key activities under the Secretariat's thematic areas (environmental governance; climate change; species conservation and management; ecosystem management; and pollution and waste management), including the cross-cutting areas, were outlined and highlighted in the presentation.

27. The Secretariat noted that there had been increases in work done in areas of climate change, pollution and waste management, and ecosystem management, reflecting Member needs. Work on species management had decreased significantly, mainly due to the lack of personnel in that particular area and lack of requests from countries on species conservation.

28. Although activity in territories had increased, this was still lower than in countries, possibly due to the fact that territories often are not eligible for some of the funding provided by donors. Additionally, it was suggested that perhaps territories also do not make requests of the Secretariat because they receive financial and other support from their metropolitan counterparts.

29. The Secretariat acknowledged with gratitude the many donors to the work of SPREP and provided an outline of the disbursements to Members in 2009. The Secretariat highlighted that while funding in general had increased, there had been no increase in core funds to the organisation in the past year. Fund-raising efforts of the Secretariat and specific proposals were also outlined.

30. The Secretariat advised the Meeting that in general, it had strengthened work with partners, increased donor funding and disbursements to countries, and increased its activities in waste and pollution.

31. Niue thanked the Secretariat for its comprehensive report and acknowledged the assistance of the Secretariat to Niue in areas of invasive species, persistent organic pollutants (POPs) and waste management, particularly the disposal of asbestos. The representative also thanked the Secretariat for its assistance with developing its national solid waste management strategy and acknowledged the support and contribution of the Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC) project in addressing climate change issues.

32. French Polynesia concurred with the comments by Niue.

33. Samoa acknowledged the work of the Secretariat and noted that it had received

assistance with preparing and submitting its 4th National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). However, he observed that other Members still required this assistance. He noted that there were areas of inactivity in the PMER and that these needed to be addressed. He highlighted invasive species as a major issue for Samoa in the protection of biodiversity and noted that a regional programme was yet to be finalised. He acknowledged with appreciation, the Aleipata rat eradication programme and programmes for protection of marine areas as well as other conservation programmes with SPREP and other partners. He also acknowledged PACC as an important programme supporting Samoa's work in climate change. He noted with appreciation, the availability of specific Pacific briefings for climate change conferences and asked that this be continued. He urged members to support common positions in COP meetings. The representative also raised the issue of lengthy gaps in recruitment of key staff positions, noting that suitable acting positions should be established in these cases to ensure the Secretariat could continue its work unhindered. The support by the GEF Adviser at SPREP was duly noted and appreciated. He further asked that in the future, the PMER consider looking at reporting on impacts and outcomes rather than on activities of the Secretariat.

34. Fiji requested that prior planning be done with countries to ensure coordination of in-country activities across the programmes. He also asked that SPREP provide Members with science-based advice to better inform country activities and requested a report at the next SPREP Meeting. The representative further requested that the Secretariat assist new focal and operational points with familiarising themselves on issues such as the GEF and urged SPREP to assist members with developing practical projects on the Clean

Development Mechanism (CDM). On marine pollution, he observed that the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) was promoting the Pacific Ocean 2020 Challenge and he asked that consideration be given to linking such initiatives to ensure best use of resources. Fiji also raised the issue of limited personnel in the Secretariat and suggested that in the area of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), countries with experience and expertise could be approached to assist others needing assistance.

35. PNG acknowledged assistance of the Secretariat in conducting training in EIA and mining risk management. He asked that risk management be included in all EIA training. He asked for SPREP assistance with a review of PNG's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). The representative also asked for clarification on a graph presented by the Secretariat relating to distribution of funds and in-country activities and sought clarification on how performance was measured by these.

36. Tonga requested more information on the Secretariat's response to events such as tsunami, asking whether, in such cases, the Secretariat is expected to approach the affected country or whether countries should approach the Secretariat. He also observed that there were a number of support activities provided by the Secretariat that may be considered minor but that had great benefits to the countries. He gave EIA training as an example. The representative further requested that the Secretariat assist Members with developing proposals to GEF5, noting however, that under GEF4 several activities had not yet been implemented.

37. Tokelau thanked the leadership of the organisation for turning around the Secretariat into a new organisation with improved morale and significant achievements.

38. Vanuatu outlined activities with which it had received assistance from the Secretariat. These included development of a waste management bill; EIA training; ozone depletion; and climate change. He noted that there had been gaps in some of the work areas due to personnel issues and asked what mechanisms were in place to ensure that these gaps would not recur in the future when positions become vacant. He also noted that Vanuatu had received significant increase in assistance and thanked the Secretariat and donors and partners for their assistance.

39. The responses of the Secretariat to the various Member comments and queries are outlined below:

40. On the issue of no activities in some areas, the Secretariat advised that the PMER is for the year 2009 and that there had been significant action since the last SM in November 2009, which was not reflected in the report. For example, all the key vacant positions had now been filled. The Secretariat further advised that a major challenge in 2009 was that of the Regional Institutional Framework (RIF), which took up a large part of Secretariat time. The Secretariat further acknowledged that the PMER could be improved to include outcomes and impacts, however, it observed that outcomes were not always evident within a year. It invited suggestions from Members in improving the PMER.

41. The Secretariat advised that the proposal for the invasive species project was now waiting approval from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and is expected to commence towards the end of 2010. There are also moves to link the GEF project with a similar project in the French territories, which will ensure significant resources and strengthened action on invasive species.

42. The Secretariat acknowledged the need for a strong Pacific voice at climate change conventions and advised that the Pacific briefing meeting would be held in Solomon Islands in November prior to the Cancun Conference of Parties (COP) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

43. On programme coordination, the Secretariat advised that this was being addressed through joint activities, e.g. climate change and biodiversity, and that Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) agencies were also cooperating through joint country missions. Coordination of regional initiatives is based on partnerships with NGOs, CROP agencies and others and an example of this is the recently-endorsed Oceanscape initiative.

44. Regarding the request for assistance with CDM, Members were advised that the Pacific Islands Greenhouse Gas Abatement through Renewable Energy Project (PIGGAREP) is providing the inputs necessary for supporting countries in developing appropriate renewable energy projects that could potentially be funded under the CDM.

45. PNG requested assistance from the Secretariat with review of its NBSAP to enable its implementation. The Secretariat advised that it had provided two advisors to assist PNG with its national capacity self-assessment (NCSA) and that a review of the NBSAP was done as part of this. This information fed into the Department of Environment and Conservation (DEC) review of its NBSAP and the 4th National Report to CBD.

46. The Secretariat acknowledged and agreed with the suggestion by Fiji to assist other countries with EIA issues but raised the issue that resources were required to enable this to happen. It also noted that SPREP had

conducted a number of training programmes and had made EIA guidelines available on the web in an effort to assist with capacity building in this area.

47. On the request for science-based studies, the Secretariat noted that its work under the Australian-funded Pacific Climate Change Science Program is underway and this will be something to report on at the next meeting. The Secretariat reported that all advice is underpinned by good information and science but that it would endeavour to look at this further in 2011.

48. The Secretariat referred the Members to attachment 3 of working paper 5.2 to provide more detailed information on the type of assistance provided to countries in the past year. The Secretariat also observed that its resources were finite and therefore it tries to prioritise its activities accordingly.

49. The Meeting **noted** the report of the Secretariat.

5.3: Audited Annual Accounts for 2009

50. In accordance with the Financial Regulations, the Secretariat, represented by the Finance Manager, Mrs Alofa Tu'uau, tabled the Audited Annual Accounts for the year ending 31 December 2009.

51. Responding to a query from Vanuatu, the Secretariat advised that the list of country contributions provided in the working papers refers only to actual payments received and does not include unpaid contributions. On "Deferred Income", it was explained that this refers to the annual value of the usage of the property, plant and equipment gifted to the Secretariat. This value is shown annually as depreciation and the contra-entry is offset against reducing the deferred income.

52. The Meeting **adopted** the audited Financial Statements and Auditors' Report for 2009.

Agenda Item 6: Institutional Reform and Strategic Issues

6.1 SPREP Strategic Plan 2011 – 2015

53. The Secretariat introduced the draft Strategic Plan and the Summary of Responses, as well as a paper summarising the discussions of the earlier informal meeting.

54. The Secretariat advised that the 20SM had agreed that the Action Plan should be combined with the Strategic Programmes, and that consultations should be wide ranging. Extensive consultations were conducted by the Secretariat, including two sub-regional meetings: in Guam and in Fiji. These meetings provided guidance on the overall vision, goals and strategies of the Strategic Plan and highlighted the need to tailor the Plan to a broad audience. The meetings stressed the need to continue regional coordination, but at the same time to give greater attention to national implementation.

55. The Secretariat advised that it was now seeking Members' assistance in finalising the Plan and that there was a proposal on the table for an open-ended working group to be established.

56. Responding to a query on process regarding communicating the draft Plan to Ministers, the Secretariat noted that this year the SPREP Meeting was a single meeting with two components: the first component comprised officials, the second component comprised ministers or heads of delegation. The intent of the high level segment would be to focus on strategic issues. This segment

would also consider for adoption the Strategic Plan and the recommendations from the officials' segment of the SPREP Meeting.

57. Australia, Cook Islands, FSM, France, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, New Zealand, PNG, Samoa and USA agreed with the proposed methodology, were appreciative of the consultative process and committed to participating in the working group which would meet and report to plenary.

58. France and French Polynesia expressed their hope that the Plan would be adopted by the end of the week and French Polynesia noted that the four strategic priorities were in line with their national priorities.

59. Australia advised the Meeting that it had provided a range of comments. These would be addressed in the working group.

60. Fiji also supported the process observing that this would help them structure their national strategic plan. The representative noted that the matrix being used had raised some confusion for his delegation, but that this would be raised with the Secretariat.

61. Nauru supported the draft but on Section 3.4 on Funding, suggested that there should be an annotation on direct access to funding, so that countries who did not meet the fiduciary standards required by various donor agencies could utilise SPREP as an accredited implementing entity.

62. New Caledonia welcomed the efforts to ensure that SPREP's role is complementary to other regional organisations such as SPC. The representative also commended the action-oriented nature of the Plan. He

emphasised the need for actions to be based on the latest available scientific knowledge.

63. New Zealand raised the monitoring and evaluation aspect, noting the importance of demonstrating tangible results on the ground. The representative also emphasised the need for a clear process for consultations with countries in terms of regional and national priority setting. He further noted that while a sub-regional presence could be helpful, a detailed cost/benefit analysis would need to be done.

64. Niue sought the Secretariat's guidance regarding whether there was any component in the Strategic Plan reflecting ongoing work to manage hazardous waste such as asbestos and, if not, could this be included in the Strategic Plan. He advised that Niue would raise any other issues when the report of the working group comes out.

65. PNG called for all Members to set a deadline for discussions on the draft Plan in the event the Meeting was unable to reach a final agreement at the 21SM.

66. Samoa agreed with the priorities outlined in the Plan and for SPREP staff to continue to support countries at international fora but not as representatives of their own countries. Samoa was also of the view that SPREP should take on the role of an implementing agency of the various funding mechanisms, and not just as an executing agency, and that this should be reinforced by strengthened relations with national focal points. The representative also suggested that "regional environmental data" should be clarified as being based on national data and that the provision of legal advice needed to be consistent with national and international instruments. Samoa further called for the mention of gender considerations in the text and added that monitoring and evaluation should not be an additional burden on the

countries. There was also a need to look at an indication of costing. The representative called for clarification on whether this was a plan for the Secretariat or for the Programme as a whole. If it was the latter, there would need to be inclusion of national activities, while noting the need to avoid mixing bilateral programmes with regional and international activities.

67. Solomon Islands advised that they would like to see that the actions being visionary but realistic, cost-effective and building on existing national plans. New actions for emerging issues facing the region should not be an additional burden on the countries. Actions should be tailored to fit the countries needs. The representative also raised a question on whether adoption of the Strategic Plan would allow for opportunities to adjust national plans.

68. Tokelau endorsed the approach, but noted the challenge would be to maintain flexibility in the Strategic Plan to enable reflection of country priorities when developing annual work plans.

69. Tonga agreed with others, and hoped to endorse the Plan at the 21SM.

70. Tuvalu advised that his country was preparing for new elections and would welcome deferring the adoption to a later stage. The Plan was supported but there needed to be a sense of realism and to keep the Strategic Plan within the capacity of the Secretariat.

71. USA noted that the Strategic Plan should look at the role of the Secretariat as the facilitator and coordinator of regional activities. The Plan should be clear on the fact that it serves the whole of the SPREP membership. Where SPREP is the lead regional agency, it should represent the whole of the membership.

72. Vanuatu advised that his country had been engaged in the consultations and, having seen the comments reflected in the revised draft, did not feel the need for any major changes.

73. The Chair then closed discussions until the working group on the Strategic Plan had met.

Report of the Working Group

74. The chair of the working group reported that there had been much progress on the Strategic Plan and linkages had been made between the Plan and the work programme and budget. Targets and indicators had been carefully considered, and the group had also provided clarification of responsibilities. The group also identified gaps and omissions. The group had developed a new version of the plan, which had taken on board most of the comments made by Members. He emphasised that, while the Plan was ready to be adopted as revised, it would still require further editing after the SPREP Meeting. He noted that, as the issue comes up under both agenda items 6.1 and 15.6, the group proposed that the Meeting endorsed the Plan and then recommend it to the High Level Segment under item 15.6.

75. The Chair thanked the working group and its chair.

76. RMI stressed the importance of highlighting climate change as a serious threat to the survival of her country. Focusing on climate change could help the organisation stand out. The chair of the working group noted that the foreword had not been amended, and that the intention was for the Director and Chair to collaborate in finalising the foreword.

77. PNG thanked the working group for its efforts in the limited time available, but requested clarification on why the reference to establishing a sub-regional office had been removed. The chair of the working group responded that the working group had debated this at length and concluded that it would retain references to improving regional and sub-regional links, on the understanding that the Secretariat would investigate all options, including sub-regional offices.

78. American Samoa noted that all Members had been enabled to participate and to have their issues addressed. He commended the working group on the work they had done, and suggested that the Strategic Plan be endorsed.

79. Vanuatu agreed on the importance of sub-regional co-operation, and also observed that there were avenues open to be explored in this regard. He also endorsed the recommendations.

80. The Meeting **endorsed** the SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015.

6.2 ICR and EC Assessment Follow up

81. The Secretariat outlined progress taken on the key recommendations of the ICR and the implementation plan of the EC's Institutional Assessment of SPREP. The ICR recommendations had been endorsed at the 2008 SPREP Meeting and had been assisted by the ICR task force which met twice in 2009. Progress had been reported to the 2009 SPREP Meeting and then to Members via reports in May and July 2010, which also reported progress on the EC recommendations. The Secretariat emphasised the importance of the ICR for the formulation of the Strategic Plan and delivery of member services by the Secretariat, as well

as to ensure that the Secretariat's operations met international best practices.

82. In response to a question from Tonga, the Secretariat clarified that as one of the EC review outcomes, SPREP had now put in place a Procurement Manual that met international standards, and that its audits were now conducted consistent with current International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS).

83. Responding to a query from New Caledonia, with regard to SPREP's country profiles through focal points and strategy development, the Secretariat clarified that, in accordance with ICR recommendations 62 and 101, it was attempting to broaden the system of focal points to involve other appropriate institutions and collaborating agencies such as those involved in regional cooperation.

84. Samoa commended the Secretariat on progress in adopting key review recommendations, but stressed the importance of performance-based reviews of staff and the importance of internal audits to ensure transparency. The Secretariat agreed that both were important, but stressed the need to secure finances to enable this to take place.

85. The Secretariat assured the representative of Nauru that all project funding is transferred to countries in their national currency to ensure that financial losses were not made through multiple currency conversions.

86. New Zealand emphasised the importance of the ICR as the heart of the reforms taking place at SPREP, and acknowledged the efforts already made by the Secretariat to implement key elements. NZ elaborated on the integral links with the

new Strategic Plan, which was critical to demonstrate tangible benefits to Members.

87. USA requested the removal of the term “assessed” from the phrase “members’ assessed and voluntary contributions”. The Secretariat clarified that the use of this term had been agreed at the 2009 SPREP Meeting, but could be modified at the request of the 2010 SPREP Meeting.

88. The Secretariat clarified references to the ongoing status of the ICR where actions were simultaneously listed as being both completed and ongoing. It was explained that this typically meant that the process to meet an identified action had been completed, but was still being implemented internally.

89. The Secretariat agreed to complete actions 100 and 101 (country profiles and focal points) before the Strategic Plan was implemented.

90. The Meeting **noted** the good progress in implementation of the recommendations of the ICR and EC assessments.

6.3 Regional Institutional Framework (RIF) Update

91. The Secretariat provided background to the RIF Joint Council Meeting agreement of July 2009 to transfer four functions from the Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC) to SPREP. A Letter of Agreement in March 2010 between SPREP and SOPAC gave effect to the transfer. The remaining SOPAC functions have been earmarked for transfer to the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) in January 2011 at which point SOPAC will become a geosciences division of SPC and cease to exist as a separate CROP agency.

92. The Secretariat stated the transfer of the functions would strengthen SPREP’s work on climate change. Additional funding had been secured for a Pacific Islands Global Oceans Observing System (PI-GOOS) coordinator to start in the 4th quarter of 2010. In relation to the transfer of the Island Climate Update (ICU) functions, talks with the NZ National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) were expected to result in a smooth transfer by December 2010.

93. New Zealand congratulated the Secretariat for the swift transfer of functions and raised for Members’ consideration, whether the transfer climate change functions should be part of SPREP’s core business.

94. The Meeting

- **noted** the full and effective transfer as of 1 April 2010 of the SOPAC climate change related functions to SPREP; and
- **endorsed** the full and effective implementation of the four SOPAC functions within the Secretariat work programme.

Agenda Item 7: Strategic Financial Issues

7.1 Report on Members’ Contributions

95. In accordance with Financial Regulation 14, the Secretariat submitted its report on Members’ contributions. The Secretariat advised that SPREP was not the only CROP agency with unpaid member contributions, but that it was highlighting these particular concerns due to funding implications, especially in terms of the use of core funding as leverage for other funding sources.

96. The representative of Nauru explained the financial situation of his country and advised that Nauru would begin paying its contributions as of 2010. However, he requested assistance from the Meeting in addressing payment of Nauru's arrears and requested the Members' consideration in writing off these arrears.

97. Cook Islands, Niue, PNG, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu undertook to pay their arrears in full either by the end of the week or within the year.

98. France advised that the shortfall as a result of exchange rates would be addressed shortly. The representative also outlined several activities being funded by France, including the regional solid waste management project.

99. Samoa commented that there was no rationale for providing the detailed information on country contributions against assistance received from the Secretariat.

100. Representatives discussed the proposal for a review of Member contributions. Cook Islands, Samoa and PNG expressed their view that they did not consider this necessary or appropriate at this stage. France suggested that member contributions would be best discussed in conjunction with discussions on the Strategic Plan. Fiji and Tokelau registered their approval for the proposal, with Tokelau noting that it was up to Members to look at the long term financial sustainability of their Secretariat.

101. The Secretariat advised that the reporting format was aimed at full transparency, but that it would be guided by the Members on this. On the issue of an apparent surplus in the organisation's budget, the Secretariat advised that the surplus funds referred to were as at the end

of 2009, and that this had already been used to balance the 2010 budget.

102. USA said that the voluntary funds column in the Members' Contribution Schedule should not be carried on into the arrears column as this reflected a specific financial situation (i.e. a request for goodwill funds from Members to assist with a budget deficit in 2008). The Secretariat agreed to this.

103. It was agreed that the Friends of the Chair Group would be tasked with providing suggested wording of the recommendations as well as advising on the arrears situation of Nauru. Samoa, Fiji, Tuvalu and Tonga were also invited to participate in this.

104. In response to the recommendations of the Friends of the Chair group, the Meeting:

- **noted** the on-going and critical issue of Members' unpaid contributions; **encouraged Members to commit themselves** to paying current contributions and unpaid contributions from previous years in full in 2010; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to work closely with Nauru regarding the latter's request for assistance in meeting its membership payments.

Agenda Item 8: Regional Conventions

8.1 Report on the Conference of the Parties to the Noumea Convention

105. The Secretariat presented the report of the Tenth Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region and Related Protocols (Noumea Convention), held on 2 September. The Secretariat advised that

the focus of the Convention was primarily on marine and coastal pollution and reported that the meeting of the Convention, although short, provided for discussion on substantive matters. The meeting report was noted.

106. The Meeting was invited to note paragraph 37, regarding the lack of consensus on amendments to the Convention; paragraph 41, seeking to draw in and integrate broader marine pollution issues; and paragraph 54, on the approval of the work programme for the Secretariat. The contribution from USA of the amount of US\$60,000 was acknowledged.

107. The Meeting:

- **noted** the Report of the Conference of Parties to the Noumea Convention.

8.2 Report on the Conference of the Parties to the Waigani Convention

108. The Secretariat presented the report of the 5th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island Countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and the Management of Hazardous Wastes within the South Pacific Region (Waigani Convention), held on 3 September 2010. The meeting report was noted. The Secretariat drew attention to:

- The reports from the Convention's two subsidiary bodies; and
- The discussion at the Conference of a proposal from a regional organisation in China to become a coordinating centre for related matters in Asia and the Pacific.

109. The Meeting:

- **noted** the report of the Conference of the Parties to the Waigani Convention.

Item 9: 2010 Work Programme and Budget

9.1: Island Ecosystems Programme

9.1.1: Regional Marine Species Programme

110. The Secretariat provided an outline of ongoing and proposed work in marine species conservation, focusing on proposing 2011 as the Pacific Year of the Dugong and a regional Plan of Action for Sharks.

111. American Samoa, Australia, France, Kiribati, RMI, New Caledonia, New Zealand, PNG and USA endorsed the Secretariat's work, including supporting the proposed Pacific Year of the Dugong in 2011.

112. On the regional action plan for sharks, New Zealand noted that this should also be extended to coastal sharks and rays. NZ could assist with further iteration of this action plan, and with the development of identification material on sharks and rays.

113. Australia reiterated the importance of cooperation to improve regional conservation and management of marine species, particularly sharks and dugong. Australia also highlighted other avenues for regional cooperation including the recently concluded Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) MOU on Sharks and the MOU on Conservation and Management of Dugongs. Australia congratulated Palau and the USA for signing the sharks MOU.

114. Kiribati asked for direction regarding the role during the Year of Dugong for countries that are not range states for dugongs. The representative also advised that issues relating to sharks were handled by the Ministry of Fisheries in his country and called on SPREP to assist countries to implement the Plan at the national level.

115. PNG informed the Meeting that they would sign the MOU during the week of the SPREP Meeting and that work on conservation of dugongs and protection of sharks, including customary linkages, was ongoing.

116. The Meeting:

- **endorsed** the year 2011 as the Pacific Year of the Dugong;
- **called** on partners and donor agencies to provide assistance where possible to ensure a successful Pacific Year of the Dugong;
- **noted** the Pacific Islands Regional Plan of Action for Sharks, produced jointly by FFA, SPC and SPREP; and
- **directed** the Secretariat to provide assistance to Members in the implementation of the Pacific Islands Regional Plan of Action for Sharks where possible.

9.1.2: 2010 International Year of Biodiversity and Pacific participation in the CBD 10th Conference of the Parties (COP10), Nagoya, Japan 18-29 October 2010

117. The Secretariat detailed activities that had occurred with regard to the International Year of Biodiversity (IYOB) and in preparation for the CBD COP10 in Japan (October 2010). These activities included the Mainstreaming Biodiversity meeting, held in Fiji (February 2010); the 4th National Report CBD workshop held in Samoa (April 2010); the 13th Pacific Island Roundtable for Nature Conservation held in Samoa (July 2010); and the Pacific pre-CBD COP10 Meeting (supported by EU/UNEP) in Fiji (August 2010). The Pacific pre-CBD COP10 Meeting allowed for the preparation of a brief to highlight successes, issues and challenges in the Pacific Islands region and to address the lack of

representation at COP due to lack of funding. A 'One Pacific Voice' was proposed, along with the desire to launch National Reports from all 14 Pacific parties to the CBD at the COP10. It was noted that currently only seven Pacific Island Countries (PICs) had completed these.

118. The Chair noted that there was too much reliance on inter-governmental organisations for representation and that it would better if forums could be provided during COPs so as to allow PICs to detail issues, and to consult each other.

119. All members responded with a word of thanks to SPREP on the support provided. Tonga, in particular, expressed appreciation for the pre-CBD COP meeting.

120. Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, New Zealand, Tonga and USA supported the 'One Pacific Voice' approach, though they cautioned that national circumstances and priorities need to be considered while supporting a common agenda.

121. Cook Islands and PNG offered their support for the 2012 Nature Conservation Conference. In addition, PNG informed the Meeting that it would seek clarification and guidance from the Secretariat to implement recommendations made at the Nature Conservation Conference.

122. Cook Islands, PNG, Samoa, Tonga and Tuvalu all noted that they had completed and submitted their 4th National Reports. RMI advised that they were working on theirs, but had capacity and financial issues, and needed further support. Niue, RMI and Tuvalu requested SPREP for support in NBSAP implementation. Kiribati stated that they were planning to review their NBSAP to coincide with the formulation of the next National Sustainable Development Plan. Cook Islands had already reviewed their

NBSAP, while Fiji and RMI noted that the implementation of the CBD and NBSAPs needed to be considerate of national priorities. The Secretariat advised that it would endeavour to assist all countries with their NBSAP review and implementation, as necessary.

123. Regarding issues of representation to CBD COPs, both Tuvalu and Samoa noted the issue of the attention to (and clashes with) climate change meetings and urged Members to focus greater attention on biodiversity.

124. New Caledonia advised that they had completed their NBSAP with support from France. The NBSAP has five objectives focused on biodiversity, conservation, knowledge acquisition, economic valuation of biodiversity, and mainstreaming of biodiversity in public policies and civil and customary societies. New Caledonia offered to share their knowledge and experience with other Members and mentioned in this regard the “Biodiversity” country profile presented under Item 11.3. New Caledonia added that France had signed in March 2010 (on behalf of New Caledonia) a letter of agreement with Australia to protect the Coral Sea Corridor.

125. PNG advised that they would have good representation to CBD COP10 and would also be featuring a side event. PNG also noted the need to incorporate climate change in protected area priorities, and advised that biodiversity would be mainstreamed across all sectors by aligning the NBSAP with PNG’s Environmentally Sustainable Economic Growth Policy.

126. France, French Polynesia and New Caledonia highlighted the need to address the issue of marine biodiversity and drew attention to the recently endorsed Framework for Pacific Oceanscape and the need for it to be supported and brought forward at CBD COP10. France also

suggested that SPREP link with the CBD’s identification work on ecologically and biologically significant areas (EBSA). France noted that a booklet had been produced on their policies on biodiversity.

127. Australia noted the positive response of Members and the number of CBD 4th National Reports that had been completed.

128. The Secretariat noted the positive and constructive comments and the need to work together to support common agendas under a ‘One Pacific Voice’, whilst noting that national circumstances and priorities need to be considered; the need to link with other regional and sub-regional initiatives; and to focus on oceans and marine issues, and to offer nature-based solutions. The Secretariat also reiterated its support for Members in reviewing and implementing NBSAPs.

129. The Meeting:

- **encouraged** contracting parties to the CBD to complete and submit their 4th National Reports before CBD COP10, if they had not done so;
- **supported** the ‘One Pacific Voice’ for CBD COP10;
- **encouraged** Members to consider including in their 2011 national work programmes implementation of NBSAPs, and where necessary, review; and
- **supported** the preparations for the 2012 Nature Conservation Conference.

9.2 Pacific Futures Programme

9.2.1: PIFACC Mid-Term Review

130. The Secretariat introduced the findings of the 2010 mid-term review of the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change (PIFACC) and advised on the

implementation of outcomes of the 2009 Pacific Climate Change Roundtable. The Secretariat noted that SPREP Members had participated in a consultative workshop to determine the outcomes of the PIFACC review in Fiji in May 2010, and that the review was noted by the Pacific Islands Forum in August 2010. The emphasis of the review was to maintain a broad regional strategic framework, with better links to closely related regional frameworks, improved monitoring and evaluation, and clearer guidance to partners and donors on regional and national climate change priorities.

131. Australia recognised the importance of PIFACC and its review, but wished to register its concerns with a number of the recommendations, and called for the recommendations to be further discussed to ensure that all Members support the proposals.

132. USA noted that some of the recommendations represented a departure from the original functions of the PIFACC and PCCR. The representative observed that while the PIFACC had value as a starting point, it did not represent the views or needs of the full membership of SPREP as well as it could.

133. The Secretariat clarified that the pre-meetings of the 2010 Pacific Islands Forum confirmed SPREP's role in leading the implementation of the findings of the PIFACC review. It further clarified that the Meeting was being requested to approve the process for implementation and not to alter the PIFACC policy document itself.

134. American Samoa, Cook Islands, Niue, Samoa and Tonga called for the recommendations to be approved, in light of the opportunities Members had already had to contribute to the PIFACC review. This would be the first step forward and would

allow the Secretariat to finalise its work to implement the next steps. Tonga noted that its national climate change policy was not reflected in the PIFACC. American Samoa suggested that the United States and Australia could present alternative recommendations to address their concerns.

135. France observed that the review did not address the role of the Secretariat in helping Pacific island countries to access adaptation and mitigation funds at the regional and national level. The Secretariat clarified that there was no specific allocation of funds to implement the PIFACC, but that while using the PIFACC as an overarching guiding document, the Secretariat worked with partners and donors to tailor assistance. The Secretariat would also produce by October 2010 the report of its feasibility study on a regional climate change financing mechanism, which should address any remaining questions. This had been discussed by Forum Leaders in August 2010 and would be discussed again at the Forum Economic Ministers' Meeting in late 2010.

136. PNG registered its support in principle for the overarching importance of the PIFACC. While PNG supported recommendations 1 to 8, it had some questions over recommendations 9 to 12. PNG suggested additional time for Members to consider the recommendations and ensure that they were consistent with national climate change policies.

137. Samoa reminded the Meeting that the PIFACC had been endorsed at the highest level – by Forum Leaders in 2005 – and that it is the mechanism for SPREP's technical assistance to Members. Samoa noted that the review had found major areas that were not being adequately addressed under PIFACC, and therefore urged the recommendations be approved to ensure the improvements take place. Samoa also

reminded the Meeting that improved coordination of financing for climate change is a high priority: Samoa's own assessment found that Samoa would require more than \$US200 million for its adaptation activities.

138. Tokelau questioned the resources that would be required to coordinate and implement the PIFACC and urged the Secretariat to help Members appreciate the implications of the findings and the recommendations more fully.

139. USA noted that the recommendations were prepared by a consultant in light of widespread consultations and confirmed the USA could support including the report as an annex to the SPREP Meeting report, rather than be asked to endorse all the consultant's recommendations.

140. The Meeting established a 'friends of the chair' group to resolve this.

141. The Friends of the Chair group reported back to the Meeting with a revised series of recommendations, which were discussed briefly before acceptance.

142. The Meeting, on the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change (PIFACC) Review:

- **noted** the continuing importance of the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change in providing an overarching strategy to ensure that regional coordination in supporting national climate change initiatives and priorities are relevant and coherent;
- **recognised** that the PIFACC is a living document and that the mid-term review was included in the Framework and was called for by Pacific leaders in 2005;
- **agreed** that the PIFACC mid-term review and its recommendations be

used to guide and inform the drafting of a revised PIFACC to meet the region's needs in 2011 – 2015;

- **established** an out-of-session working group constituting of 'friends of the chair', tasked with the revision of the PIFACC, guided by the Review and developments over the last 5 years;
- **tasked** the Secretariat with circulating the revised Framework (PIFACC – 2011) to Members for input with a view to out-of-session finalisation by mid January 2011; and
- **agreed** that monitoring and evaluation of PIFACC implementation should form an integral part of the SPREP Strategic Plan and work program and be funded accordingly.

9.2.2: Review of Regional Meteorological Services

143. The Secretariat presented a paper outlining the Review of Regional Meteorological Services since 2008 as requested by the Pacific Islands Forum Leaders' 2009 communiqué. The Review was tabled at the 2010 Small Island States Leaders Forum where its recommendations were endorsed.

144. USA commended the work of the Secretariat in completing the review and stressed the critical role of meteorological services for the region. USA supported the recommendations of the Secretariat relating to proposed follow up activities. USA further noted that the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) was upgrading in the region and this would benefit all meteorological services in the region. SPREP had previously been providing that function, which needed to be fully supported. USA and Cook Islands strongly encouraged the Secretariat to fully staff the Secretariat in

order to carry out its work in meteorological services.

145. Kiribati, Cook Islands, Samoa, Marshall Islands and Australia supported the recommendations. The Kiribati representative emphasised the need to formalise the services that the Regional Desk for Pacific National Meteorological Services would provide. He also noted that the names of countries in table 1 needed to be corrected, clarifying that Banaba is part of Kiribati.

146. Cook Islands informed the Meeting that his country had formed a task force that included sector-wide agencies to help address national disaster risk issues dealing with public safety.

147. Australia requested the Secretariat to fully integrate the Pacific Desk into its programmatic work activities and added that fragmentation of functions was not desirable.

148. Tokelau commended the work of the Secretariat and inquired whether territories were covered as well since the review was considered at the Small Island States (SIS) Leaders' Meeting. He also pointed out the need to move to implementation noting that this requires resources and partnership.

149. Responding to the various comments, the Secretariat noted the support for the review and recognised the need to mobilise resources for implementation. To this end the Secretariat undertook to convene a partnership of interested Parties, with WMO as key partner. The Secretariat also acknowledged that the Meteorology and Climatology Officer (MCO) position has been a standing item in many Meetings and it was hopeful that the extensive dialogue with the Commonwealth Secretariat would bear fruit. The Secretariat agreed that integration was logical and critical for the Pacific Desk and

advised that is reflected in the Strategic Plan. It also advised that the Secretariat aims to address territories along with countries.

150. Samoa informed the Meeting that it had been active in implementing meteorology-related activities. Samoa also requested further information on a proposal relating to a plan to corporatise the Fiji Meteorological Service. The Secretariat advised that this report was not yet available but assured the Meeting that this had no bearing on the recommendations.

151. RMI informed the Meeting that her office worked closely with the Meteorology Office and she supported the Secretariat recommendations.

152. The Meeting:

On the recommendations put forward by the Review:

- **endorsed** the Recommendations and the Next Steps as outlined by the Review of Regional Meteorological Services;
- **agreed** to the nomination of SPREP to undertake the role of the Pacific Desk to provide support to the efforts of countries and the region in coordinating and facilitating regional coordination and implementation of relevant meteorological services;
- **endorsed** the formation of a Pacific Meteorology Council and **directed** the Secretariat to develop terms of reference for the Pacific Meteorology Council and to submit them for endorsement to the Council's first meeting in 2011;
- **urged** Members, donors and partners to assist including strengthening existing technical support to SPREP as well as additional resources;
- **requested** the Secretariat to report on the implementation of these decisions to the 22nd SPREP Meeting;

and on the current arrangements for the supply of regional specialised meteorological services to support national meteorological services, to:

- **acknowledged** and **expressed appreciation** for the role played by Fiji, Australia, New Zealand, United States and France in support of regional meteorological services in the Pacific, and to the ongoing support provided by development partners, particularly Australia, Japan, New Zealand, the United States and Finland, and the global network of meteorological services.

9.2.3: Directions in the UNFCCC Process

153. The Secretariat provided an update on developments relating to climate change negotiations. The representative advised that the December 2009 Copenhagen Climate Change Conference did not deliver a legally binding agreement. The COP noted the Copenhagen Accord (CA), a political agreement that 138 Parties to the UNFCCC have chosen to associate with, to date. The Secretariat advised that, while some donors had started to deliver their Fast Start Financing, the longer-term financial arrangements under the UNFCCC were yet to be delivered. The Secretariat also advised that the pledges to date under the CA could still warm the planet by an average of around 3-4.5 degrees Celsius in the future. Details of the update are provided in working paper 9.2.3 and its attachment. The Secretariat also advised that the proposed November meeting in the Solomon Islands will likely serve as a preparatory meeting to the COP and negotiations training for those attending the COP. Media training and a side event are being planned to help with outreach at the COP.

154. Tonga raised the issue of the fast tracking of funds under the Copenhagen Accord and that Solomon Islands had received these funds. He asked that the Secretariat work towards becoming an implementing agency to enable fast tracking of funds under the Accord and the Kyoto Protocol. The representative explained that countries are required to establish a national implementing agency but due to capacity constraints, a regional implementing agency would be helpful. The Secretariat clarified that the funds received by Solomon Islands were under the Kyoto Protocol and that currently no country in the region had accessed the Fast Track funds. The Secretariat was preparing its application proposal to become an implementing agency but advised this was a lengthy and difficult process.

155. Nauru commented that the Secretariat should consider adding legal advisory personnel to the SPREP delegation to strengthen COP negotiations and that the Secretariat facilitate common positions on areas of divergence to assist for the region at the COP.

156. FSM, Fiji, NZ, RMI, Samoa and Tuvalu commended the work of the Secretariat, noting the challenging nature of the work, especially in the area of negotiations. Several Members highlighted the need for continued negotiation skills training as well as convening separate Pacific meetings during the FCCC COP.

157. Tuvalu urged that work on adaptation continue due to its importance to small islands. On mitigation, he informed the meeting that Tuvalu is setting up a policy to set an example for mitigation by the year 2020. He also called for collaboration and partnerships in the region be continued.

158. France advised that it was very supportive of the ambitious goals announced

before Copenhagen but noted that it was important to implement adaptation activities and fast-track financing. Supported by American Samoa, he suggested that practical, concrete stories on successes be developed and that these be used to feed into the international processes.

159. NZ requested clarification regarding funding of the proposed communication tools. The Secretariat advised that many materials had already been developed (e.g. factsheets, media posters and films) but that reprints would require additional funding. The Secretariat also advised that opportunities were being identified to strengthen these activities through other funded projects such as a proposed series of documentaries under the PIGGAREP on renewable energy.

160. Fiji requested information on whether there was a "Plan B" in the event that there would be no legally binding agreement at Cancun and recommended that the Secretariat identify other opportunities for financing adaptation and mitigation in the region.

161. USA acknowledged the strong emphasis on climate change in SPREP and welcomed the opportunity to engage in these issues. USA encouraged SPREP to enhance its support under the UNFCCC. USA suggested that communication could be improved in order to understand the different positions of the Members and to use the opportunity to engage the Membership as a whole and to do this more openly. USA urged the Membership to be more ambitious than what it had been doing to date.

162. Samoa noted that its Government accredits the Secretariat as part of its delegation to enable better access to the COP to support all Pacific parties. The Secretariat

acknowledged this essential support from the Government of Samoa with gratitude.

163. The Chair informed the Members that PNG had established a climate change office. It has now appointed 12 staff. A climate change compliance strategic action plan was being prepared. An interim plan of action has been developed to prepare an enabling environment for a demonstration project under REDD-plus (Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation). With that, the PNG Government is seeking legal advice to declare a moratorium to prevent logging of forests under the pretext of agro-forestry developments. In addition to the above, a number of climate change adaptation projects are underway, which includes coastal environments.

164. Tokelau asked whether there was a regional approach to the climate change issue by the CROP agencies.

165. The Secretary General of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (PIFS) was invited to make comment. He advised that the sub-committee, co-chaired by the Director of SPREP and the PIFS Secretary General, will deal with coordination of climate change across the CROP agencies with the aim of identifying what each organisation is doing in response to climate change. The sub-committee will meet towards the end of October 2010. Leaders have identified access to funding as a key issue. Currently the region does not have the capacity to manage the large sums of money being promised under the Copenhagen Accord and a large amount of groundwork is required before these funds can be accessed. He also stressed the need for good projects to be designed in order to attract such large-scale funds.

166. The Secretariat advised that negotiations training would be provided as part of the pre-Cancun meeting and also

informed Members of plans to make negotiations training an ongoing component of a proposed climate change course at the University of the South Pacific. On the issue of lessons learned and success stories, the Secretariat advised that more work was needed in this area and that it would focus on sharing lessons from its current projects.

167. The Meeting:

- **noted** the various ways in which the Secretariat is supporting Members to prepare for and participate in negotiations under the UNFCCC;
- **noted** the efforts to strengthen the climate change team at SPREP and **endorsed** the recommendations on the establishment of PCCR Working Groups as a means for more effective delivery on climate change in the region and enhancing interactions between SPREP, CROP and national climate change focal points;
- **endorsed** the approach taken by SPREP in support of PICs and **undertook** to support and work with SPREP in the UNFCCC process, including the delivery of negotiations training and preparatory meetings for the FCCC; and
- **agreed to provide** support to the development of communications tools such as national climate change profiles, as well as any other suggestions as to how to strengthen support to PICs in the FCCC negotiations process.

9.2.4: Global Environment Facility (GEF) developments and issues in the Pacific

168. The Secretariat introduced its report on recent developments and issues relating to the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The Secretariat noted that the paper provided

details on the involvement of the GEF in the region. In past years the region had concluded that the Pacific had not received its commensurate share of GEF resources. The position of GEF Support Adviser was established and funded by NZAID and AusAID, but will complete its cycle in 2011. The region had been successful in securing around US\$100 million in the GEF-4 cycle. Some new challenges have emerged in GEF-5, such as whether the region would be able to replicate its successes from GEF-4 in terms of levels of financing. The Secretariat noted that a future challenge for the region would be the need to develop national and regional project concepts in order to benefit from the GEF-5 funding. This may require further support for coordination of these efforts in the region. The Secretariat also acknowledged the support and contributions of Australia and New Zealand, particularly in funding the position of GEF Support Adviser at the Secretariat. It sought the Meeting's agreement to continue this position, for which funding would end in March 2011.

169. Fiji, Nauru, RMI, Samoa, Tonga and Tuvalu supported the continuation of the GEF Support Adviser position, noting the need for support on project proposal development. Nauru also supported the need for engagement with the GEF Secretariat, but on the basis of country needs. Fiji also called for capacity building for GEF focal points.

170. Australia noted the success of GEF-PAS in improving Pacific island countries' access to funding. Australia added that changes to the resource allocation in GEF5 would be beneficial to the region and provided for more certainty about the resources they can access. Australia encouraged PICs to consider the option of undertaking a GEF 'National Portfolio Formulation Exercise' either through a direct grant or with support of a GEF implementing agency. In regard to the GEF-PAS monitoring

and evaluation coordination unit, Australia questioned whether there would be significant benefit in establishing a separate coordination mechanism for GEF-PAS, given that GEF-PAS projects are now at the implementation stage. Australia expressed appreciation of the work carried out by the GEF Support Adviser, and noted that if Members consider the functions of the Adviser essential then it would encourage Members to ensure that these functions are captured in SPREP's strategic planning process and supported by core funding.

171. RMI noted the complexities of the GEF-4 process, but believed that, based on learned experiences that the new STAR resource allocation framework would be beneficial. The representative added that national coordination would be key to success and that there was a need to avoid conflicts between countries and the Secretariat arising from implementation of the first recommendation below. She raised a question regarding the M&E unit. The Secretariat clarified that the M&E unit was approved as part of the GEF-PAS, however its placement, whether with a GEF Implementing Agency or a CROP Agency, had not been clarified. Meetings of the GEF constituency and the 20th SPREP Meeting had confirmed the preference in the region for this unit to be housed at SPREP.

172. New Zealand expressed some hesitation as to the added benefits of the establishment of the M&E unit, when the focus should now be on the successful implementation of individual projects. Commending the work of the GEF Support Adviser, NZ added that the future relationship between the Secretariat and the GEF needs to be considered in the context of discussions on the new Strategic Plan, including whether the GEF Support Adviser should be made part of SPREP's core functions.

173. Vanuatu noted past difficulties in resourcing project personnel as well as delays in the process of funds disbursement. The representative called for greater engagement of national counterparts in the development of regional projects. He also expressed concern over the management fees charged by various GEF implementing agencies.

174. French Polynesia observed that while they were not eligible for funding from the GEF, the issues being discussed were for the whole of the organisation. The representative was in favour of seeking support for the unit and the position through the GEF resources, as opposed to burdening the core budget costs that are shared by all Members.

175. France noted the significant increase in funding that would become available under the GEF-5. The representative also noted that the French GEF was also available for funding projects in the region. France thought that the Secretariat should give priority to providing country assistance to mobilise GEF funds. France considered that financing relating to the GEF unit within the Secretariat should be borne within the framework of GEF

176. FSM commended the work of the GEF Adviser, noting the value of the Small Grants Programme as a useful modality for channelling parts of the national GEF allocations. Supported by Cook Islands, the representative also commented on the need to engage other CROP agencies in the dialogue with the GEF Secretariat

177. Many speakers expressed gratitude to Australia and New Zealand for their support and to the GEF Support Adviser for his work.

178. PNG also noted concerns in regards to GEF implementing agencies and requested that the Secretariat seek feedback from the GEF Secretariat in this regard.

179. Kiribati supported the recommendation and urged the Secretariat to engage countries to develop a clear approach to assessing GEF 5 resources taking into account different capacity levels in member countries.

180. The Secretariat welcomed the comments from Members, and noted the need for continued capacity building as well as the continuation of the position of the GEF Support Adviser, bearing in mind the need to find external resources for that position. The Secretariat also noted that the M&E unit was intended to be funded through GEF resources. There could also be opportunities for territories benefiting from GEF projects, as evidenced, for example, by the Micronesia Challenge.

181. At the request of the chair, the Friends of the Chair addressed these issues and reported back to the Meeting.

182. The Meeting:

- **urged** the Secretariat to engage with countries, other CROP agencies, the GEF Secretariat and GEF implementing agencies to develop and implement an approach to accessing GEF-5 resources;
- **reiterated** SPREP Members' support for establishing a GEF-PAS monitoring and evaluation coordination unit to be located at SPREP; and
- **agreed** that the position of GEF Support Adviser with SPREP be continued, with revisions to responsibilities reflecting the above GEF operational changes and **urged** the Secretariat to seek funding for the position as necessary, and Members to consider possible options for funding.

9.2.5: Waste Reduction and Pollution Prevention

183. The Secretariat outlined past campaigns and current strategies and highlighted the need to more strongly draw critical links between waste management and other environmental sectors and processes, such as biodiversity and environmental protection. The Secretariat advised that it was seeking to conduct a one-year regional campaign to address waste reduction and pollution prevention in 2012.

184. Tuvalu thanked the Secretariat for its work in Small Island States, which face real problems in this area. The representative asked that the campaign address the removal of hazardous waste, which had been stored for some years since the earlier removal under a previous SPREP project.

185. Cook Islands reiterated the need to address removal of asbestos particularly in Small Island States and indicated that the campaign was on the right track to achieve this. The representative also expressed the need to deal with growing amounts of whiteware waste and e-waste.

186. France expressed full support for the awareness raising and communication campaign proposed by the Secretariat. Indeed, the struggle against waste was considered a priority for Small Island States in the Pacific. Because of this, France had, through the Agence Française de Développement (AFD), tabled a one million Euro project for a period of 4 years designed to undertake training action, waste collection and the strengthening of capacity *inter alia* by creating networks including, in those networks, the donors. The awareness and communication campaign presented by the Secretariat would come upstream from the projects to combat waste and more specifically, the action of AFD.

187. The Meeting:
- **endorsed** the Secretariat's proposal for a Waste Reduction and Pollution Prevention Campaign in 2012; and
 - **encouraged** Members to fully participate in the planning and delivery of activities and nominate a contact point for the campaign.

Agenda Item 9.3: Consideration and Approval of Proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2011

188. The Secretariat presented a balanced budget for 2011 of US\$11,550,052, which the SPREP Director observed was a significant increase on the scale of budgets of recent years. He also noted that, while the annual work programme had been structured in accordance with the previous planning documents of the Secretariat, it would be adjusted to match the priorities of the new Strategic Plan.

189. The Secretariat outlined the details of the anticipated income and expenditure for the coming year and acknowledged the range of donors that would contribute to programme funding.

190. New Zealand welcomed the work programme but noted that NZ was still undertaking its internal processes required to approve its budget line to SPREP for 2011, and thus its support was subject to confirmation.

191. In response to a question from New Zealand, the Secretariat acknowledged that the vast majority of its budget (approximately \$9 million) was project and programme funding, while its core budget comprised approximately 20%. The Secretariat confirmed that SPREP charged a 10% administration fee on project funding, but had a smaller levy (1-4%) on programme

funds, depending on the amount available after staff salaries were covered.

192. In response to a request from USA, the Secretariat agreed to remove from future budget documents references to 'assessed contributions' and 'arrears', and to refer instead to 'contributions' and 'unpaid contributions'. The Secretariat would also ensure that references to PIFACC were consistent with the decisions of this Meeting.

193. FSM, NZ, PNG and RMI called on the Secretariat to provide more detailed information in future on which countries and territories were likely to receive assistance under which budget lines – i.e. a more specific list of the benefits individual Members could expect from the work programme.

194. The Secretariat noted that the purpose of the presentations under agenda item 9 at the SPREP Meeting were to allow more detailed scrutiny of individual budget line items, and that all budget documents were subject to auditing, both by independent auditors, and by donors under their memoranda of understanding.

195. France welcomed the increasing trust donors were showing in SPREP, as evidenced by the growing overall budget and the mobilisation of donor funds. France would welcome an assessment of the leverage of the Secretariat, to determine how this results in actions within countries and territories. The Secretariat undertook to provide more country-by-country detail in the 2011 PMER.

196. American Samoa urged all Members to pay their contributions in full to prevent any shortfalls. He asked whether the increase in the budget from 2010 – in the vicinity of \$1.7 million – was justified, in light of the fact that there was a surplus in the 2010 core budget. The Secretariat clarified that this

increase was largely due to the increase in PACC and PIGGAREP project funding.

197. American Samoa queried the high level of expenditure on travel shown in the budget. The Secretariat confirmed that the amount included funding of sponsored participants to SPREP workshops. American Samoa called for measures to reduce this burden, such as for Members to cover the costs of their own travel to attend SPREP events.

198. PNG noted that the proposal to establish sub-regional offices of the Secretariat was also relevant to PNG's desire to better align its activities with the regional priorities of SPREP.

199. The Secretariat noted that the work programme is designed to be flexible, and that other documents gave more detail on individual countries and territories targeted for assistance.

200. RMI observed that the explanation for some of the smaller island countries appearing to receive more assistance than others may be due to some projects focusing on some places more than others in particular years.

201. In response to a query from USA, the Secretariat noted that the PI-GOOS position was not listed in the budget because at the time of preparation, the funding details had not yet been finalised but that good progress was being made to secure that funding. The Secretariat agreed to include the PI-GOOS position in the work programme and budget at the request of USA.

202. The Meeting:

- **approved** the proposed Work Programme and Budget of US\$11,550,052 for 2011.

Agenda Item 10: Corporate Services

10.1: New Salary Banding Model

203. The Secretariat reported on progress relating to the new Salary Banding Model for the Secretariat as part of the CROP harmonisation process. It was noted that the consultant assessment had identified seven staff positions for increase in salary under the new banding model. This equates to an additional requirement of US\$25,000 for the 2011 budget. The Secretariat advised that placement of the salary banding for CEO positions was open for consideration by the respective governing councils. The new salary banding model for SPREP would be linked to the newly developed Performance Development System (PDS). The Secretariat also recommended that the evaluation of the Director's performance follow the same policies and guidelines as the PDS, with the exception that this be conducted by a standing committee of Members, and headed by the current Chair.

204. American Samoa and Cook Islands queried what guidelines would apply for the proposed Standing Committee. RMI agreed that guidelines would be needed and these would need to be prepared with guidance from the SPREP governing council.

205. French Polynesia also queried the role of the Standing Committee, noting that a review of the Director's performance is conducted at the time of the renewal of his/her mandate; and questioned the viability of the Standing Committee overall, given additional logistical and financial requirements. France also suggested that the Director's performance evaluation could be conducted prior to the SPREP Meeting, facilitated by a questionnaire to all Members, thus negating the need for a standing committee.

206. FSM, Samoa and Tokelau recommended that the issue of salary banding be separated from performance. Tokelau suggested that in the future, these be two separate agenda items. Samoa suggested that the Director's evaluation be done before each SPREP Meeting, and supported the Secretariat recommendation of having annual performance evaluations for the Director. Cook Islands also agreed with the recommendation for the Director's performance evaluation process.

207. PNG queried the impacts that the salary banding would have on Member contributions, particularly when taking in consideration the deletion of a previous recommendation under Item 7.1 to review Member contributions. The Secretariat replied that the increase of US\$25,000 for the 2011 budget was not an issue, as the monies required were already covered by other programmatic and core sources, but would need to be considered in future meetings.

208. Tuvalu and Vanuatu both stated that since the salary banding had financial implications for the annual budget, that this issue should have been discussed before the budget was approved. Vanuatu also asked if there were any other cost implications of the salary banding for those Members who are also members of other CROP agencies.

209. The Meeting discussed the issue of determining the banding position of the SPREP Director based on the consultant assessment, which was at Band 17. Several countries were in favour of accepting the assessment while others were in favour of moving to the upper band (18). American Samoa and Cook Islands considered that this was best done by Members while Australia, France and RMI noted that the consultant assessment was part of an agreed process and should be the basis for consideration.

210. Samoa queried how the consultants had determined the salary banding but supported the proposed increase in principle, due to the increasing focus on environment. Australia, FSM, NZ, RMI, PNG, Tokelau and Tonga also supported the evaluation processes taken by the consultants. Members also noted that the increase did not impact on the 2011 budget.

211. Finally, at the initiative of French Polynesia it was decided to continue the discussion and to request the consultant to further discuss this matter with the SPREP chair.

212. The Meeting:

- **approved** the proposed new CROP harmonised banding model as outlined in WP.10.1;
- **noted** that the cost of implementation is approximately US\$25,000 for which a provision has been made in the 2011 Budget and Work Programme;
- **noted** that implementation of the new banding model will be effective from 1 January 2011;
- **noted** the evaluation of the SPREP Director role and relevant banding as recommended in the '*Report on the Banding of CEO roles*' by the Consultants and request the consultant to further discuss this matter with the SPREP chair; and

on the matter of Director Performance Evaluation

- **agreed** to appoint a Standing Committee, to be chaired by the current SPREP Chair, to evaluate the Director's performance on an annual basis.

10.2: 2010 Market Data Review

213. The Secretariat advised that the 2010 market data had been evaluated by consultants as part of a harmonisation initiative to determine appropriate salary scales for SPREP professional and support staff, with the long-term view of attracting and retaining a skilled work-force to serve member countries. Costs associated with implementation of the new staff salary scale were estimated at US\$80,000 and this cost has been provided for in the approved 2011 budget and work-plan.

214. The Meeting:

- **approved** the salary scales for professional staff (positions advertised internationally), presented in SDR, effective from 1 January 2011;
- **approved** the salary scales for support staff (positions advertised locally), presented in SAT, effective from 1 January 2011; and
- **noted** that the cost of implementation is approximately US\$80,000 for which a provision has been made in the 2011 Work Programme and Budget.

10.3: Appointment of the SPREP Director – proposed revisions

215. In response to Member requests for revised rules for appointing the SPREP Director, the Secretariat introduced the revised Rules of Procedures for the Appointment of Director. The Secretariat thanked Members for their input and comments on the revisions.

216. Cook Islands raised reservations on the amendments and drew attention to Rules 3, 4, and 7, in particular Rule 4 on Conflict of Interest where a member of the Selection Advisory Committee (SAC) is from the same

country as a candidate. The representative further noted that the role of ministers in the appointment of the Director was an issue that was strongly voiced by the Ministers from Tuvalu and Samoa at the 19th SPREP Meeting in FSM. The representative felt that the issue of the role of ministers should be adequately addressed otherwise the role of Ministers would be perceived as just rubber stamping decisions of the SAC.

217. In response to the issue regarding the role of ministers, the Secretariat advised that there is no rule preventing ministers from attending the SPREP Meeting. In the past, the ministerial segment came after, and was separate from, the SPREP Meeting. Starting this year however, the ministerial segment would be part of the SPREP Meeting and therefore this should no longer be an issue. The Secretariat also pointed out that Rule 8 acts to protect decisions of the SAC from political preferences.

218. With regard to Rule 4, the Secretariat advised that conflict of interest situations need to be declared and it is the role of the SAC as well as the discretion of the Chair of the SAC to assess the seriousness of that conflict of interest. The Secretariat also reminded the Meeting that the selection and appointment of the Director is based on merit rather than country or nationality.

219. FSM reaffirmed that the Officials Meeting is the legal decision-making body and he suggested that the amendments to the Rules of Procedure was a step forward to address issues of conflict of interest in the selection process in a transparent manner. The representative proposed to endorse the recommendation subject to revisions to Rule 8.3.

220. The Secretariat responded that Rule 8.3 would only come into effect should the recommended candidate decline the offer

and in such cases, the post should be offered to the second most suitable candidate.

221. Tokelau reminded the Meeting of the sensitivities of hearsay comments made by Members, recalling comments made by other Members. The Secretariat advised that at the drafting committee stage it would be possible for such statements to be modified.

222. RMI and Tuvalu expressed support for the work undertaken by the Secretariat to address concerns on this issue and Tuvalu added that further scrutiny of the amendments may be necessary.

223. American Samoa raised concerns over the role of ministers in the appointment of the Director and drew attention to the fact that not all countries have their Ministers represented in the ministerial meeting. On this matter, the representative pointed out that, if it was ever changed to be based on donor contribution, this would mean that the countries with major contributions to SPREP should then have a major role in the appointment process.

224. French Polynesia sought clarifications on the ranking process and queried why there were two ranking processes, one by the Selection Advisory Committee and the other by the SPREP Meeting.

225. France sought clarification on the schedule of the appointment of the Director and whether the new Rules of Procedure would be applied to the contractual renewal process.

226. The Secretariat clarified that the Rules of Procedures would come into effect immediately and so would be used next time there is a new appointment. The renewal of the current Director's contract is based on an assessment of his performance.

227. The Meeting **endorsed** the revised Rules of Procedure for Appointment of Director.

10.4: Appointment of Auditors

228. The Secretariat advised the Meeting that two tenders for the 2010 and 2011 audits had been received and that Betham and Company was being recommended for these years.

229. The Meeting **approved** the selection of Betham and Company of Samoa to audit the SPREP accounts for the years 2010 and 2011.

10.5: Amendments to Staff Regulations

230. The Secretariat advised the Meeting that it was proposing some minor amendments to the Staff Regulations, which had resulted from internal consultations of the Secretariat. It noted that currently such amendments can only be approved by the SPREP Meeting and that there was a need for a more efficient process to deal with these amendments. The Secretariat proposed that an open-ended working group be established to consider such amendments between sessions of the SPREP Meeting.

231. The Meeting:

- **approved** the proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations as outlined in Attachment 1 of WP.10.5; and
- **approved** the establishment of an open-ended Working Group comprising interested Members to meet inter-sessionally in order to:
 - (i) dispose of proposed amendments to the Staff Regulations that arise during the course of the year; and
 - (ii) recommend a more efficient process of dealing with Staff

Regulation amendments other than solely by way of the SPREP Meeting.

10.6: Report by the Director on Staff Appointment Beyond 6 Years

232. The Secretariat advised the Meeting on the reappointment of Mr Clark Peteru to the position of Legal Adviser for another 3-year term after serving 6 years in the same post.

233. FSM noted that this was a sensitive issue, given that a person is already in the position, and requested further information on the selection process. The Secretariat responded that this had been done in the past, as happened in the case of the Finance Manager in 2008, and that a competitive regional recruitment process had been conducted. The incumbent was the successful applicant and the Secretariat was satisfied with the performance of the person.

234. Cook Islands noted that this was not the first occasion that this had occurred, and there may be a need to look at the terms of reference for different positions within the Secretariat to allow for a broader applicants base. However, the representative agreed with the recommendations.

235. Samoa noted that the appointment had already been made, and that the Membership would therefore have to go along with the recommendations. The representative recommended that in future, there should be an outside panellist on all selection panels for senior appointments for purposes of transparency.

236. American Samoa agreed with the recommendation of the Secretariat, in light of the experience and good work of the incumbent.

237. Several delegates expressed their appreciation to the Environmental Legal Adviser for the services that have been provided over the years.

238. The Meeting *noted* the reappointment of Mr Clark Peteru to the position of Legal Adviser for a final 3 year term.

Agenda item 11: Items Proposed by Members

11.1: Mainstreaming Invasive Species and Biodiversity – a paper by New Caledonia

239. New Caledonia introduced a paper highlighting issues relating to invasive species and their impacts on livelihoods and ecosystems, including the need to assist in preserving the biodiversity of the region in the face of climate change. The Invasive Alien Species (IAS) project reflects the continued and particularly successful collaboration between New Caledonia and the Secretariat which was begun when New Caledonia was brought in to the Pacific Islands Invasives Learning Network (PILN).

240. FSM, Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, NZ, Niue, PNG, RMI, Samoa and USA strongly supported the project presented by New Caledonia and the recommendations. USA and Kiribati also highlighted complementary work with the Micronesian Biosecurity Plan and the Phoenix Islands Protected Area initiatives respectively. Niue also raised the issue of biocontrol measures, which should be carefully considered.

241. The Meeting:

- *reaffirmed* the importance of healthy ecosystems in helping Pacific islands to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change;

- **reaffirmed** that invasive species constitute a primary threat to livelihoods and ecosystems;
- **noted** prior efforts in invasive species control and **encouraged** the Secretariat and Members to search for increased resources and collaborative efforts to address the invasive species threat;
- **requested** the Secretariat to develop a social marketing strategy and programme that emphasises both political mainstreaming and environmental inspiration for the very young, to raise the level of understanding of the values of biodiversity and healthy ecosystems and of threats to it, including invasive species and climate change, and thereby generate increasing public and political support for management of these threats to livelihoods and the environment; and
- **encouraged** itself and all members to support such a programme within their respective jurisdictions.

11.2: Streamlined reporting by Pacific Island countries to the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements – progress update (a paper by Australia)

242. Australia presented its report and detailed the background to the processes and efforts to streamline reporting for PICs for biodiversity-related Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs), noting that the project will cease at the end of November 2010.

243. Cook Islands, NZ, PNG, Tuvalu and Vanuatu noted the work of Australia and supported the recommendations and a streamlined approach to reporting. Tuvalu, however, noted the difficulties of internet

capabilities and connectivity, and requested support to assist Members who do not have sufficient bandwidth. PNG suggested that streamlined reporting could also be part of the 'One Pacific Voice' at the CBD COP10.

244. NZ stated that it would like to see this streamlined reporting approach as a model, one which might be adopted in other international regimes with overlapping reporting requirements. Vanuatu echoed similar sentiments. Samoa would like to see the continuation of this project and urged Australia to continue with this initiative.

245. The Meeting:

- **noted** the final report and achievements of this project;
- **noted** the project end date of 30 November 2010; and
- **agreed** to continue to support the concept of streamlined reporting in international meetings where possible.

11.3: Country Profiles – exchange of information by Members on Year of Biodiversity

246. This was an information sharing session on activities carried out under the International Year of Biodiversity. Reports had been received from Australia, France, French Polynesia, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Samoa and USA. The Chair invited Members to provide brief verbal presentations on new developments that hadn't been covered during the week. Countries provided verbal updates on their activities, which ranged from schools-based activities to tree planting, banning of plastic bags and innovative public awareness programmes. Several countries have taken steps to engage high level decision-makers in their activities.

247. Members undertook to provide their written country profiles to assist the Secretariat with ongoing work in biodiversity conservation.

Agenda Item 12: Regional Cooperation

12.1: CROP Executives Meeting Report

248. The Secretariat tabled the Summary of Decisions of the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) Chief Executives on their meeting of 10-11 June 2009. The SPREP Director highlighted some of the key achievements and some proposed tasks for the future, in particular the establishment of the CROP CEO working group on climate change.

249. RMI noted the recommendations and the report and commended the established coordination between the CROP agencies. The representative noted that while SPREP had the mandate for the coordination of PIFACC, there are cross-cutting issues such as climate change and energy, biodiversity and food security, therefore meaningful coordination is required to make the most of investments. She welcomed the report.

250. The Meeting **noted** the report of the CROP Chief Executives.

Agenda Item 13: Statements by Observers

251. Statements were made by several observers at the Meeting. A full list of the observers and text of their statements is attached as **Annex VI**.

Agenda Item 14: Other Business

252. Samoa advised that, as co-chairs of the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI), Samoa and the Government of France would be hosting the next ICRI meeting in Apia, Samoa from 8 to 12 November. Members were invited to contact the Samoa delegation for more information if required.

253. American Samoa advised that his country would be hosting a climate change summit and its representative could be contacted for further information on this.

Agenda Item 15 – 18 are part of the **High Level Ministerial Segment** and is a separate report.

ANNEX I: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**KEY: N: Noumea COP Mtg
W: Waigani COP Mtg
O: Officials Meeting
HLS: High Level Segment**

AMERICAN SAMOA

Dr Fanuatele Toafa Vaiaga'e
Director
American Samoa Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
PO Box PPA
PAGO PAGO
American Samoa 96799

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: (684) 633 2304
Fax: (684) 633 5801
Email: tvaiagae@gmail.com

AUSTRALIA

Mr Andrew McNee
Assistant Secretary
Strategic & Advice Branch DEWHA
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel : +612 6274 2490
M: +614 9697-039
Email: Andrew.mcnee@environment.gov.au

Ms Melissa Jacques
Senior Policy Officer
International Section
Department of the Environment, Water, Heritage & Arts
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +612 627-61072
Fax: +612 627-61058
Email: Melissa.Jaques@environment.gov.au

Mr Jonathan Mitchell
Program Manager - AusAID
Australian High Commission
PO Box 214
Suva, FIJI

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +679-338-2211
Fax: +679-338-2316
Email: Jonathan.Mitchell@ausaid.gov.au

Ms Anne Giles
Assistant Director
International Adaptation Strategies Team
DCCEE
GPO Box 854
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +612 6159 7136
Email: Anne.Giles@climatechange.gov.au

Ms Louise Yabsley
Assistant Director
Sector Negotiations & Liaison Team
DCCEE
GPO Box 854
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +612 6159 7560
Fax: +612 6159 7136
Email: Louise.Yabsley@climatechange.gov.au

COOK ISLANDS

Mr Vaitoti Tupa
 Director
 National Environment Service
 PO Box 371
 Rarontonga, Cook Islands

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel : +682 21 256

Fax: +682 22 256

Email: Vaitoti@oyster.net.ck**FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA**

Mr Andrew Yatilman
 Director
 Office of Environment and Emergency Management
 FSM National Government
 PS-69 Palikir, Pohnpei 96941
 Federated States of Micronesia

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +691 320 8814/5

Fax: +691 320-8936

Email: andrewy@mail.fm**FIJI**

Hon. Samuela Alivereti Saumatua
 Minister
 Ministry of Local Government
 Urban Development, Housing & Environment
 PO Box 2131
 Suva, FIJI Islands

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +679 3304-307

Mobile: +679 9904-700

Email c/o: ctavaga@environment.gov.fj

Mr Jope Davetanivalu
 Director
 Department of Environment
 Ministry of Local Government, Urban Development, Housing
 & Environment
 PO Box 2109
 FIJI Islands

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +679 3311 – 699

Mobile: +679 9905-366

Email: jdavetanivalu@environment.gov.fj**FRANCE**

Ms Josiane Couratier
 Representant permanent-adjoint
 Aupres de la Communauté du Pacifique
 Delegation française auprès
 De la Communauté du Pacifique
 7 rue de Sebastopol – BP 8043
 Noumea, Nouvelle Calédonie

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +687 26 16 03

Fax: +687 26 12 66

Email: josiane.couratier@diplomatie.gouv.fr

Mr Laurent Caplat
 DAEI- SDCCDD-BBM
 Charge' de mission
 Mers Régionales et Eaux Douces
 Ministère de l'Ecologie, de l'Energie,
 du Développement
 Tour Pascal A, 6 place des Degres,
 92055 La Defense cedex
 France

N	W	O	HLS
√		√	√

Tel: +33 1 40 81 76 13

Fax: 689 47.22.71

E: Laurent.Caplat@developpement_durable.gouv.fr

FRENCH POLYNESIA

Mr. Bruno Peaucellier
 Chef du Service des Relations Internationales
 Office of the President
 PO Box 2551
 98713 Papeete
 French Polynesia

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +689 - 47.22.76
 Fax: +689 - 47.22.71

Email: bruno.peaucellier@presidence.pf

KIRIBATI

Hon. Amberoti Nikora
 Minister
 Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural
 Development
 P.O. Box 234
 Bikenibeu, Tarawa-Kiribati

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +686 28000
 Fax: +686 28334

Email: ambrikora@yahoo.com

Ms. Teboranga Tioti
 Deputy Secretary
 Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agricultural
 Development
 P.O. Box 234
 Bikenibeu, Tarawa-Kiribati

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +686 28000
 Fax: +686 28334

Email: teboranga@gmail.com

Mr. Farran Redfern
 Senior Environment Officer
 Environment & Conservation Division
 Ministry of Environment, Lands and
 Agricultural Development
 P.O. Box 234
 Bikenibeu, Tarawa-Kiribati

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +686 28211/28000
 Fax: +686 28334

Email 1: farranr@environment.gov.ki
 Email 2: kaokioki@yahoo.com

Mr. Timoa Tokataam
 First Secretary
 Kiribati High Commission
 Suva
 Fiji

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +679 9929 843
 Email : fssuva@mfa.gov.ki

MARSHALL ISLANDS

Ms. Yumiko Crisostomo
 Director
 Office of Environmental Planning and
 Policy Coordination (OEPPC)
 PO Box 975
 MAJURO 96960
 Republic of the Marshall Islands 96960

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +692- 625 7944
 Fax: +692- 625 7918

Email 1: yumikocrisostomo@gmail.com
 Email 2: oeppc@ntamar.net

NAURU

Hon. Fredrick. W. Pitcher
 Minister
 Ministry of Commerce, Industry & Environment
 Government Offices
 Yaren District
 Republic of Nauru

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +674 444 3133

F: +674 4443157

Email: Freddie.pitcher@naurugov.nr

Mr. Michael Aroi
 Director
 Regional Affairs
 Department of Foreign Affairs & Trade
 Republic of Nauru

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +674- 557 3133

Email: Michael.aroi@naurugov.ar

Mr. Russ Kun
 Secretary
 Department of Commerce. Industry & Environment
 Yaren
 Republic of Nauru

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +674- 557 3042

Email: russ.kun@naurugov.nr

NEW CALEDONIA

Hon. Jean-Louis d'Anglebermes
 Minister
 Ministry of Environment, Agriculture & Fishing
 98848 Noumea Cedex
 New Caledonia

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +687-75 56 40

Fax: +687

Email: jldanglebermes@gouv.nc

Dr Yves Lafoy
 Senior Adviser
 Scientific & Cultural Cooperation to New Zealand Regional
 Cooperation and External Relations
 Government of New Caledonia
 Currently on Secondment to New Zealand
 BP.P M2 98 849
 Noumea CEDEX
 New Caledonia

N	W	O	HLS
√		√	√

Tel: +64 27 260 1477

Email: yves.lafoy@gouv.nc

NEW ZEALAND

Ms. Marion Crawshaw
 High Commissioner
 New Zealand High Commission
 Waigani Crescent
 PO Box 1051
 Waigani NCD
 Port Moresby
 PNG

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +675 325 9444

Fax: +675 325 0565

Email: marion.crawshaw@mfat.govt.nz

Mr. David Dolphin
Deputy High Commissioner
New Zealand High Commission
PO Box 1876
Apia, Samoa

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +685-21635

Fax: +685-20086

Email: david.dolphin@mfat.govt.nz

Mr. Willy Morrell
Programme Manager
NZ AID Programme
Pacific Group (EMAIL ONLY)
Private Bag 18-901
WELLINGTON
New Zealand

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +64 4 439 8618

F: +644 43988683

Email: willy.morrell@mfat.govt.nz

Ms. Annie Wheeler
Conservation Engagement Group
Conservation House
Wellington
New Zealand

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +64 9 307 4843

Email: awheeler@doc.govt.nz

NIUE

Mr. John Talagi
Environmental Education Officer
Department of Environment
PO Box 80
Alofi, NIUE

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +683- 4021

Fax: +683- 4391

Email: environment.ca@mail.gov.nu

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Hon. Benny Allen
Minister
Ministry of Environment & Conservation Parliament House

Waigani, National Capital District
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +675 3277-520

Fax: +675 3253 551

Email: bennyallen@hotmail.com

Hon. Roy Biyama
Vice Minister
Ministry of Environment & Conservation
Parliament House
Waigani, National Capital District
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +675 3250-180

Fax: +675 3250-182

Email: rbiyama@gmail.com

Hon. Ben Semri
Minister
Ministry of Fisheries
Parliament House
Waigani, National Capital District
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +675 3277-579

Fax: +675 3277-480

Email:

Hon. Francis Potape
Minister
Ministry of Climate Change & Development
Parliament House
Waigani, National Capital District
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +675 3277-520
Fax: +675 325 0182
Email:

Dr. Wari Lea Iamo
Secretary
Dept of Environment & Conservation
P O Box 6601
Boroko, National Capital District
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 3250-180
Fax: +675 3250-182
Email 1: officesec@dec.gov.pg
Email 2: warileaiamo@yahoo.com

Prof. Frank Griffin
University of Papua New Guinea
Team PNG SPREP Special Advisor
Department of Environment and Conservation
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 3267-319
Fax: +675 3260-369
Email 1: frank.griffin@upng.ac.pg
Email 2: fkgriffin@gmail.com

Ms. Kay Kalim
Deputy Secretary
Sustainable Environment Program
Dept of Environment & Conservation
PO BOX 6601, Boroko
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675-325-0180
Fax: +675-325-0182
Email: kkalim@dec.gov.pg

Ms. Gwendoline Sissiou
Deputy Secretary
Policy & Evaluation
Department of Environment and Conservation
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 3250-180
Fax: +675 3250 182
Email: gsissiou@dec.gov.pg

Mr. Vagi Rei
Executive Manager
Marine Environment Program
Department of Environment and Conservation
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 3250 180
Fax: +675 3250 182
Email: vrei@dec.gov.pg

Mr. Michael Wau
Director
Environment Protection
Department of Environment and Conservation
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 3250 180
Fax: +675 3250 182
Email: mwau@dec.gov.pg

Mr. Michael Bongro
Executive Manager
International Policy
Department of Environment and Conservation
PO Box 6601
Boroko, National Capital District
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 3250 180
Fax: +675 3250 182
Email: mbongro@dec.gov.pg

Ms. Rose Singadan
 Manager
 Terrestrial Protected Area
 Department of Environment and Conservation
 Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 3250 180
 Fax: +675 3250 182
 Email: rsingadan@dec.gov.pg

Mr. James Sabi
 Manager
 Terrestrial Ecosystem Management
 Department of Environment and Conservation
 Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 3250 180
 Fax: +675 3250 182
 Email: jsabi@dec.gov.pg

Mr. Bernard Suruman
 Manager
 Marine Protected Area
 Department of Environment and Conservation
 Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 6250 180
 Fax: +675 3250 182
 Email: bsuruman@dec.gov.pg

Mr. Veari Kula
 Manager
 Industry Services
 Department of Environment and Conservation
 Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +675 6250 180
 Fax: +675 3250 182
 Email: vkula@dec.gov.pg

SAMOA

Hon. Faumuina Liuga
 Minister
 Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
 Government of Samoa
 Private Mail Bag
 Apia, Samoa

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +685-23800
 Fax: +685-23176
 Email: info@mnre.gov.ws

Mr. Taulealeausumai Laavasa Malua
 Chief Executive Officer
 Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment
 Government of Samoa
 Apia, Samoa

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel : +685 23800
 Fax : +685 23176
 Email : taulealea.malua@mnre.gov.ws

Ms Afoa Arasi Tiotio
 General Manager
 Samoa Land Corporation
 Government of Samoa
 Apia, Samoa

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel : +685 24881
 Fax : +685 21914
 Email : atitio@yahoo.com

Mr. Hele Matatia
 Principal Foreign Service Officer
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
 PO Box L1859
 Apia, Samoa

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel : +685 21171
 Fax : +685 21504
 Email : mfat@mfat.gov.ws

SOLOMON ISLANDS

H.E Bernard Batahanasia
Solomon Islands High Commissioner
Port Moresby
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Fax:

Email: sihicom@daltron.com.pg

Mr. Joseph Hurutau
Ministry of Environment
Conservation and Meteorology
HONIARA
Solomon Islands

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: (677) 27751

Fax: (677) 28054

Email: jhurutarau@gmail.com

Ms. Debra Kereseka Potakana
Senior Environment Officer
Environment Conservation Division
Ministry of Environment, Conservation & Meteorology
PO Box 21
Honiara
Solomon Islands

N	W	O	HLS
√	√		

Tel: +677-23031/2 Ext 201

Fax: +677-28054

Email: debra.kereseka@gmail.com

TOKELAU

Hon. Kuresa Nasau
Minister
Ministry of Economic Development & Natural Resources
Office of the Ongoing Government of Tokelau
Tokelau

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +690 2132

Fax: +690 2108

Email: knasau@gmail.com

Mr. Jovilisi Suveinakama
General Manager Apia/National
Office of the Ongoing Government of Tokelau
PO Box 3298
Apia
Samoa

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +685-20822

Mobile: +685-7771820

Email: jovilisi@lesamoa.net

TONGA

Hon. Lord Ma'afu Tukui'aulahi
Minister
Ministry of Lands, Survey & Natural Resources
PO Box 5
Nukualofa
Kingdom of Tonga

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +676 25-050

Fax: +676 25-051

Email:

Mr. Asipeli Palaki
Director
Ministry of Environment & Climate Change
PO Box 5
Nukualofa
Kingdom of Tonga

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +676- 25-050

Fax: +676 – 25051

Email: a_palaki@yahoo.com

TUVALU

Mr. Mataio Tekinene
 Director
 Department of Environment
 Private Mail Bag
 Vaiaku, Funafuti
 Tuvalu

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +688 – 20179
 Fax: +688- 20167/ 20836
 Email: enviro@tuvalu.tv

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Dr. Robert Domaingue
 International Relations Officer
 Bureau of Oceans, Environment & Science
 Office of Ocean & Polar Affairs
 2201 C Street, NW, Rm 2665
 Washington, D.C 20520
 United States of America

N	W	O	HLS
√		√	√

Tel: +202 647-3073
 Fax: +202 647-4353
 Email: DomaingueRC@state.gov

Dr. Norman Barth
 Regional Environment Officer
 31 Loftus street
 US Embassy Suva
 Suva, FIJI

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +679 331-4466
 Email: barthnh@state.gov

Ms. Susan Ware Harris
 NOAA Office of International Affairs
 14th St. & Constitution Ave., N.W.
 Room 6224 (Mail Stop 5230)
 Washington, DC 20230 United States of America
 U.S. Department of Commerce

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: 202-482-6196
 Direct Line: 202-482-5143
 Email: susan.ware-harris@noaa.gov

Ms. Sandeep Singh
 Regional Environmental Affairs Specialist
 31 Loftus street
 US Embassy Suva
 FIJI

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +679 331-4466 Ext 8210
 Email: singhsk1@state.gov

Dr. Stephen R. Piotrowicz
 Oceanographer
 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/OAR

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +301 427-2493
 Fax: +301 427-2131
 Email: steve.piotrowicz@noaa.gov

1100 Wayne Avenue
 Suite 1210
 Silver Spring, MD 20910
 United States of America

Mr. Brian Asmus
 Political/ Economic Officer
 US Embassy
 PO Box 1492
 Port Moresby
 Papua New Guinea.

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +675 321-1455 Ext:2136
 Fax: +675 321-1593
 Email: asmusBP@state.gov

VANUATU

Hon. Paul Telukluk
Minister
Ministry of Lands, Geology, Mines
Water Resources, Energy & Environment
Government of Vanuatu
Private Mail Bag 9007
Port Vila, Vanuatu.

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +678-23105/22892
Fax: +678-22213

Email: ptelukluk@vanuatu.gov.nu

Mr. Albert Williams
Director
Department of Environment & Conservation
PMB 9063
Port Vila
Vanuatu

N	W	O	HLS
√	√	√	√

Tel: +678 22227/25302
Mobile: +678-555-2174

Email 1: albert.williams52@gmail.com

Email 2: awilliams@vanuatu.gov.vu

Mr. Jean Tranut
First Political Advisor
Ministry of Lands, Geology, Mines
Energy & Rural Water
Port Vila. Vanuatu

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel: +678 23105

Email: tranut@vanuatu.com.vu

CROP AGENCIES/ADVISERS

PACIFIC ISLANDS FORUM SECRETARIAT

Mr. Tuiloma Neroni Slade
Secretary General
Pacific Island Forum Secretariat
Private Mail Bag
Suva
Fiji

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +679-3312-600

Fax: +679-322-0230

Email: sg@forumsec.org.fj

Dr. Scott Hook
Economic Infrastructure Adviser
Pacific Island Forum Secretariat
Private Mail Bag
Suva
Fiji

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +679 322-0212

Fax: +679 322-0249

Email: scotth@forumsec.org.fj

SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY

Mr. Amena Yauvoli
Manager
SPC Regional Office for Northern Pacific
Pohnpei
Federated States of Micronesia

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: 691-320-7523

Fax: 691-320-2725

Email: amenay@spc.int

SOPAC

Mr. Marc Overmars
 Manager- Water & Sanitation Programme
 South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)
 Private Mail Bag, GPO
 SUVA, Fiji

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +679 338 1377
 Email : marc@sopac.org

FFA

Ms. Barbara Hanchard
 Oceanic Fisheries Management Project Coordinator
 Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries
 Management Project Coordinator
 1 FFA Road, PO Box 629
 Honiara
 Solomon Islands

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +677 21124 Ext: 216
 Fax: +677-23995
 Email: Barbara.hanchard@ffa.int

OBSERVERS

Birdlife International

Dr. Mark O'Brien
 Senior Technical Advisor
 Birdlife International
 GPO Box 18332, Suva
 Fiji

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +679-331-3592
 Fax: +679-331-3492
 Email: mark@birdlifepacific.org.fj

Conservation International

Ms. Modi Pontio
 Country Program Manager
 Conservation International
 Port Moresby
 Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +675 641-00349
 Fax: +675 641-0359
 Email: mpontio@conservation.org

CSM

Ms. Heidrun Frisch
 ASCOBANS Coordinator/CMS Marine Mammals Officer UN
 Campus- Room 927
 Hermann-Ehlers-Str.10-53113 Bonn
 GERMANY

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +49 228 815 2418
 Fax: +49 228 815 2440/49
 Email: hfrisch@cms.int

Dr. Donna Kwan
 Programme Officer-Dugongs
 UNEP/CMS Office-Abu Dhabi
 C/o Environment Agency- Abu Dhabi
 Al Mamoura Building A, Al Muroor Rd (St No.4)
 PO Box 45553, Abu Dhabi
 United Arab Emirates

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +971 (0) 2 6934 410
 Mobile: +971 (0) 56 6987830
 Email: dkwan@cms.int

European Union

Dr. Kay Beese
 Counselor
 Rural & Human Resources Development
 Delegation of the European Union to PNG
 3rd Floor, The Lodge, Brampton St.
 Port Moresby, NCD
 Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +675-321-3544
 Fax: +675-321-7850
 Email: kay.beese@ec.europa.eu

Finish Meteorological Institute (FMI)

Mr. Jaakko Nuottokari
 Manager
 FMI Consulting Services
 Finnish Meteorological Institute
 FINLAND

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel:
 Fax:
 Email: Jaakko.Nuottokari@fmi.fi

Global Environment Facility (GEF)

Mr. Rawlestone Moore
 Adaptation & Country Relations Officer
 Global Environment Facility
 1818 H Street, NW
 Washington DC 20433. USA

N	W	O	HLS
			√

Tel : +1 202 473 8231
 Fax : +1 202 522 3240
 Email : rmoore1@thegef.org

International Union Conservation Nature (IUCN)

Mr. Etika Rupeni
 Roundtable Coordinator
 IUCN Office
 PMB, 5 Ma'afu St
 Suva, FIJI

N	W	O	HLS
		√	

Tel: +679
 Fax: +679
 Email: etika.rupeni@fspj.org.fj

Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

Mr. Kikuo Nakagawa
 Director General
 Global Environment Department
 5-25, Niban-cho, Chiyoda-ku
 Toyko 102-8012
 Japan

N	W	O	HLS
		√	

Tel: +81-3-5226-9510
 Fax: +81-3-5226-6343
 Email: Nakagawa.Kikuo@jica.go.jp

Mr. Shiro Amano
 Senior Advisor
 5th Floor, Nibancho Centre Bldg
 5-25 Niban-cho, Chiyoda-ku
 Tokyo 102-8012
 Japan

N	W	O	HLS
		√	

Tel : +685- 21593/28569
 Fax : +685- 28570
 Email : amano.shiro@jica.go.jp

Mr. Kentaro Yoshida
Environmental Management Division 1
Global Environment Department
5-25, Niban-cho, Chiyoda-ku
Toyko 102-8012
Japan

N	W	O	HLS
		√	

Tel: +81-3-5226-9542
Fax: +81-3-5226-6343
Email: Yoshida.Kentaro@jica.go.jp

Mr. Shun Nesaki
Assistant Resident Representative
JICA PNG
1st Floor, Pacific Place, Musgrave St
PO Box 1660, Port Moresby, NCD.
Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
		√	

Tel: +675 321 2677
Fax: +675 321 2679
Email: Nesaki.Shun@jica.go.jp

Mr. Faafetai Sagapolutele
Waste Management Consultant
Private Mail Bag
Apia, Samoa

N	W	O	HLS
		√	

Tel: +685 774 5668
Email: faafetais@hotmail.com

Mrs. Naoko Laka
Project Formulation Adviser
JICA Samoa office
Apia, SAMOA

N	W	O	HLS
		√	

Tel : +685-22-257
Mobile : +685-770-1252
Email : laka.naoko@jica.go.jp

National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research Ltd (NIWA)

Mr. Doug Ramsay
Manager- Pacific Rim & Coastal Consultant
National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research Ltd
NIWA. PO Box 11115 Gate 10
Silverdale Road
Hamilton
New Zealand

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel : +64 0 7 859 1894
Fax : +64 0 7 856 0151
Email : d.ramsay@niwa.co.nz

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Mr. David McLachlan-Karr
Resident Representative
Port Moresby
Papua New Guinea

Tel : +675
Fax: +675
Email:

Ms. Carol Flore
Deputy Resident Representative
Port Moresby
Papua New Guinea

Tel : +675
Fax: +675
Email:

Ms. Gwen Maru
PNG Country Office
Port Moresby
Papua New Guinea

Tel : +675
Fax: +675
Email:

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Dr. Greg Sherley
 Task Manager Biodiversity Conservation
 Division of Global Environment Fund
 UN Environment Programme (UNEP)
 Private Mail Bag
 Apia
 Samoa

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: +685-23670
 Fax: +685-7505346
 Email: greg.sherley@undp.org

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

Mr. Henry Taiki
 WMO Office for the South West Pacific Centre
 PO BOX 3044
 Vailima, APIA
 SAMOA

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel: (685) 25706
 Fax: (685) 25771
 Email: htaiki@wmo.int

World Wide Fund (WWF)

Dr. Eric Verheij
 Conservation Director
 Western Melanesian Programme
 WWF
 Port Moresby
 Papua New Guinea

N	W	O	HLS
		√	√

Tel:
 Fax:
 Email: everheij@wwfpacific.or.pg

TRANSLATORS & INTERPRETERS

French Language Solutions Pty Ltd
 21 Queen Street
 Randwick
 NSW 2031
 Australia

Phone: +612 93981767
 Fax: +612 85691383
 Email: Olivier@french.com.au

INTERPRETERS

Mr Bertold Schmitt
 Ms Dominique Toulet
 Mr Tyrone Carbone

TRANSLATORS

Mr Olivier Richards
 Mr Pierre Pellerin
 Mr Raymond Poirrier

TECHNICIAN

Mr. Alan Doyle

SPREP Secretariat

Mr. David Sheppard
Director

Mr. Kosimiki Latu
Deputy Director

Mr. Stuart Chape
Programme Manager – Island Ecosystems

Dr. Netatua Pelesikoti
Programme Manager – Pacific Futures

Mr. Clark Peteru
Environmental Legal Adviser

Mr. Espen Ronneberg
Climate Change Adviser

Ms. Alofa S Tuuau
Finance Manager

Mr. David Haynes
Pollution Prevention & Waste Management Adviser

Mr. Jeffrey Kinch
Coastal Management Adviser

Ms. Easter Galuvao
Biodiversity Officer

Mr. Anthony Talouli
Marine Pollution Adviser

Mr. Dean Solofa
PI-GCOS Officer

Mr. Joe Stanley
Global Environmental Facility-Support Adviser

Ms. Seema Deo
Education & Social Communications Adviser

Mr. Stephen Powell
Institutional Capacity Adviser

Mr. Christian Slaven
IT Database & Systems Administrator

Ms. Apiseta Eti
Personal Assistant to the Deputy Director

Ms. Lupe Silulu
Registry Supervisor

Ms. Pauline Fruean
Conference & Travel Officer

ANNEX II: OPENING ADDRESS BY THE SPREP DIRECTOR, MR DAVID SHEPPARD

Honourable Minister Mr Benny Allen,
Minister for Environment and
Conservation in Papua New Guinea
Distinguished delegates to the SPREP
Meeting
Donors and Friends of SPREP
Observers
Ladies and gentlemen

Good morning,

Bikpela gut morning i kam long you olgeta

Thank you Minister for your courtesy and consideration in making time in your busy schedule to address our gathering and officially open the 2010 SPREP Meeting. We are looking forward to your opening address.

I would like to extend a warm welcome to everyone to this Opening Ceremony. I hope your journey here was a safe one, and thank you for making the time to attend this very important meeting.

I am well aware that this is a challenging time for all of us working in the environmental field and also that you are all busy people.

We have a full agenda in front of us – reflecting a busy and active past year and also ambitious future plans.

We will outline many activities and initiatives over the next few days.

Following your instructions from last years' SPREP Meeting we have embarked on an ambitious change management strategy - the bottom line is that we are refocusing to better serve and assist you, our Members, in addressing the major environmental challenges you face in

your Pacific Island Countries and Territories.

I believe SPREP is becoming stronger and better able to support our Members in these efforts.

We have spent most of this year looking to the future – addressing issues such as where is SPREP heading and how do we best get there. In looking forward it is also important to look back and to learn the lessons of history.

In August this year we celebrated the 10th anniversary of moving into the SPREP Compound in Vailima in Apia and also – in a sense - the 36th birthday of SPREP. As we noted at the time this is much older than all of the ladies currently at SPREP.

We recalled that SPREP's origins date from a Regional Conference on Conservation of Nature in 1969 which recommended the recruitment of a regional ecological adviser. And that SPREP then started as a small programme in July 1973 - in fact a one man band, Arthus Dahl - within the Secretariat of the Pacific Community – SPC.

A tour ceremony marking 10 years in the SPREP compound, we paid tribute to the many persons who have guided SPREP since that time, including past SPREP Directors: Vili Fuavao, Tamarii Tutangata, and Asterio Takesy. We also noted the transition of SPREP from a programme of SPC to an independent organisation.

Like any birth there are always nervous moments but we were fortunate for the guidance of wise men and women from many Pacific Islands to steer us through this process, including Robin Yarrow from

Fiji, Sione Tongilava from Tonga, and Kilifoti Eteuati from Samoa.

We noted the many changes for SPREP and for the Pacific environment since we first set up shop in Noumea. On the environment front – many of the same threats and challenges still exist - and, in fact, have become more critical.

In PNG as for other Pacific countries, the environment has special meaning. It has shaped our Pacific cultures - it is our heritage and the basis of our life. It provides us with an income, a home and a sense of self respect as Pacific people.

Biodiversity is an area of even more focus than usual for SPREP this year as we celebrate the International Year of Biodiversity in the Pacific under the theme: *Value Pacific Island Biodiversity – It's Our Life*. The biodiversity of the Pacific region is of global significance but is highly at risk. Extinction rates in the region, especially for bird species, are among the highest in the world. There are many reasons why the Pacific has so many threatened species, including the vulnerability of small, isolated islands to impacts such as invasive species, loss of habitat and excessive resource exploitation.

Issues relating to biodiversity are clearly bought into focus in Papua New Guinea.

We note that PNG in itself contains over 5% of the world's biodiversity in less than 1% of the world's total land area. This biodiversity has both global and local value – it is vital for the many endemic and rare animal and plant species but it is critically important for local people who depend on this biodiversity for their food and livelihoods, and as a source of spiritual inspiration.

We note PNG's commendable progress in conserving biodiversity, including the establishment of protected areas on land and at sea, and your measures to work with and involve local communities. Like other Pacific countries there are major challenges in addressing issues such as pollution, including that from mining operations, and in developing the capacity to effectively manage your environment.

Minister – thank you your efforts to better manage the environment in PNG in a sustainable manner and we look forward to learning from your experience while in your country.

Climate change remains the key overarching threat facing us all. I have visited a number of Pacific countries over the last year and have seen at first hand the immediate threats facing the low lying atolls and islands of the Pacific.

Climate Change is not just an environmental issue – it is also an issue with immense social, economic and moral dimensions.

Many of us participated at the Copenhagen Climate Conference last year. While the results were less than we hoped for we must still work together to ensure that the Pacific voice is heard and heard loudly at the international level.

We must ensure the funding commitments made at Copenhagen are honored, including those part of the Copenhagen Accord. Funds must flow immediately to assist Pacific countries – among the most vulnerable in the world – to adapt and respond to climate change.

There are many other important climate financing issues that should be addressed

in our region in particular, the need for quicker access to available funding and the need to reduce administrative requirements and process wherever possible.

The last year has been a period of change as we have moved to implement findings of the Independent Corporate Review of SPREP and the Regional Institutional Framework. These provide many opportunities for SPREP to move forward as a stronger and more effective organization.

We have done our best to follow the clear directions you provided at the 2009 SPREP Meeting and we will report on progress to this SPREP Meeting.

At all times our work has been guided by the principle that we must be more responsive to our Members and ensure that all programmes and projects are addressing identified country priorities in environmental management and climate change.

We have worked with all SPREP Members to develop a new Strategic Plan for the organisation to guide our work over the next 5 years. We seek guidance from you, our Members, on this Plan and on the vision for SPREP over the coming week.

Delegates, ladies and gentlemen, we have a busy agenda ahead of us. We will address many of the major challenges facing the people of the Pacific. We look forward to your guidance and wisdom as we work through our agenda.

The SPREP Secretariat is here to help you and will provide every assistance to support your efforts and ensure useful outcomes arise from this Meeting.

This is my second meeting as the SPREP Director and I would like to acknowledge the hard work of Kosi Latu, our Deputy Director and the SPREP staff, over the last year. I feel honored and very fortunate to be able to lead such a team of competent and hardworking men and women.

Many of you have had the opportunity to work directly with our staff members. We look forward to strengthening the bonds of this relationship and our friendship over the coming week and beyond.

We have appreciated the positive support from SPREP Members as we have worked to support your country environmental priorities.

Thank you to the many donors of partners of SPREP who have ensured that our work has translated to practical and tangible outcomes at the national and regional level.

Thank you Honorable Minister and all your staff for the very warm, positive and friendly hosting of this the 21st SPREP Meeting.

Thank you

Fa'afetai lava
Tank yu tumas

ANNEX III: OPENING ADDRESS BY MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION, GOVERNMENT OF PAPUA NEW GUINEA – HON. BENNY ALLEN MP

Your Excellencies, the High commissioners from New Zealand and Solomon Islands

Distinguished delegation leaders and your delegates

The Director of SPREP and the Secretariat staff

Invited officials from the UN agencies, the GEF, and relevant government, non government and collaborating organisations

Staff of Department of Environment and Conservation and Foreign Affairs and Trade

Ladies and gentlemen

Good morning,

On behalf of the Government and people of Papua New Guinea, I have the honor and privilege to stand before and formally welcome you all to this country, especially Madang to this 21st Meeting of Pacific Regional Environment Programme or SPREP as it is often referred to. This meeting is a special one us as this is the first time this country is hosting this meeting. Many of you have already been here for almost a week and I hope the arrangements that have been put in place to welcome and accommodate you have been adequate.

Distinguished delegates and observers - in this day and age where our nations strive to achieve sustainable development, the importance of managing the integrity of our environment, be it local, national or regional in an environmentally sound manner cannot be emphasized enough.

As we all know, one of the three pillars for acquiring sustainable development at any national level is the *environment* – more specifically a healthy environment.

It is widely recognized in the region that the destruction of the environment is one of the major threats to sustainable development in the Pacific islands and has a direct influence on the quality of people's lives. Without adequate measures to combat the growing destructive practices the Pacific islands' efforts to maintain healthy societies, to stimulate development and new investment and ensure a sustainable future for its people may be severely or significantly undermined.

Rapidly increasing populations are putting huge pressures on the ability of our environment to sustain our evolving way of life. Developmental activities and increasing urbanisation are beginning to show this. In addition, increased imports of polluting and hazardous substances combined with a lack of resources and adequate knowledge on safe disposal techniques, make general pollution prevention and waste management a critical issue for all of us. Waste management, ladies and gentlemen has both a direct and indirect relationship to and influence on the health of the environment. In addition, inappropriate and over usage of land for unsustainable agricultural and forestry practices is also putting pressure on the land to sustain growing communities.

Our marine resources are being harvested at alarming rates and if we do not react quickly enough and/or put in place appropriate conservation measures and sustainable usage practices then we stand to lose many of our traditional food sources and edible species of marine fauna and flora which will be devastating to our future generations.

Climate change is a no longer an issue

that we can only read about in books, reports and documents -our people in the Pacific region are beginning to be affected by this phenomenon. Our region is one of the most vulnerable regions in the world and the concerns of increases in the intensity of natural events such as cyclones, hurricanes, floods and coastal inundations are becoming regular realities - some as frequent as on a half yearly basis. For some low lying atolls, these may mean relocation. We in Papua New Guinea have already had to relocate a community of people from the Cataret Island.

Our region is the home to the world's most diversified collection of coral reefs which are in turn home to a massive range of flora and fauna which cannot be found anywhere else in the world. In many parts of the region, these coral reefs are the backbone of our food supply. These are now under threat because of coral bleaching due to climate change.

Distinguish delegates and observers, environmental pollution and destruction through what I have just explained can have direct and indirect linkages to economic development. The generation of waste materials through, for example, the purchase of goods with a high disposable content (e.g. packaging) represents a waste of raw materials and also a waste of money by the purchaser. Many of the materials thrown away as municipal rubbish represent lost resources when the materials could be used in other ways (e.g. use of green waste as compost). The recovery of some of these materials can have direct economic benefits through incentive mechanisms (e.g. recovery and resale of aluminium cans and glass bottles) and in other cases indirect benefits (e.g. use of waste oil as a fuel substitute). In addition, there is an economic cost involved in collecting and disposing of these materials properly.

The downstream economic effects of destructed environments can also be significant. These can include reduction in land value and productivity due to contamination, direct effects on fish and other marine resources, and increased health costs due to the adverse effects on people. Export markets are also potentially at risk as many developed countries continue to tighten their monitoring and control of contaminated foods.

Another potential downstream effect of destructed environments is on tourism. Much of the tourism industry in the Pacific Islands is based around the images of clean unspoilt beaches, crystal clear waters and thriving coral reefs. This image can be severely jeopardised by inappropriate land usage, littering and rubbish dumping, and through the associated contamination of marine areas. Tourists may also be discouraged by public health concerns over infectious and vector-borne diseases, which can sometimes be attributed to inadequate waste management practices.

The potential economic benefits from a clean and well managed environment should also be recognised. In the manufacturing and energy sectors this can include reductions in raw material costs, while at the consumer level reductions in waste materials such as packaging will often be associated with reductions in overall costs for the goods associated with that packaging. In the case of tourism, clean surroundings and a healthy environment will enhance the overall tourist experience and assist in promoting future visits.

Properly managing all aspects of our environment can also help improve our health. Rubbish dumps are a potential source of numerous toxic and harmful materials, which have the potential to impact on humans through leaching into

water supplies or by uptake into foods grown in contaminated soils. Fish, shellfish and other marine food sources can also become contaminated through surface run-off or leaching into coastal marine areas.

Rubbish burning is a common practice in many Pacific Islands, and this can be a major source of air pollution and the release of toxic chemicals such as dioxins and furans. Poorly managed rubbish collection systems and disposal facilities are also a significant source of odours and a breeding ground for rodents, flies and mosquitoes, with the resulting potential for increasing outbreaks of infectious and vector-borne diseases.

There are numerous health aspects associated with improper environmental management activities. At a very basic level, poorer neighbourhoods are often the preferred locations for rubbish dumps. And, the residents of these neighbourhoods are often most at risk from the associated pollutants, due to their generally poorer health status compared to other groups. Women and children have been shown to be more at risk than men from many pollutants. For example, most persistent organic chemicals accumulate in body fats and the accumulation rates tend to be higher for women than for men because of their generally high fat levels. Those same pollutants can be readily transferred from mothers to their babies, either through placental transfer to the unborn child, or via breast milk in lactating mothers. Infants and young children are especially vulnerable to the effects of pollutants such as mercury and lead, which can have adverse effects on both mental and physical development.

In Pacific communities, women are often the people most directly involved in aspects of environmental management,

especially at a domestic level. There are class aspects as well, with most waste management activities being seen as connected with people of lower social status. Poor people can least afford to spend money on "waste" materials such as packaging. In addition, they are amongst the most vulnerable to losses of basic food supplies through the effects of contamination of land or marine resources. They are also amongst the most vulnerable to the potential adverse health effects associated with exposure to harmful pollutants.

Future Trends:

Over the last two decades, the Pacific Islands region has undergone a great deal of progress and development both at the national and regional level. This trend is unlikely to change over the next decade and consequently the associated environmental issues are also unlikely to deviate significantly from the current trend.

This means that as countries in the regions continue to develop in all aspects of their progress the inevitable increase pressure on our environment to sustain us is also likely to continue. Populations in the region will continue to grow and with it come an increase in the destruction of our environment as well as the need for other services. People in the region are becoming more prosperous through their involvement in the commercial and industrial development of the countries and as such their generation of waste and environmental use is also going to continue to increase. Industries continue to develop in modern technology and in many of these cases the requirements for their existence need an increased amount of material, many of which will ultimately end up as waste.

All these progresses will also increase the need for environmental and public utility services to be provided under the

different sections described above. All these will inevitably result in a need for all of us to collectively work together to make sure that the integrity of our is not compromised but at the same time, allowing economic development to occur for the benefit of our people.

SPREP is an organisation that we all belong to and believe in. It is also the Regional Organisation that has been charged by our leaders to assist the countries with all of these environmental issues that I have highlighted. The Government of Papua New Guinea supports the work of the Secretariat and I know that in this meeting there will be deliberations on the new Strategic Plan for the next five year (2011-20 15) among other things. I encourage you all to be critical, frank and candid in your interventions and input in the discussions. Let us be reminded that this is our Strategic Plan and we need to direct **our** Secretariat on what we want it to do – not the other way around.

The Secretariat needs to be guided on how we want it to work at the national level and this meeting is an excellent opportunity for us to do just that. The regional coordinating role it plays is a given but the management and staff of the Secretariat also needs to understand that the environmental problems exist at the national level and we need them to be more visible and participatory at the national levels rather than just providing advisory roles remotely from the Headquarters in Samoa and meeting up with them at international meetings. This will have resourcing implication and we as individual members need to assist in this manner by digging deeper.

In as far as the rest of the program is concern, I encourage you all to take time in healthy debates of the issues that are before us in this meeting. Let us be

critical, analytical and strategic in your interventions but above all, let us be sensitive to the needs of others and assist the Secretariat in putting together what our real needs are so it can assist us effectively and properly with your needs so together we can make a change. Because in environmental protection in the real world, no one group, approach or action in isolation can achieve the goal. This is where our partnerships or synergistic approaches are necessary in managing our environment.

In the environment, everything is linked. And so the actions to deal with threats to the environment must also be linked. And all sectors and the community must be involved. The different players may take different approaches, but it is important that these approaches are coordinated, are in step, and that each knows what the other is doing – at both the national, and regional levels.

I thank you once again for your commitment and effort and wish you all a successful and productive week.

In concluding distinguish delegate and observers. I hope your deliberations over the next couple of days will transpire into decisions that will set the way for our issues to be addressed in a way that will benefit the very people we all represent. I also hope that you will take time out to enjoy the friendship, culture and food that the people of Madang and Papua New Guinea at large have to offer.

Finally, I wish you all well in your meeting and safe journeys home following the meeting.

ANNEX IV: AGENDA

Agenda Item 1: Opening Prayer

Agenda Item 2: Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair

Agenda Item 3: Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures

Agenda Item 4: Action Taken on Matters Arising from Twentieth SPREP Meeting

Agenda Item 5: 2009 Overview

5.1 Presentation of Annual Report for 2009 and Director's Overview of Progress since the Twentieth SPREP Meeting

5.2 Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Report on the 2009 Annual Work Programme and Budget

5.3 Audited Annual Accounts for 2009

Agenda Item 6: Institutional Reform and Strategic Issues

6.1 SPREP Strategic Plan 2011 - 2015

6.2 ICR and EC Assessment Follow up

6.3 Regional Institutional Framework (RIF) Update

Agenda Item 7: Strategic Financial Issues

7.1 Report on Members' Contributions

Agenda Item 8: Regional Conventions

8.1 Report on the Conference of the Parties to the Noumea Convention

8.2 Report on the Conference of the Parties to the Waigani Convention

Agenda Item 9: 2011 Work Programme and Budget

9.1 Island Ecosystems Programme

9.1.1 Regional Marine Species Programme

9.1.2 CBD COP10 preparations

9.2 Pacific Futures Programme

9.2.1 PIFACC Mid-Term Review

9.2.2 Review of Regional Meteorological Services

9.2.3 Directions in the UNFCCC Process

9.2.4 Global Environment Facility (GEF)

developments and issues in the Pacific

9.2.5 Waste Reduction and Pollution Prevention

9.3 Consideration and Approval of Proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2011

Agenda Item 10: Corporate Services

10.1 New Salary Banding Model

10.2 Annual Market Data

10.3 Appointment of Director - proposed revisions

10.4 Appointment of Auditors

10.5 Amendments to Staff Regulations

10.6 Report by the Director on Staff Appointment Beyond 6 years

Agenda Item 11: Items Proposed by Members

11.1 Mainstreaming Invasive Species and Biodiversity – A paper by New Caledonia

11.2 Streamlined reporting by Pacific Island countries to the biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements – final report – A paper by Australia

11.3 Country Profiles – Exchange of Information by Members on Year of Biodiversity

Agenda Item 12: Regional Cooperation

12.1 CROP Executives Meeting Report

Agenda Item 13: Statements by Observers

Agenda Item 14: Other Business

Agenda Item 15: High-Level Ministerial Segment (9 September)

15.1 Welcome Ceremony for Environment Ministers

15.2 Introduction to meeting

15.3 Environmental Financing in the Pacific (keynote address: Monique Barbut, GEF CEO)

15.4 Climate Change – UNFCCC Process: from Copenhagen to Mexico and PIFACC Mid-Term Review

15.5 Recommendations from Officials Meeting

15.6 SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015

15.7 Madang Communiqué

Agenda Item 16: Date and Venue of Twenty-Second SPREP Meeting

Agenda Item 17: Adoption of Report of the Twenty-First SPREP Meeting

Agenda Item 18: Close

ANNEX V: DIRECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2009 & OVERVIEW OF PROGRESS SINCE THE 2009 SPREP MEETING

SPREP Members, distinguished guests, Ladies and Gentlemen.

It is my pleasure to present to you the 2009 Annual Report for SPREP and also to report on progress since the last SPREP Meeting.

Our achievements are detailed in the Annual Report and in the Project Management and Evaluation Report which will be discussed next.

In this presentation I would like to highlight a few items to illustrate how SPREP is becoming a more relevant and focused organisation responding to member priorities.

At the outset I would like to say how happy I am to be back at SPREP.

It has been my pleasure to have visited 9 SPREP Member countries since starting – thank you very much to all involved for your warm hospitality. I have appreciated the opportunity to see at first hand your environmental challenges and to discuss with you how they can be addressed.

It has also been an honour and a pleasure to work with the professional, hardworking and dedicated team at the SPREP Secretariat. I can assure you that you are well served by this team.

The last year and a half has been a period of change – both for the Pacific environment and for SPREP itself.

From an environmental perspective, many Pacific countries and territories were affected by extreme weather events and natural disasters, the worst of which was the tsunami that severely impacted Samoa, American Samoa and Tonga on 29 September 2009, with tragic loss of life and

destruction of property. The Secretariat assisted Samoa through impact assessments, surveying and mapping affected areas as well as assessing impacts on fisheries and sea turtles.

The impacts of climate change continue to pose major challenges for Pacific countries. Leaders at the recent Pacific Islands Forum meeting noted that climate change remains the greatest threat to the livelihoods, security and well being of the peoples of the Pacific.

SPREP has actively responded to climate change and to other major challenges during the year.

Your Secretariat has closely followed your directions from last year's SPREP Meeting to ensure we are a more efficient and effective organisation.

We launched an ambitious change management strategy in 2009, guided by four key principles.

The first principle has been to improve the delivery of tangible services to SPREP Members.

Last year you directed the Secretariat to increase its level of support to Pacific Island Countries and territories

I am pleased to report major progress.

We have made good progress with implementing decisions of last years' SPREP meeting and this is outlined in the Working papers for this meeting.

The first item on the list of suggestions from SPREP Members at the last SPREP Meeting (see Working Paper 4) was for the Secretariat to improve the awareness of

Pacific environmental issues by developing appropriate material, such as a calendar.

I hope that you will be pleased with the 2011 SPREP calendar that has been distributed to you.

Some other highlights have included increasing the attention to waste management and pollution – in 2008 we allocated 6% of our budget to this area – this has now been increased to 15%. We will sign an agreement at this meeting with the Japanese government to greatly expand work on waste management in Pacific Island countries. We have also increased our engagement with Pacific Island Territories – such as through our joint work with New Caledonia on the major regional Ramsar meeting held recently. We will continue to expand our involvement with Pacific Territories.

We have significantly increased our level of direct support to SPREP Members. The large number of activities SPREP has implemented in each - and every - Pacific Island Member country and territory is outlined in Attachment 3 of Working Paper 5.2.

Please look through this list and take this as a measure of our commitment to support practical country initiatives and to respond to your identified needs and priorities.

Efforts to consult members on priorities has increased since the last SPREP Meeting, notably through the preparation of the draft Strategic Plan. I am proud we have implemented the largest Member consultative exercises in SPREP's history. I am also delighted that three-quarters of all SPREP members responded to the strategic plan questionnaire and participated in the consultative workshops – this is a huge increase on the level of involvement in the last SPREP Strategic Planning exercise in 2004.

Through this exercise you have informed us that the region's strategic priorities are climate change, biodiversity, waste and pollution management, and environmental monitoring and governance.

These are the priorities outlined in the draft Strategic Plan under consideration at this SPREP Meeting.

We seek input from you - the Members - to finalise the plan at this SPREP meeting.

The second principle has been to improve internal processes, in particular in response to recommendations of institutional reviews

The first half of 2009 was dominated by the finalisation of the Regional Institutional Framework (RIF) review process, which recommended a number of functions be transferred from SOPAC to SPREP and to SPC. We have moved decisively to implement RIF recommendations.

All functions relating to SPREP, including the PIGOOS position and the Island Climate Update, have been transferred under a Letter of Agreement in April, 2010.

Two major reviews – the Independent Corporate Review (ICR) and the European Union review - have provided SPREP with a platform for institutional strengthening, which will put your Secretariat on a better footing to deliver services to member countries and territories.

These reviews highlighted a number of issues where improvement was required, particularly in relation to strategic planning, staff morale and financial management.

The Secretariat has moved quickly to address key recommendations from these reviews, and this is reported in the background papers for this meeting.

The need to improve staff morale was highlighted in the ICR. We have

strengthened team building initiatives, including through a staff retreat in July 2010, which we also used to involve staff in drawing up SPREP's first ever set of organisational values and code of conduct.

Recently we undertook a staff satisfaction survey to monitor progress in morale. This will be undertaken annually and the results used to monitor progress and to address particular issues and problems.

Last year I reported to you that the 2009 staff survey found that 21% of staff assessed their morale as high or very high. I am pleased the results from this year's survey indicate a significant increase in overall staff satisfaction, with 74% of staff currently rating their morale as high or very high.

We have made our management more open and consultative. We regularly meet as a full Secretariat and have established a functioning Executive Team which is reporting regularly to staff in an open and transparent manner. Our performance indicator is that all outcomes from each Executive Team meeting are reported to all staff within 2 days of the meeting.

We have also strengthened our financial management, including through approving state of the art procurement guidelines and implementing a number of improvements to our financial systems to tighten our accountability.

In relation to financial matters, I am pleased to report that the SPREP budget has increased from a dip in recent years. In 2007 the SPREP budget was 7.19 million, this has increased to 9.8 million in 2010, and we anticipate the budget to increase in 2011 to 11.5 million. This will enable the Secretariat to better support your national environmental priorities.

We note that this increase is through project and programme funding, currently

around 80% of our budget, and that the level of core funding, currently around 20%, has remained relatively stable over many years.

We believe this pleasing growth in the SPREP budget reflects a growing confidence of donors in our performance and also in our improved financial management.

We value this trust and we will work hard to maintain it.

Our aim is to ensure that this increase in budget is resulting in improved services to SPREP members and that all financial management is transparent, accountable, and in accord with global best practice.

The SPREP budget will be discussed later in the meeting but I am pleased to also note that the auditors have provided a clean and unqualified opinion of the Secretariat's financial operations in 2009.

The third key principle has been to strengthen SPREP's partnerships, to better support Member countries.

The environmental challenges facing the Pacific are too large for any one organisation to tackle. Effective and more focussed partnerships are essential.

We recognise the critical role of partnerships to SPREP's work. Over the last year MoUs have been signed with key partners such as the International Maritime Organisation, the University of the South Pacific (USP) and the Ramsar Convention Secretariat.

One outcome of the RIF process has been a more collegial and cooperative approach between the different CROP agencies. SPREP hosted a meeting of CROP CEOs in June and we agreed on a number of measures to improve cooperation, including through establishing a CROP Working Group on Climate Change.

The CROP Marine Sector Working Group was also re-activated last year, and already inter-agency cooperation through its leadership has resulted in the development of the Pacific Oceanscape concept proposed by Kiribati and its endorsement by the Pacific Leaders Forum this year.

The Oceanscape initiative provides an excellent way of linking different initiatives related to conservation and sustainable use of the Pacific Ocean, including the Coral Triangle, the Micronesia Challenge and the Pacific Ocean 2020 Challenge. Our challenge is to work with Members and regional agencies to ensure that it is funded – and becomes a reality.

I would also like to acknowledge the many donor organisations supporting SPREP. A glimpse through our 2009 Annual Report shows that 46 donors and supporters have contributed to SPREP's work.

We are particularly pleased that several key SPREP Member countries have increased their support to SPREP, including France in relation to solid waste management and Australia in relation to climate change.

I apologize for not mentioning all donors by name but I would like you to know how appreciative we are for your support and for your confidence in SPREP.

What we can never fully convey adequately in a set of numbers or an overview presentation like this is the multiplier effect of these investments – every dollar invested in SPREP is resulting in tangible benefits to the countries and peoples of the Pacific. In many cases that funding is used to lever support from other partners, to multiply those benefits many times over.

To our donors and partners - thank you all, most sincerely, for supporting and working with SPREP to make the Pacific environment a healthy and sustainable one.

The fourth principle is to improve the linkage between SPREP's policy work and practical, on-ground demonstration projects.

We are striving to ensure SPREP's work at the policy level is based on practical, on ground experience and better linked to good information and science.

SPREP provides policy support to its members in a number of fora, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. It is essential that this advice is grounded in reality and based on the best knowledge available. Decisions on key issues affecting the region such as climate change must be based on the best available science.

A good example of SPREP's shift to practical national support is our increasing development waste management programmes within Pacific countries, with the support of Japan, through JICA and support from France.

We are developing partnerships to strengthen the scientific basis of our work, such as through our joint work with the Australian funded Pacific Climate Change Science Program.

In summary, SPREP has made considerable progress over the last year in addressing the concerns expressed by SPREP members and as outlined in the various reviews of the organisation.

We have achieved many practical on ground outcomes for the environment and for sustainable development in the Pacific region as outlined in the Annual Report. However major challenges remain.

The biodiversity of the Pacific is of global significance but is also highly at risk. For example, extinction rates in the region, especially for bird species, are among the highest in the world.

Climate change remains the overarching challenge for Pacific countries.

In 2009, the Secretariat heavily supported Pacific country preparations for the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference which proved to be one of the largest-ever UN gatherings.

There was strong representation of our region, with eight Pacific Heads of State sending a clear message about the importance of climate change for the Pacific. All Pacific island countries at Copenhagen worked hard to ensure the Pacific voice was heard, and heard loudly.

The outcomes from Copenhagen fell short of the hopes of Pacific countries. However, I believe that SPREP and its Members should not give up. We should recognise the conference as one step along a path, even though it is neither as ambitious nor as effective an outcome as that for which many were pushing so hard.

It is also essential that the targets and the financial pledges in the Copenhagen Accord are honoured and directed to help our communities adapt to climate change.

The strategy for follow up on climate change will be one of the major topics under discussion this week and, in particular, at the high-level segment of the SPREP meeting, which will be attended by many environment ministers from the region.

We are pleased that we have strengthen our work on Climate Change through the innovative PACC and PIGGAREP projects, implemented in partnership and with the generous support through UNDP/GEF. We acknowledge this support with appreciation.

The 2009 Annual Report highlights the breadth of work SPREP is undertaking to support its Members to improve management and protection of their

environments. Excellent progress was made in helping Pacific countries better manage their solid waste, address marine pollution, and protect ecosystems and important species, both on land and in the sea. The Secretariat continued to support Pacific countries in United Nations and other global processes on biodiversity, species conservation, wetlands conservation and support for sustainable development.

The Secretariat is committed to making SPREP a more efficient and effective organisation that can better serve the needs of its Member Countries and Territories in addressing their environmental and climate challenges.

We will accelerate and continue to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our work with Members and partners at all times.

Together I am confident that we can rise to and meet the major challenges facing the Pacific.

In closing I would like to say thank you.

Thank you to the dedicated and professional staff at SPREP

Thank you to our host country, the Government of Samoa. We appreciate being hosted in Samoa and we also appreciate the opportunity to learn from the practical and innovative experience of Samoa in managing its environment

Thank you again to the many donors who support SPREP. We value your support and increasing trust in our organisation. We will work hard to ensure that we have earned your trust and confidence.

Thank you to SPREP Members who we as a Secretariat have worked hard to support. We appreciate your guidance and your partnership.

SPREP Members, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much.

ANNEX VI: OBSERVER STATEMENTS

BirdLife International

The Chair
Director of SPREP and Staff
Distinguished Delegates, Observers, Ladies
and Gentlemen

Three years ago Don Stewart, Pacific Regional Director of BirdLife International, gave a passionate and heartfelt plea to the 18th SPREP Meeting in Apia highlighting the disproportionately high rate of extinctions of birds in the Pacific Region, compared with elsewhere in the globe, in the last 500 years. Rather than regale you any more with depressing statistics about the continued parlous plight of birds and other biodiversity in the region, I thought I would outline actions that have happened since Don's speech 3 years ago.

Within the Pacific Islands countries and territories there are 20 species of birds that are classed as Critically Endangered – that is species that will become extinct in our lifetime if we don't do something to help them. Recovery programmes are underway for 6 of these species with basic surveys to find and identify the distribution of a further 7 species leaving another 7 species for which we have not, as yet, made any progress. We know we can succeed in preventing extinctions – the Rarotonga Monarch would be extinct now if it hadn't been for intensive conservation action on the Cook Islands, the Tahiti Monarch is still present thanks to a long-term but costly intervention project co-ordinated by SOP Manu – the BirdLife partner in French Polynesia. We know we can succeed – we have a responsibility to future generations to make it succeed.

Birds provide a quick way of identifying Key Biodiversity Areas- sites that are essential for increased conservation effort and Birdlife is thankful to SPREP for advertising or showcasing the 180 Important Bird Areas that have been identified across the region. If you weren't aware that IBAs had been proposed for your country, can I ask that you check out the SPREP website and provide feedback on your views. Identifying sites is only the first step – improving the conservation status of those sites, be that through legislation, community involvement or active management is, the real aim. All information gleaned at the site level is combined to enable a global assessment of progress. This year's UN Millennium Development Goals used information to indicate that over a quarter of the c11,000 IBAs identified globally are completely covered by legal protection, but we have a lot of catching up to do to get to this level of protection in the Pacific.

BirdLife, through its country partners, aims at practical delivery of on-the-ground conservation measures. However, we can only achieve so much, and therefore we rely on organizations that are able to promote national and regional policy and advocacy changes to facilitate conservation of sites. Hence our partnership with SPREP.

Bird conservation across the region needs to do more than simply focus on priority sites. Two important broad scale issues need to be addressed. First, many bird extinctions across the region can be directly related to the introduction of invasive alien species. Counter measures, such as rat control, have recently been successfully employed although this only represents the first step toward restoration of island ecosystems.

Forests hold much of our most charismatic fauna and flora. Opportunities to develop sustainably-managed forests that can additionally contribute non-timber derived income to local communities need to be investigated. We need to ensure that the ecosystems services provided by our forests are highlighted and that the global benefits, such as for climate change mitigation, derived from maintaining our forests are recognised.

All these benefits will come to nothing if we are unable to persuade the communities that live and work with these habitats and sites. We need to be able to demonstrate that long-term sustainable development can be achieved hand-in-hand with biodiversity conservation. We need to provide communities, local stakeholders and civic society with the information to enable them to make the choices that will best deliver the required results for their communities and for the environment. At the very least we have the responsibility to pass on to future generations a natural environment that is no worse than the one that we have received. But surely we must do better than that. And you can help in doing so.

I thank you for your attention and the Director of SPREP, and its members, for the opportunity to talk to you, and everyone here for your attention.

Conservation International Pacific Islands Program (CI)

Thank you Chair for this opportunity to present our Observer Statement to the Secretariat and the Members of SPREP.

On behalf of Conservation International's President, Dr. Russell Mittermeier, and CI Pacific's Executive Director, Mr François Martel, who is shortly stepping down from

this role and could not be here, I would like to congratulate SPREP and its members for a successful 21st meeting.

In this region SPREP is CI's most important partner. Indeed one of the key reasons that CI's Pacific Islands Program is located in Samoa, is to ensure a close working collaboration in planning, funding and delivering nature conservation and healthy ecosystems outcomes throughout this region. And CI has reinforced this collaboration since July 2010, by merging its Melanesia and Pacific Islands programs into one, representing the same geographical and political boundaries as SPREP's membership.

We commend the leadership of SPREP in developing and promoting its Strategic Plan 2011-2015 into a single plan that aligns regional priorities with SPREP's action strategy and response. In this context, CI would like to reaffirm our commitment to model our own Pacific islands strategy 2011-2015 in full alignment with the SPREP Strategic Plan and the current and next Action Strategies for Nature Conservation in the Pacific, in full respect of its principles and guidelines.

Conservation International has had a MOU with SPREP since 2002. Our current MOU is active until 2013 and focuses largely on biodiversity conservation. Our joint activities with SPREP are wide ranging and include collaboration over marine target setting in the Pacific, to conducting ecological gap analyses studies in Samoa and Kiribati, to funding SPREP to implement conservation projects in a number of SPREP member states. Currently we have active and approved grants to SPREP worth more than 800,000 USD.

As you can now see, today marks the official launch of CI's new logo – a new logo that symbolizes, not unlike SPREP's new

Strategic Plan, Conservation International's new strategy focusing on healthy ecosystems and the conservation of nature for people to thrive.

Our pillars remain the same, strong science, sustained partnerships and focus on human well-being. Although this new strategy focuses on human well-being securities, such as climate, food, health, water and species, thus aligning well with the four priority strategies of the new Plan.

So, in partnership with SPREP, we remain committed to the full implementation of:

1. The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund for the Polynesia-Micronesia Hotspot. We are also currently hard at work developing an Ecosystem profile for the New Caledonia Hotspot with many New Caledonia-based partners, while hopefully the Eastern Melanesian Islands Hotspot (PNG northern islands, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu) should become eligible for investment from CEPF in 2011. We are particularly grateful for the support of the Government of France to the CEPF and providing the funds to allow the launch of a new round of CEPF funding globally. Since we launched the CEPF in this region two years ago, we have committed more than \$4 million USD to 58 projects in 14 countries and territories, all of which are SPREP members.
2. Invasive species management. In this regard CI strongly believes that Invasive Species Management remains one of the core activity for ecosystems and species conservation and is pleased to see SPREP take a lead role in capacity building and promotion for the successful implementation of the new Guidelines for Invasive Species Management. CI's ongoing support to the Pacific Invasives Learning Network and the Pacific Invasives Initiative under the newly formed Pacific Invasives Partnership, along with our funding support for invasive species management projects from the CEPF, will complement this effort.
3. The 2010 Year of Biodiversity and achievement of CBD targets. We are with SPREP looking forward to COP10 in Nagoya, now only weeks away, and assessing our performance as part of the committed partner in this region. To that end we were pleased to be involved in ecological gap analysis projects jointly with SPREP in Samoa and Kiribati, However, we acknowledge that this is an area that needs significantly more effort and looking towards the future, at the next targets.
4. The World Heritage listing of the Phoenix Islands Protected Area (PIPA). CI is honored to continue our close partnership with the Government of Kiribati and our colleagues at the New England Aquarium for the design and establishment of what is the world's largest MPA World Heritage site. The work on this undertaking is proceeding well thanks to grants from the Global Conservation Fund, the Governments of Australia and New Zealand as well as the CEPF. We are continually impressed with Kiribati's commitment to this endeavor and this confidence in the partnership has helped CI secure our first endowment contribution of \$2.5 Million USD.
5. The Pacific Oceanscape Framework. Also with Kiribati's leadership, CI together with CROP agency partners, have made a commitment to assist the development of a Pacific Oceanscape as per the Forum Leaders Decision in Aug 2009 and consistent with the Pacific Plan and Ocean Policy. This is a bold and

significant pledge now endorsed by all leaders with this new initiative integrating much of our marine conservation effort across the region, including the outcomes of the Coral reef Initiative for the Pacific (CRISP), but at a larger scale aimed at ocean stewardship for a large part of the largest ocean on the planet.

6. The restoration of watersheds for carbon sequestration, conservation, community livelihoods in the Fiji Islands. With numerous partners, including the National Trust of Fiji, FIJI Water and the University of the Pacific, as well as Fiji Government key institutions, CI continues to work closely with landowners and communities of various part of Fiji for new innovative projects in support of healthy ecosystems, from the Sovi Basin forests to the Tokaimalo reforestation projects. These form part of our contribution to SPREP and Fiji's efforts towards forest protection on the islands and we hope that in looking at ecosystem services and the approaches developed here, this could be adapted to other Pacific Islands, with much interest in New Caledonia, Samoa and Papua New Guinea, among others.

In concluding, I would like once again to thank the Director and Deputy Director of SPREP and the SPREP staff for their support during the past year and to congratulate SPREP and its members for the achievements so well presented at this meeting and in adopting the coming years SPREP Strategic Plan.

Soifua

Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)

Director General, your staff and delegates of the 21st SPREP Meeting, many thanks for

the opportunity to make this brief statement on behalf of the Secretariat for the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency, and the Director General Mr. Tanielu Su'a.

The FFA has in recent years infrequently attended SPREP Council meetings. I would stress that this is not a reflection of a poor level of inter-agency communication and collaboration on work from overlapping mandates for countries, but a period of concentrated effort by the FFA Secretariat as we helped Pacific Islands countries take a central and lead role in the negotiation and adoption of the Western and Central Fisheries Convention for the Conservation and Management of the region's tuna and other related highly migratory species. The Commission for the WCPFC is successfully established and based in Pohnpei after an energy consuming 10 years of working to ensure that Pacific Island's sovereign rights to conserve and manage the fisheries resources in their waters are not eroded by the agenda of other players in the region's large and significant tuna fisheries, and that they themselves take the lead in developing and implementing measures that will ensure that the region's tuna stocks remain globally significant.

In the past decade there has been a worldwide shift to incorporate more holistic forms of management for natural resources. This change has been particularly evident within marine systems, and has been most commonly focused on fisheries management where one of the numerous titles for such a concept is Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM).

The major change required for these forms of management is that not only must there be management of the target stocks, but any impacts on the broader ecosystem arising from the fishing activity need to be considered along with the social and economic outcomes of this activity

compared to other potential uses or priorities. This results in assessments now being required of by-catch levels and a general drive to introduce more environmentally friendly fishing methods and techniques.

The oceanic tuna fishery is one of the major components of a complex marine ecosystem that exists in this region. Pacific island countries influenced by their obligations to various international and regional management regimes, are involved in the development of viable management arrangements that will be effective in addressing issues such as resource sustainability, fishing capacity and effort control, maximizing benefits from resource utilization and mitigating impacts on the environment and non-target species. These issues are the objective of the WCPF Convention as it seeks to ensure long-term conservation and sustainable use of highly migratory fish stock in the WCPO in accordance with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982).

The initiative of the Forum Fisheries Agency is to introduce EAFM as a more sophisticated approach to fisheries management in the western and central Pacific region, to be of assistance in efficiently implementing the objectives of not only the WCPF Convention but also other international and regional fisheries management instruments and their obligations.

It is recognised that our general knowledge of the complex marine ecosystem in this region is limited, and the possible affects of tuna fisheries are poorly understood. Consequently, the EAFM is a long-term undertaking for FFA member countries in an effort to reduce uncertainty in the decision making process particularly for the sustainable development of the region's tuna resources.

It is an effort that requires increased and strengthened coordination and communication between countries, and with other regional organisations such as the Oceanic Fisheries Program of SPC, the Forum Secretariat and with SPREP who share mandates that underpin the Leaders endorsed regional oceans governance policies such as the 'Pacific Plan', the 'Regional Ocean's Policy' and the 'Pacific Oceanscape framework' whose principles amongst other things are to improve our understanding of the Pacific Ocean, to sustainably develop and manage the use of ocean resources and to maintain the health of our ocean,

We heard yesterday of the successful completion of the Regional Plan of Action for Sharks. This is a good example of how inter-agency coordination and collaboration in order to assist countries address principally the issues surrounding the incidental and targeted capture of sharks in the commercial tuna fisheries in the Pacific region. We take note of New Zealand's intervention concerning the lesser focus on coastal sharks and rays in the plan. The RPOA Sharks serves as a guide on management arrangements for countries to address their shark conservation obligations. In places where impacts on those species are an issue, national plans of action are an option but should in most circumstances be included in national fisheries legislation and management arrangements of which the development and review processes for countries are assisted by both the oceanic and coastal fisheries work programmes at the FFA and SPC.

Allow me to mention the great value that FFA recognises in working with SPREP, and in particular Joe Stanley as the GEF Pacific Advisor, on all matters relating to the Global Environment Facility. Seeking to win global environment benefits, the relationship

between the work of the GEF in International Waters and the Pacific countries has its foundation in the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for International Waters in Pacific Islands Region led and developed in the late 1990s by SPREP.

The FFA executes a full GEF supported regional oceanic fisheries management project. The 'Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project' was timely and instrumental in the negotiation and establishment of the WCPF Convention and in assisting Pacific countries meet their obligations to that Convention. Preceded by a pilot phase in the Pacific SAP, the GEF Council approved a full programme of oceanic fisheries management work in the Pacific in 2005 to address a major area of concern about the unsustainable use of transboundary oceanic fish stocks, especially the impacts of unregulated fishing in areas of high seas in the region and across all waters of the region.

A five year programme of work scheduled to conclude next year, the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFMP) has with a great deal of success, assisted countries address concerns about the weaknesses in governance, awareness and information gaps in oceanic fisheries management in the Pacific on a number of levels. The most satisfying outcome from the project at a regional level, of course is the establishment of the WCPF Commission itself.

While it's acknowledged that significant gains had been made under the current project, the complexity and burden of work for countries to meet their WCPFC and international obligations and stay apace of the Commission measures emerging remains.

With the eminent completion of the OFMP, a concept for another phase of assistance

from GEF for the implementation of oceanic fisheries conservation and management in the Pacific region has been developed by Pacific fisheries officials and ministers. The concept for Phase II and its budget of USD13 million for a further five year project is based on a number of principles which will use resources to implement conservation and management measures, with less focus on the Commission and a greater focus on national fisheries management particularly for the smaller of the Pacific countries. There remains a high degree of compatibility between these regional oceanic fisheries management needs and the objectives of the GEF International Waters focal area in the fifth GEF cycle of funding principally the promotion of multi-state cooperation in marine fisheries in Large Marine Ecosystems while considering climatic variability and change.

On that note Mr. Chair please let me conclude by saying that we can only expect that the technical exchanges between the FFA and SPREP Secretariat will only strengthen as countries further make their commitments to holistic forms of sustainably managing their marine resources and maintaining broad marine ecosystem health.

Thank you

Finnish Meteorological Institute (FMI)

Mr Chair, dear SPREP secretariat, distinguished delegates and fellow observers.

The Finnish Meteorological Institute would like to thank SPREP and Papua New Guinea for the invitation to join this productive and efficient meeting in beautiful Madang. The newly formed cooperation between FMI and SPREP has now continued for 1.5 years and I would like to transmit the warm

thanks of the Government of Finland for the continuing cooperation and support by SPREP for the project, and to the Pacific Meteorological Community. I would like to especially give thanks to Mr. Dean Solofa for the continuing excellent cooperation in the project implementation.

The ongoing support for PI-GCOS, MCO and now the Pacific Meteorological Desk Officer positions within SPREP is crucial to the meteorological community as these have a substantial influence in the development of climate and weather services in the region. The FMI is committed to provide its technical assistance to SPREP in the development of multilateral efforts for investment into regional and national weather and climate services. We hope to see the visibility, impact and capacity of the National Meteorological and Hydrological Services significantly improved in the coming decade and for the wider community to take note of the important work being done at the NMHSs.

Thank you

Forum Secretariat (ForSec)

Chairman,

I should like to congratulate you on your presidency of this important SPREP meeting, and to offer words of appreciation to the Government for its largesse in hosting this meeting. With such rich and abundant biodiversity, underpinning some of the most unique and outstanding cultures in the world, PNG could not be a more appropriate setting for an environment meeting such as this, and one to finalise the preparations for the International Year of Biodiversity.

Allow me also to thank and congratulate the Director of SPREP, Mr David Sheppard, for his excellent stewardship of this, his first governing council meeting. The Forum

Secretariat works closely and collaboratively with SPREP on many matters, such as the RIF, and CROP issues, and the Director knows that we stand ready to assist and cooperate with SPREP, including with its corporate reforms and the new Strategic Plan, if and when required.

Chairman, the Pacific Island Forum Secretariat appreciates the opportunity to participate at this meeting and to be able to make this intervention. What I say will be general in nature, though I should devote time to the challenge of climate change.

Challenging as its environmental mandate is, SPREP functions in a work-environment that is even more challenging. Our region, of course, is characterised by the smallness and isolation of island countries and their lack of resources and capacities. Those around the main table which are not part of metropolitan areas are all small developing countries, a number of them being least developing countries. Not one can cope with the devastations of natural disasters or the exacerbations of the global economic crisis in the past few years, and certainly not the impacts of climate change.

Millennium development goals

I would note that one of the principal MDGs is to ensure environmental sustainability. As a global target, and by 2015. This will be a major challenge for member countries, and for SPREP, and we know that, generally, Pacific countries are at this time unlikely to achieve their MDG goals. I stand to be corrected, Mr Chairman, but I should say that I have not read or heard much of the MDG targets (specifically MDG7 – Ensuring Environmental Sustainability) at this meeting. Though I should mention that the MDG Tracking Report recently prepared highlighted that there has not been enough data to effectively measure progress on this goal.

Rio+20

In similar vein I am also wondering whether we should already be giving attention to regional preparatory work for the 20th anniversary of the Rio conference on environment and development in 2012. Two of the major international conventions dealt with at this meeting, the CBD and the Climate Change Convention, were born of Rio as, indeed, the Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island States which will be reviewed by the UN in New York later this month.

In so wondering, I am addressing myself as well as the Forum Secretariat as I do other CROP agencies, noting that the UN has already commenced its preparations in this respect.

Climate change

Climate change is encompassing, ever present, and for all SPREP countries a reality of urgency and seriousness. Climate change impacts widely, and indiscriminately. As Mr Sheppard correctly noted in his opening statement, climate change is not solely environmental, for the consequences affect national economies, agriculture, health, human safety and security, and many other sectors. In the report on the mid-term review of the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change (PIFACC) it is noted that climate change is a cross-cutting issue and that the PIFACC needs to be implemented in line with and to take account of other related regional policies such as the Pacific Plan, the Cairns Compact for the strengthening of development coordination, the regional Oceans Policy, the Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action, and so on.

Recognising the importance of addressing climate change from all sectors in a coordinated manner, the CROP Sub-Committee on Climate Change was established by CROP Executives at their

meeting in June this year, and the Sub-Committee will meet early next month for the first time to discuss how best to ensure effective regional coordination. As I indicated yesterday, this group will be held at CROP Executive level and will be co-chaired by the Director of SPREP and the Forum Secretary General.

Climate change, in particular, has exposed the vulnerability that is inherent in the condition of small island countries. Certainly, as the United States has noted, all countries are vulnerable, however, by whatever measure, there is about small island communities that dimension of survivability and finality which tends to mark them out as being vulnerable in a truly existential sense.

In the Pacific context, you will recall that at their meeting last year in Cairns, Forum Leaders had set the Pacific Plan priorities for the next three years on the basis of the vulnerability of Pacific communities. So, in fundamental terms, the policy of the region is focused on the need to strengthen and improve the coping abilities of all Forum countries, in terms of the natural resilience of peoples and communities, of their social and economic organisations and governance and to ensure the sustainability of the natural eco-systems.

Funding for climate change has been discussed extensively, internationally at the climate change negotiations and regionally, in this Council meeting and by Forum Leaders at their meeting last month. As we have heard from Mr Ronnenberg and the other experts, there is some degree of uncertainty about the Copenhagen funding. However, in the event of international consensus on the matter, we in this region must be ready to act. As I have indicated, there are presently no regional arrangements or a regional mechanism to handle funds of the magnitude

contemplated by the Copenhagen Accords, including 'fast track' funding.

Moreover, perhaps the greatest challenge for the region would be to ensure that there is an appropriate and effective regional mechanism, or mechanisms, plus the necessary capacity to manage such funds. Directly relevant to all this would be the need for national arrangements to be in place in member countries, or upgraded and reformed as necessary, including essential public financial management systems to ensure transparency and full accountability.

In this respect, the Forum Economic Ministers Meeting (FEMM), which includes regional Ministers of Finance, has been tasked by Forum Leaders to look at options to better access and manage funds and resources to address climate change. This call reinforces the importance of mainstreaming climate change into national planning processes and budgets as well as all sectors.

Specifically, Forum Leaders at their recent meeting in Port Vila have:

- tasked Forum Economic and Environment Ministers and Executives of CROP Agencies to advise on options to improve access to, and management of, climate change resources; and
- they also tasked the Forum Secretariat to work with relevant organisations to develop mechanisms to assist countries access the different international financing for climate change.

We in the Forum Secretariat look forward to working collectively with all stakeholders, including SPREP, to respond to these important directives.

Forum Leaders have put the spot light on the problem of access to international funding sources, and this aspect has also been canvassed in this meeting. Over the past decade there have been consistent calls from this region to improve access to international resources by simplifying access, reducing conditionality, establishing quick disbursement procedures, reducing transaction costs and untying donor assistance.

I would note that these are calls from the region, not to strangers, but to traditional donors and friends of the region: the GEF, the World Bank, UNDP, ADB and so on. Some of our donor friends are SPREP Council members and are being represented at this meeting: four Council members of the GEF Executive Council, US, France, Australia and New Zealand; as well as the EU, UNDP, UNEP and others of the UN family. The Pacific island countries have their own direct representation, through the Pacific islands tripartite constituency on the GEF Executive Council, and through the AOSIS seats on the respective Boards of the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) of the Kyoto Protocol, and the Adaptation Fund. My point would be that as we take up the directive of Forum Leaders and turn to study in detail the problem of access to international funding sources, we in the region would need to have a clear understanding of the difficulties or disadvantages being experienced by Pacific island countries, and be able to explain exactly to the international community what it is we seek to remove or minimise such difficulties; and further to press our case as conscientiously and as effectively as possible, including through our own island constituencies and representations.

We expect that the consultancy looking at the feasibility of a regional funding mechanism will have started looking at some of these issues, and we very much

look forward to seeing the consultant's report.

There is also the important matter of the expenditure of climate change funds. My own expectation is that, except for the current trend of direct budgetary support measures, international funding will continue to respond to individual or regional climate change projects. Here again, I believe it is incumbent on the region to be absolutely clear on our plans for climate change responses, in each member country and for the region as a whole. Undoubtedly, this is ongoing and substantial work, especially in adaptation efforts, for member countries and for all regional organisations with SPREP leading much of this work. We need to be clear where resources and efforts are required and where necessary develop a top-line of well thought out and well-designed projects programmes and/or strategies. An obvious concern would be a situation where, for example, the international system is ready to start the flow of Copenhagen funding; and we find ourselves unable to match the international effort with a credible articulation of our priorities which require funding.

Chairman, this is my first SPREP Council meeting, and I have followed your proceeding with great interest. Thank you for allowing me to do so.

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Oceania and the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation (PIRT)

Mr Chair, Distinguished Delegates, Observers, Ladies and Gentlemen; I am making the presentation for the International Union for Conservation of Nature, IUCN Oceania and the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation.

On behalf of Mr Taholo Kami, Regional Director of the IUCN Regional Office for Oceania and chair of the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation (PIRT), is delighted to participate in this 21st SPREP Meeting and would like to congratulate SPREP and its members for the achievements in 2009/2010 and the success of this meeting.

IUCN and PIRT extends sincere appreciation to SPREP for the support and partnership with IUCN this past year and we congratulate the SPREP Director Mr. David Sheppard and the dedicated and professional staff for SPREPs 2009 achievements, leadership and vision.

Please be assured that IUCN and the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation is committed to the development of a strong and lasting partnership with SPREP and its member countries, to enhance environmental governance and management in the Pacific Region.

IUCN greatly values the Memorandum of Understanding between IUCN and SPREP, signed in 2007, and looks forward to continuing to build the level of collaboration with SPREP, which has already been significantly enhanced with the presence of IUCN's Regional Office for Oceania in Suva, Fiji.

IUCN is a unique and democratic membership union with more than 200 government members, over 800 NGO member organisations, and almost 11,000 volunteer scientists in more than 160 countries.

IUCN membership in the Oceania region is diverse, drawing together States, government agencies and non-government organisations. There are currently 27 members based in Australia and 9 Members in New Zealand. The Pacific islands have seen a significant increase in membership

since the IUCN Oceania office opened in 2007. We welcomed our new state members Fiji, Nauru, Solomon Islands and most recently Tonga who join Australia, France, New Zealand and the USA as IUCN state Members bring total members in the Pacific to 10. Other organisations and governments, most notably from PNG, Samoa, Kiribati and the Cook Islands have recently shown interest in becoming IUCN Members. We look forward to welcoming more Pacific island countries and organisations into the global IUCN family in the near future. 2010 is our 4th year since being established and we have seen amazing growth in partnerships, programs, membership and funding.

Investing in Biodiversity is IUCN Oceania underlying theme – recognising that biodiversity and related ecosystems provide the natural infrastructures of life, nature solutions can contribute to the mitigation and adaptation to climate change's worst impact.

The IUCN Oceania Regional programme of work for the next 4 years, 2009-2012, focuses on 5 thematic areas and focuses on supporting governments in their efforts in biodiversity conservation, identification of endangered species, and management of water, marine, freshwater and terrestrial environments. IUCN recognises the importance for ecosystems to be managed not only to protect biodiversity but also to provide livelihoods to local communities.

IUCN would like to take the opportunity to highlight some of our work that may be relevant to your governments. Most of this work is being supported through alliances of organisations represented at this meeting, including SPREP.

IUCN, SPREP and NGO partners have embarked on an effort to develop an IUCN Red List of endangered species in the Pacific

islands for the first time. This is important work and will become even more so given that our fragile islands are so vulnerable to climate change. The species on our islands are too important to lose.

IUCN is a member of the Pacific Invasives Initiative (PII) and has established an Invasive Species programme node through the IUCN Invasive Species Specialist Group based at the University of Auckland in New Zealand. This team is working through our Oceania Regional Office on Pacific invasive species issues through PII and PILN. We are committed to providing the best possible advice and support to address this vital issue in the Pacific.

IUCN's regional Energy programme is currently working in 6 of your countries: Marshall Islands, Palau, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu, to accelerate the transition to energy systems that are ecologically efficient, sustainable and socially equitable. Switching from inefficient mercury and vapour street lights to more efficient LED lights in the Marshall Islands is projected to save USD\$200,000 per year in the operation of lights, which is equivalent to a saving of 60% of the cost of existing lights.

Water and Nature Initiative (WANI): A global initiative of IUCN's Water Program initiative focusing on 5 themes: ecosystems and security; governance; democracy and participation; economics and finance and learning and leadership. The initiative is working on three sites and these are Kadavu (Fiji), Nadi (Fiji) and Togitogiga in Samoa. A decision-making support tool for assessing and enhancing project impacts on local adaptive capacity to climate variability and climate change will be trialled to develop in Nauru, a State member of IUCN, and the Cook Islands. Awareness-raising materials addressing water issues peculiar to atolls and a document compiling the lessons

learnt from the projects in the Pacific will be produced.

The IUCN Oceania Pacific Centre for Environmental – Is intended to act as the regional virtual centre of excellence in environmental law, policy, economics and leadership. It will provide cost effective access to expertise in these areas, and seeking to play a leadership role in development and delivery of environmental governance programs in the region.

The Pacific Mangrove Initiative: Promotes sustainable management of mangroves and associated ecosystems and raises awareness on the value of coastal ecosystems goods and services, including resilience to natural disasters and climate change. It will work with other initiative promoting ‘ridge to reef’ to integrate catchment management.

The Pacific 2020 Challenge: A Pacific Ocean Initiative to increase global attention to the Pacific Ocean issues, build new partnerships and generate necessary commitments, to address threats to the world’s largest natural resource – the Pacific Ocean. IUCN has noted the need raised by some members to ensure integration of this initiative with other regional oceans initiatives such as the regional oceanscape framework, CTI and Micronesian Challenge. IUCN reaffirms its commitment to working with SPREP and its Member Countries with a range of relevant experiences, technical expertise, and the best available science and knowledge to support sustainable development and the implementation of the Programme of Work for 2010 and beyond.

We continue to actively support the United Nations Year of Biodiversity and working with you all by producing information briefings to Pacific island countries and

participating in regional activities and communications.

Chair, I would like to now brief on the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation

The Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation (PIRT) is a coalition of nature conservation and development organizations, governments, inter-government, donor agencies and community groups created to increase effective conservation action in the Secretariat of the Pacific Islands Region. It was formed in 1997 at the request of Pacific Island countries and territories. The forum enables those organizations working on nature conservation in the Pacific to improve their collaboration and coordination towards effective conservation action. It is the key **coordination mechanism for the implementation of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Island Region 2008-2012.**

PIRT partners have been encouraged to sign a charter outlining their commitment to the 2008 to 2012 Action Strategy and Principles adopted at the 8th Pacific Nature Conservation and Protected Areas conference held in Alotau, PNG in 2007. A total of thirteen key partners have now signed¹. At the 2008 PIRT meeting in Fiji, partners agreed to focus roundtable support at the country level, initially in Fiji, the Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea, towards improving coordination and implementation of their existing national nature conservation strategies and mainstream them into national development strategies. This will provide

¹ IUCN, WWF, Conservation International (CI), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), The Locally Managed Marine Area (LMMA) network, University of the South Pacific (USP), the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP), Pacific Islands Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC), RARE and Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International (FSPI), Birdlife International, Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum (PBIF) and SeaWeb

lessons to guide roundtable support in other Pacific island countries.

This year we convened our 13th Meeting in Samoa and we would like to thank SPREP and the Samoan Government for their outstanding hosting during the week. We saw 60 participants from the region ranging from Heads of Organisations, CROP working groups, academics, government representatives, field practitioners, scientists. Working Groups in Invasive Species, Marine, Climate Change, Capacity Building, Species and Regional Initiatives such as CTI and some specific country interest groups e.g PNG were convened and they assessed regional issues, gaps and set some regional priorities to address these areas which will be monitored during these annual meeting. This continue to build strong partnerships and networks amongst the nature conservation NGOs, CROPS and Government. Seven Member countries were invited by the UNDP CBD POWPA to share lessons on their POWPA work. The 2011 meeting has been currently discussed to be hosted by French MPA Agency in one of the French Territory countries and the focus will be to compile the report on the Action Strategy for the 2012 Nature Conservation conference.

Mr Chairman, as the Secretariat of the Pacific Islands Round Table for Nature Conservation working closely with SPREP, we would like to reiterate the Round Table's support to the One Pacific Voice at the CBD COP 10. I would also like to thank the meeting for your support and assistance to the preparations for the 2012 Nature Conservation Conference.

With that Mr Chair, Delegates, members and observers, IUCN Oceania and the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation would like to thank you for the opportunity to address you, VINAKA

National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research Ltd (NIWA)

Mr Chair, Distinguished Delegates, Director of SPREP and Staff, Ladies and Gentlemen; on behalf of New Zealand's National Institute of Water & Atmospheric Research (NIWA) we are very pleased to be part of this 21st SPREP meeting and thank you for this opportunity to contribute.

As Delegates discussed earlier in this meeting, the Island Climate Update was one of the four functions of SOPAC to be transferred to SPREP as part of the Regional Institutional Framework. NIWA has been honoured to provide the technical support, in partnership with the region's National Meteorological Services, SPREP and SOPAC, for the production of the Island Climate Update since it's inception over eleven years ago, and we thank both NZAid and NOAA for their continued financial support for the project. The ICU plays an important role in developing and building climate forecasting capacity in the region with this role was recognised by the National Meteorological Service Directors at their 13th meeting in Nadi in May 2009. We look forward with much enthusiasm to working with SPREP and the National Meteorological Services to continue to develop the ICU to enable it to have a greater impact in informing and supporting climate sensitive sectors in Pacific Island countries and territories.

Whilst I am on the topic of strengthening the region's Meteorological Services we are heartened to hear from the SPREP Director that funding support may soon be available to enable the regional Meteorology and Climate Officer position to be re-established. We join our colleagues from the US in encouraging the SPREP Secretariat to fill this position as soon as is possible.

Over this last year we have increasingly been working with our Pacific Island colleagues on activities within many of SPREP's strategic priority areas and if I may Mr Chairman I would like to briefly highlight some of these activities.

In the area of climate change adaptation a major focus for NIWA in this last year has been our involvement with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment in Samoa to assist with the first of their NAPA implementation projects to develop a climate early warning system for the agriculture and health sectors. In Kiribati we have continued our involvement with Phase Two of the Kiribati Adaptation Project to develop and integrate climate risk information for climate proofing activities. We are also providing some initial technical support to a number of the in-country project teams, including Fiji, Cook Island and FSM, in implementing their Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change demonstration projects, and are also working with our Australian and Pacific colleagues on some of the implementing activities associated with the Australian funded Pacific Climate Change Science Program and Pacific Adaptation Strategy Assistance Program.

Our recent biodiversity and biosecurity activities include our continued work with Palau and US colleagues to study the biodiversity of the Palauan lakes which, in these unique environments, has identified to science many new species of sponges. We have also been working with Micronesian and US partners to assess the risks posed by invasive aquatic weeds in Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, Federated States of Micronesia and the Palau, and have recently provided basic training in marine pest surveys to staff from the Vanuatu Department of Fisheries and Environment to undertake an initial assessment of marine pest risks associated

with demolishing the Star Wharf at Port Vila. This builds on the training course on port biological baseline surveys and marine pest surveillance we conducted with SPREP as part of the International Maritime Organization's GloBallast Partnerships Programme in early 2009.

In closing NIWA looks forward to continuing to actively work with and supporting SPREP and its Member Countries in implementing the programme of work and related activities in contributing to sustainable development in the region. Finally, Mr Chair, I would like to take the opportunity to thank you, your Government, and the people of Papua New Guinea for your hospitality during this SPREP Meeting.

South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)

Colleagues,

First may I take this opportunity to congratulate the SPREP Director, not so much on his appointment which is now almost a year ago, but more importantly on this occasion being the first SPREP Council and Ministerial session that he has held responsibility for.

David, let me assure you that you have the full support of the SOPAC Secretariat. SOPAC looks forward to 2011 when, as the new Applied Geoscience and Technology Division of SPC, we will be able to further develop and strengthen our efforts to work together through joint programming not only at the regional but also, and in particular, at the national level in order to improve service delivery to members.

In accord with the Leaders decision on the Regional Institutional Framework (RIF) review on 31st March SOPAC and SPREP signed an Letter of Agreement (LOA). The specific functions covered by that LOA were as follows:

- Pacific Islands Global Ocean Observing System (PI-GOOS).
- Islands Climate Update (ICU).
- Climate and Meteorological Databases (CMD)
- Energy functions related to Climate Change, specifically monitoring and evaluation of Greenhouse Gas and the Clean Development Mechanism.

The LOA stipulates that SOPAC undertakes to continue to support SPREP in its future role in regard to these four work programme functions, in the spirit of cooperation, collaboration, and partnership amongst regional organisations, and as described in the CROP Charter.

Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation

One of the most significant challenges facing SOPAC, SPC, SPREP and other regional and global partners is in relation to the need to integrate our efforts in assisting member countries and territories to mainstream disaster risk management and climate change considerations (especially adaptation) into the national planning and budgetary processes. There is an overwhelming convergence on this at a philosophical level and over the last 2 years or more, both regional and global fora have made commitments towards an integrated approach. What we have not seen to a significant extent are the practical applications of the philosophy.

In the Pacific, Tonga is the first country to take strides to harmonise climate change and DRM mainstreaming efforts into a single National Action Plan and both SOPAC and SPREP assisted the Tongan government in its planning efforts. The joint NAP in Tonga was approved by its Cabinet in July this year. A number of other countries have expressed an interest to also harmonise their respective DRM and climate change

efforts and these should be encouraged. These include Federated States of Micronesia, Cook Islands and Fiji. More however needs to be done.

During the 16th Regional Disaster Managers Meeting held in Suva in mid August disaster managers pondered the issue and identified that a significant shortcoming was the lack of an appropriate institutional framework at the country level to support harmonisation. This means that we at a regional level, must take the lead and create an environment to encourage the key DRM and climate change stakeholders to come together. Presently there exist at least two formal regional mechanisms that deal respectively with climate change and with DRM. The Pacific Platform for DRM is held annually with the Pacific Climate Change Roundtable held biennially. We must bring these two communities together and if possible have a single forum; SOPAC and SPREP need to work together on this. By consolidating our efforts in terms of these cross cutting development issues we in turn encourage the countries to re-think, harmonise, and maybe even re-align their national institutional mechanisms for DRM and for climate change.

Developing an institutional framework to better enable mainstreaming of DRM and climate change is one challenge to overcome but this must be complemented by improved coordination of funding and resource support for our countries and territories in these areas. The 5th Annual Meeting of the Pacific DRM Partnership Network in Suva in mid August re-emphasised the need for improved coordination through joint programming and implementation of Climate Change and DRM regional and national initiatives guided by PIFACC and Regional DRM Framework, as well as the need to use the funds related to these issues most effectively. Related to this, the meeting re-emphasised the need

to strengthen national capacity to access funds from various sources and opportunities for joint implementation of climate change and DRM priorities, thereby increasing resilience in PICTs.

That meeting of country representatives and donor partners also acknowledged the recent 2010 Communiqué by Forum Leaders and its statements concerning DRM and Climate Change, including the need for sustainable funding mechanisms for climate change. SOPAC supports the comments of the Secretary General on this matter and stands ready to fully engage in future deliberations leading up to a recommended way forward to be presented to Leaders in 2010 together with establishing any necessary interim arrangements that may be required.

SOPAC science

SOPAC has for nearly 40 years built a strong reputation for doing sound scientific and technical work. A knowledge base which is still at best, minimal. The reality is we need to understand fully all the pieces in the jigsaw, and only then we may develop an understanding of how they fit together to complete the picture.

SOPAC remains deeply concerned that good science and technical data are collected and made available in order to better inform decision-making. This is particularly important in the environmental vulnerability context where we must understand “normal” or historic natural change. Thereby with ongoing monitoring, island communities at all levels will be better able to build coping strategies that will build resilience to the increasing vulnerability the islands are facing - not the least of which is from the adverse impacts of climate change.

Regional Economics Climate Change Study
SOPAC congratulates SPREP
on securing new project funds for the

conduct of a Regional Economics of Climate Change Study. Robust figures on the costs to the region of climate change will not only assist in future negotiations but improve information for land planning and adaptation. Because of SOPAC's key role in generating scientific information to assess vulnerability including climate change (sea level rise etc.), there is considerable potential for this project to further strengthen links between SOPAC and SPREP. This relationship may be strengthened further given SOPAC's longstanding expertise in resource economics.

Much of SOPAC's economics work can have a bearing on climate change analyses because of the extent to which it can be used to inform adaptation. For example, the joint SOPAC and SPC work on vegetation mapping and monitoring, and SOPAC's economic assessments of flood mitigation options including early warning systems, improved forecasting systems and raising the height of houses to accommodate floods. All of these strategies can be used to adapt to increased intensity and or frequency in hydrometeorological threats.

Likewise, work on the economic feasibility of alternative aggregate sources can enable atoll nations to minimise coastal threats in the face of rising sea levels. SOPAC assessment of the economic costs of disasters will also provide an important baseline for assessing the feasibility of future adaptation strategies.

Future collaboration

SOPAC, as the new Applied Geoscience and Technology Division of SPC, will be fully committed to continue and strengthen the collaboration with SPREP, not only in the fields of climate change and resource economics, but also in other relevant fields

such as environmental management and protection.

We are pleased that discussions are now ongoing between SOPAC and the SPREP Secretariat to jointly develop and implement programmes to support our members in this regard.

Thank You

Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)

Chairperson,
Distinguished National Representatives,
Director David Sheppard & Staff,
H.E. Tuiloma Neroni Slade- SG of PIFS
Colleagues from Other CROP and
International Agencies,
Ladies & Gentlemen.

Let me at the outset mention how grateful we are to attend the SPREP 21st Meeting here in Madang, PNG. The SPC Director General - Dr. Jimmie Rodgers, who had intended to attend this meeting himself conveyed his sincere regret that due to his prior scheduled commitments and engagements, including the preparations for the 40th Meeting of the SPC CRGA next month, he is heavily constrained from attending this important gathering. Given the importance of SPREP to SPC he tasked me as the member of the SPC executive most closely aligned with the work of SPREP to represent him at this meeting.

Mr Chairman, we've noted the excellent progress of the meeting during this week and despite the heavy agenda, you displayed skillful management and efficient running of the meeting. On the same note, we wish to congratulate Director David Sheppard, who is leading the SPREP team in his first SPREP meeting since taking up appointment late last year, and Deputy Director Kosi Latu, and the SPREP staff

members for the excellent organization and programming of the 21st SPREP Meeting.

Mr Chairman, this brief statement will focus on three issues: First, against a background of the Regional Institutional Framework (RIF) that were mandated by our Leaders, and would be completed by the end of this year, there is a need for strengthened partnerships amongst all stakeholders, including amongst CROP agencies, to better support Pacific Island Member Countries, in bringing services closer to our communities and peoples that we jointly serve. Recognising numerous constraints that are prevalent at the PICTs national levels, pragmatic approaches and effective coordination mechanisms that delivers tangible results on the ground is the key for our regional services. As we all know and appreciate, these are the real challenges we need to synergistically overcome. We very well noted that this meeting is gearing SPREP towards meeting these challenges in the years to come. Let me assure you that my Director General is committed to further strengthening SPC's partnership with SPREP in many areas of mutual interest. SPC will support SPREP in particular in areas that SPREP leads at the regional level.

Secondly, SPC have a number of policy mechanisms in place, as directed by our Ministerial Conference in recent meetings to help bringing its services closer to our members. Decentralisation of services beyond Noumea and Suva came about after the 2005 SPC Corporate Review and endorsed at the subsequent Ministerial Conference hosted by the Independent State of Samoa in 2007. This has resulted in SPC's presence in the North Pacific (Micronesian Region) and plans for establishments in other sub-regions are gradually progressing. We have a country office in Honiara, Solomon islands, and are in the process of finalising arrangements for similar country offices in Papua New Guinea

and Vanuatu. The formulations of Joint-Country Strategies (JCS) and establishments of Country Profiles have facilitated a much closer engagements with our members. This exercise have enabled SPC to work and identify member's priorities over a five year period and through an agreed M&E mechanism, these are continuously reviewed so as to assess the progress, identify gaps, strengths and weaknesses of SPC's regional services to our members. SPC is keen to further engage with all CROP and other agencies through our sub-regional presence, and in the formulations of JCS, that would broaden partnership platforms and strengthen our services delivery to our members. SPC is very happy that CROP heads agreed at their recent meeting in Samoa this year to do a joint mission to the Republic of the Marshall Islands later this year to develop a CROP-wide / RMI JCS.

Thirdly, climate change remains the overarching challenge for Pacific Island countries. Considering its cross-cutting nature into food & nutritional security, public health, gender, agriculture, marine, water resources it is crucial there is an effective coordination mechanism at the regional level to ensure the best possible outcome is achieved by the region. In this regard, SPC is working very closely with SPREP- as the lead CROP agency on environmental matters, and PIFS, and other CROP agencies through the CROP Sub-Committee on Climate Change established by the CROP Executive at the June meeting to improve and strengthen adaptations and mitigation measures, into our respective memberships. It is important however to note that climate change while it affects environment is not strictly speaking an environmental matter but a cross-cutting development matter with considerable political challenge thus it is crucial that we have a multi-pronged approach involving the best of all our organisations and partners and thus the importance of the

work of the subcommittee that is being jointly chaired by PIFS and SPREP to bring our efforts to bear. This subcommittee can form the basis for the mechanism called for by Forum Leaders in Vanuatu in which key development partners and countries could be members. The support of other international agencies is very important. This is in recognition of the fact that the environmental challenges facing this region are too large for anyone organization, local, regional or international, to tackle.

Finally, Chair through you, may I convey our grateful appreciations to you and your Government of PNG for the excellent arrangements and facilitations of this meeting. It surely made this meeting a wonderful success.

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

UNEP congratulates SPREP and hosts PNG for organising an efficient and productive meeting. We are grateful for the close collaboration with SPREP over the last two years especially and look forward to building on this in the future.

We appreciate the chance to comment on the SPREP Strategy and are prepared to support its development in future. Similarly, we look forward to working with SPREP and country Focal Points in developing new projects during the fifth Global Environment Facility funding round. Under the new funding regime for the GEF 5, multi-country and cross-cutting projects may well be more challenging to design, thus placing more imperative for countries to collaborate with regional agencies - if such projects are their priorities. SPREP could play a significant role in facilitating the initiation of GEF 5 projects for its member countries. UNEP would be happy to collaborate in this. As already noted by

some countries, in developing new projects using the GEF 5 funding, we should not lose sight of the progress made in biodiversity conservation and other disciplines.

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

Mr Chairman,
Distinguished Delegates
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have pleasure on behalf of Mr Michel Jarraud, the Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), to express the appreciation of the Organization and his own to Mr David Sheppard, Director of SPREP and members of SPREP for the invitation extended to WMO, and to convey his greetings to you.

I would like to indicate my appreciation to the Government of Papua New Guinea for hosting this meeting. I would also like to seize this opportunity to express my appreciation to Dr Wari Lea Iamo, Secretary for the Department of Environment and Conservation, and his staff for the excellent arrangements made for this meeting.

Madang, in particular this resort is not only a popular tourist destination but also an important meeting venue for many significant regional meetings and endorsement of regional frameworks, such as the frameworks for actions on climate change and disaster risk reduction. Both of these frameworks have not only offered opportunities but also some challenges for National Meteorological Services (NMS)/National Weather Services (NVVS) to contribute to their implementation in areas relating to enhancing resilient of communities against risks associated with natural disaster as well as contributing to sustainable development. Nearly all of the Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICT) have a National Meteorological Service (NMS)/National Weather Service

(NWS), with basic functions to providing weather forecasts, warnings on tropical cyclone warnings and other severe weather events, and climate information, but the level of service varies from country to country, hence the importance of regional coordination of weather and climate services in the region. As this forum is familiar with climate information and services for climate change, the rest of my statement will focus on weather services and tropical cyclone warnings.

Mr Chairman, allow me to provide some background information on regional coordination of weather and climate services in the region. It all started with the provision of weather information for the aviation sector at the time of the 2nd World War. The South Pacific Air Transport Council (SPATC) was set up immediately following the War to continue services from Nadi Airport in Fiji. The South Pacific Air Transport Council (SPATC) also set up a Weather Forecast Office at Nadi airport - referred to as Nadi Weather Office (NWO) , operating as a sub-office of the New Zealand Meteorological Service, serving the weather services requirements of international aviation traversing the Fiji Flight Information Region (FIR) as designated by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO).

At that time, there were other non-aviation requirements such as weather forecasts and essential tropical cyclones warnings for the islands and international shipping. Nadi Weather Office (NWO) took on all these additional responsibilities.

Following independence, the Government of Fiji decided to set up a national weather service as a part of its public service set up. In 1975 the Government of Fiji assumed regional aviation responsibilities from the South Pacific Air Transport Council (SPA TC), with the subsequent formation of the Fiji

Department of Civil Aviation (DCA) and the Department of Meteorology (later named - as the Fiji Meteorological Service). Fiji Department of Civil Aviation (DCA) was then transformed into an authority – Civil Aviation Authority of Fiji, in 1979 while Fiji Meteorological Service (FMS) remained a Government Department. Fiji Meteorological Service (FMS) retained all the earlier responsibilities of Nadi Weather Office (NWO) and continued to provide weather forecasts and tropical cyclones warnings for Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICT). It also provided weather forecasts and tropical cyclones for shipping sector for sea area extended from the Equator down to 25 degrees South latitude, and from 160 degrees East to 120 degrees West longitude.

In June 1995, following fulfillment prescribed criteria, Fiji Meteorological Service (FMS) was designated as the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Regional Specialized Meteorological Centre Nadi (RSMC Nadi) - Tropical Cyclone Centre (TCC) with responsibility for tropical cyclones in the region - commonly referred to as RSMC Nadi. RSMC Nadi is one of the five Regional Specialized Meteorological Centre functioning globally. Also, its functions are incorporated into the Weather Forecasting Division of the Fiji Meteorological Service (FMS). The functions and responsibilities of the Fiji Meteorological Service (FMS)/RSMC Nadi are regularly reviewed and described in the Tropical Cyclone Operational Plan for the South Pacific and Southeast Indian Ocean.

Ladies and Gentlemen, as you are aware from the background information, Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi is one of the key stakeholders, playing a key role in regional coordination and provision of weather forecasts and tropical cyclone warnings for public, marine and aviation sectors safety and economic activities. To

be more specific of its area of responsibility, Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi:

- (i) Monitors, tracks, forecasts and names all tropical cyclones and issues regular warnings and advisory services for public interest and safety for the South Pacific area extending from the Equator to 25 degrees South Latitude and from 160 East to 120 degrees West Longitude.
- (ii) Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi is issuing regular weather forecasts and information and tropical cyclone warnings for safety of mariners over international waters within this area.
- (iii) Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi is also designated by International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) as a Meteorological Watch Office (MWO) for the Nadi Flight Information Region (FIR), providing a variety of services.
- (iv) Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi is also designated by the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) as Tropical Cyclone Advisory Center (TCAC) , having responsibility for providing advisories on hazards relating to tropical cyclones for use by other ICAO designated Meteorological Watch Offices (MWOs) within Nadi Flight Information Region (FIR).
- (v) Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi is providing Significant Meteorological (SIGMET) messages on severe weather within the Nadi Flight Information Region (FIR).
- (vi) Besides serving fully the two of Fiji's own international airports located at

Nadi and Nausori, Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi issues regular Terminal Aerodrome Forecasts (TAFs) for a large number of other international airports in the Pacific Island Countries and Territories, namely, Faleolo (Samoa), Fuamotu, Hapaai and Vavau (Tonga), AJofi (Niue), Rarotonga and Aitutaki (Cook Islands), Wallis & Futuna, Funafuti (Tuvalu), Tarawa (Kiribati), Port Vila and Santo (Vanuatu).

- (vii) Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi identifies tropical cyclones in the Nadi Flight Information Region (FIR) and issues warnings on them to aircrafts for their safe operations.
- (viii) Fiji Meteorological services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi provides regular Aviation Area Forecasts to serve domestic flights and operations in Fiji, Tonga, Samoa, Southern Cook Islands, Tuvalu and Kiribati
- (ix) Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi provides Route Forecasts (ROFORs) and other en-route weather information for all flights originating from Nadi and Nausori.
- (x) Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi is providing and making available flight documentation and briefing services available at Nadi and Nausori for flights originating at or passing through these two international airports.

Distinguish Delegates, these are some of the weather information and warnings services which are currently coordinated in the region, Also, the services provided by Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi to the other Pacific Island Countries

and Territories (PICT) are both regional and national in nature. The recommendations from the report titled "Reviewing of Weather and Climate Services in the Pacific. which you have endorsed, not only called for strengthening regional coordination of weather and climate services in the region but to assist other Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICT) who are fully or 100 per cent reliant on Fiji Meteorological Services (FMS)/RSMC Nadi to enhance their capacity and capability in the provision of basic or first level weather forecasts as well as warnings at national level. Also, I would like to inform the delegates that members of the WMO Regional Association V (South-West Pacific), during their fifteenth session in May this year, has placed high priority on the review of weather and climate services in the region and agreed that they would to collaborate with SPREP to address its outcomes.

In conclusion, I would to re-iterate that WMO will continue to collaborate with SPREP and its members, and development partners to address recommendations emanating from the report titled "Reviewing of Weather and Climate Services in the Pacific" which you have endorsed during the course of this meeting.

Once again, I would like to express WMO appreciation to SPREP, the Government of Papua New Guinea, and Madang Resort staff, for excellent arrangement made for this meeting.

Thank you for your attention.

Report of the High Level Ministerial Segment

9 September 2010

Madang, Papua New Guinea

Summary of Discussions

1. The High Level Ministerial Segment of the 21st SPREP Meeting (21SM) was held on 9 September 2010. Heads of Delegation included Ministers from Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, and Vanuatu; and senior officials from American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, France, French Polynesia, New Zealand, Niue, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and the United States of America.

Agenda Item 15.1: Welcome ceremony for Ministers

2. The High Level Ministerial Segment was opened with a prayer, singing of the national anthem of Papua New Guinea and a traditional dance performance.

Agenda Item 15.2: Introduction to meeting

3. The keynote address by the Prime Minister of PNG, Rt. Hon Sir Michael Somare GCMG CH, was delivered by the Minister for Environment and Conservation, Hon. Benny Allen MP. A copy of the keynote address is attached.

4. The High Level Ministerial Segment considered the following issues.

Agenda Item 15.3: Environmental Financing

5. A keynote address was presented by Dr Rawlestone Moore from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on behalf of GEF Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson Ms Monique Barbut. Dr Moore highlighted the need to progress implementation of the

GEF-Pacific Alliance for Sustainability in the region; concern that there were currently only 12 projects on the ground; confirmation that the GEF5 replenishment will amount to US\$4.25billion, meaning a 52% increase for the Pacific region from GEF4; the GEF Secretariat has taken note of Pacific needs and reduced the project cycle to 18 months; there is now a simpler mechanism to enable countries to access to up to \$500,000 for national communications and reporting to international conventions, and \$30,000 for the non-compulsory national portfolio formulation exercise (NPFE). He also recommended that the region consider a programmatic approach for the future to enable coordination and effective implementation. A copy of full statement is attached as Annex.

6. The Minister of Natural Resources and Environment of Samoa, Hon. Faumuina Liuga, responded to the keynote address noting the important contributions that the GEF financing has made for the region, and provided his views on the way forward for GEF-5. The full statement of the Minister is attached as an Annex.

7. Other Ministers and Heads of Delegation also responded. In summary, key issues discussed were:

8. Assistance to smaller islands to access funds – Smaller islands face various challenges in accessing global funds, mainly due to their limited personnel capacity and in some cases their inability to meet some of the fiduciary requirements of the GEF. It was recommended that (a) the SPREP Secretariat seek accreditation as an implementing agency to help address this issue; and (b) the GEF Support Adviser position at SPREP be retained, with broader terms of reference to include assisting countries with access to funding facilities other than the GEF.

9. Small Grants Programme – GEF clarified that all the relevant countries in the region are categorised as either small island developing states (SIDS) or Least Developed Countries (LDC). Thus, \$250,000 is accessible per year for Small Grants Programme (SGP) for all the countries in the region. Each country is defined as a category 1 country, and therefore there is also a regional component of \$500,000 to help UNDP regionally implement the programme. This allocation can be supplemented from the country allocation under STAR, and reallocated to the SGP. However, countries are under no obligation to do this. The maximum a country is allowed for SGP is \$600,000. Further information on this can be found at GEF website, paper GEF/C.36/4.

10. Capacity building – The challenges of capacity in small islands is recognised by GEF. To this end, GEF-4 worked with an adviser at SPREP to work with the countries. GEF also recognised the need to build in-house capacities at national level and saw that SPREP had a key role to play in this.

11. Access to funds for territories – This was noted as an issue for all territories mainly due to their relationship with their developed counterparts (USA, NZ and France).

12. Accelerating the project cycle – The GEF secretariat advised that it has 10 days to review a project once it is received from the implementing agency. After this, it is placed on the GEF website for one month for CEO endorsement and for comments by donors and the GEF Council. It was now looking to move to a one stage process to speed up the process. Countries should work closely with implementing agencies to facilitate the proposal development process. The GEF Secretariat noted that there was also a role for SPREP to facilitate this, and referred to Samoa's model of establishing a national GEF office.

13. Ocean Fisheries Management – GEF recognised the importance of this and advised that it will work with countries to try and facilitate this.

14. Solid Waste – GEF advised that its 6 focal areas are: International Waters, Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) and Chemicals, Ozone Depleting Substances, Climate Change, Biodiversity, and Land Degradation. Countries have been using the area of POPs to address some of the waste issues which cannot otherwise be addressed under the GEF Focal Areas.

15. GEF-5 Preparations – The need to identify a way forward for the Pacific region under GEF5 was noted. There are opportunities to meet with the GEF in October 2010 during the Nagoya CBD COP and in November-December during the Cancun UNFCCC meetings. This will help GEF and the region design programmes that address national and regional needs. The key role of SPREP in facilitating this was also recognised, in particular, the recent Strategic Plan development process, which could assist the GEF Secretariat in identifying national and regional priorities.

Agenda Item 15.4: Climate Change

16. The climate change discussion was introduced by the Director of SPREP. He noted that this item was requested for discussion by Ministers he had consulted, and was also highlighted at the recent Pacific Forum meeting in Vanuatu. He observed that international funding for climate change was likely to increase in coming months, but aside from international and regional mechanisms being negotiated, the priority for the region must be to secure delivery on the ground. Communications and coordination were important in this regard. The CROP climate change task force, co-chaired by SPREP and PIFS CEOs, was an important step. SPREP's

financial mechanism study will consider three key matters: the current financing situation; likely future scenarios; and options for delivery and support for PICs. The links between environment and financing will also be considered in the context of the Forum Economic Ministers' Meeting in Niue in late October 2010, to which he urged Environment Ministers to provide input.

17. Hon. Benny Allen of PNG delivered the keynote address, observing that climate change had, at some levels, been brushed aside by sceptics as an academic issue. But he emphasised that despite some continuing scepticism, there is now scientific proof that climate change is a fact. For PNG that proof is clear to communities through unforeseen weather events, sinking islands and saline intrusion. While the science and causes of climate change were well known, as were the requirements to halt climate change, the Minister stressed that the region must adapt to the changes to which the atmosphere was already committed due to historical greenhouse gases. Speaking on climate resilience, he noted that PNG wishes to develop a thriving economy but also to address climate change. To pursue this PNG has been preserving the forests as the lungs of the planet, and this stewardship of the forests provides PNG with a valuable opportunity to treat the forests as suitable carbon sinks, and to work with other rainforest nations. PNG has established a new office of climate change and development and a national draft strategy for low carbon development.

18. The Ministers from Nauru and Tokelau responded. The statements by the Ministers of PNG, Nauru and Tokelau are attached. The Secretary General of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat was also invited to address the meeting. Other Ministers and Heads of Delegation joined the discussion.

Key issues discussed were:

19. A six-point point strategy to address issues for Cancun was outlined by Nauru and generally welcomed:

- A legally binding agreement should be concluded at Cancun, and not deferred to 2011. A two track process should be embraced that addresses all of the issues in the Bali Action Plan. If it is not possible to reach such an agreement, then a new mandate, with timelines and milestones, must be agreed at Cancun.
- Financing for adaptation must be agreed as soon as possible, with special recognition of the needs of LDCs, SIDS and countries in Africa experiencing desertification and drought. This financing must be new and additional, timely and predictable.
- There is a strong need to separate out the impacts of response measures from adaptation.
- The social, environmental and economic loss and damage associated with slow onset or unavoidable climate change must be addressed through a new mechanism for risk management and insurance.
- Global emissions must be reduced below what is considered dangerous levels: the Pacific position as articulated prior to Copenhagen remains valid.
- The accounting rules must ensure environmental integrity, for example through limiting use of offsets, proper accounting for LULUCF, accounting for major sources such as forest and peat land degradation, and should not include untested technologies in the Clean Development Mechanism such as carbon capture and storage.

20. SPREP was requested to organize a PIC meeting and to assist with communication tools to enable a higher profile for PICs, for example through climate change fact sheets to highlight Pacific concerns at Cancun. In this regard, Ministers supported having Pacific media present at the COP. It was also proposed that SPREP should support Members through briefings, technical advice and backstopping, assisting PICs with side events, and advice on travel arrangements and logistics.

21. Delegates also expressed support for the intent of the pre-Cancun meeting proposed by Kiribati. They also expressed the need for unity in the region and to maintain respect for each other's positions and avoiding any situations similar to that which occurred during the 2009 AOSIS Summit and on the floor of the Copenhagen conference.

22. Some delegates called for vulnerable nations to keep pushing for the polluter pays principle, to allow PICs to keep living on ancestral lands. Consideration should also be given to the humanitarian angle to account for possible migration forced by climate change. Furthermore, the validity of precautionary approaches was also highlighted. One delegation called for support for a proposal that would address long-lived greenhouse gases under the FCCC and phase out these gases as ozone depleting substances under the Montreal Protocol.

23. Preparations for UNFCCC COP16 (Cancun) – Several delegates acknowledged the value of working through AOSIS, but expressed disappointment with the outcomes of the 2009 Copenhagen Climate Change Conference and the slow, convoluted progress since. Other delegates referred to the need to maintain the balance achieved by leaders in Copenhagen to ensure forward movement and avoid further stalemate. There was general support for the idea that any outcome of

the next conference in Cancun must reflect meaningful commitments to address greenhouse gas emissions by all major economies, contain provisions that ensure such commitments are carried out in a transparent manner and provide a framework for support for developing countries in their efforts to mitigate and adapt to the adverse effects of climate change.

24. Financing - Key constraints for the region relate to the challenges of preparing and formatting proposals, implementing and reporting on activities, administrative capacity and access to information. Many delegates highlighted the need for finance sources to reduce the complexity of access rules and reporting requirements, assistance from SPREP and other agencies to Members with low capacity, a review function under adaptation projects to gauge whether the project has been effective, and to allow adjustments in cases where climate change impacts are greater than initially expected. Climate change financing should be viewed not in the short term context of economic growth, but in the long term context of sustainable development. Pacific Leaders laid out in their meeting in Vila principles to promote effective coordination of adaptation and mitigation action. Significant increases in funding would require commensurate implementation structures and capacity.

25. While the emerging sources of finance underline the importance of integrating adaptation and mitigation into national planning through mainstreaming, it was noted that many SIDS' national budgets do not yet provide for funding for climate change, and thereby they rely exclusively on international funding.

26. The need to avoid competition between national and regional efforts was emphasised, as was the wisdom of using the regional approach where this make sense. A menu approach for what each PIC could be

accessing in terms of support would also assist in developing proposals. It was noted that while the GEF is only accessible to PICs, the territories also need support, and this should be considered in the context of the SPREP financing study.

27. Since many donors have begun to agree in principle to provide direct budgetary arrangements, which would avoid losses from transaction costs of implementing agencies, some delegates called for flexibility in the financing mechanism that recognized the value of bilateral arrangements. Some delegates also noted the model proposed by AOSIS on direct access, which would support the preferences in the PICs.

28. SPREP Support - SPREP support for PICs to date on climate change was acknowledged as highly satisfactory. Delegates requested that SPREP consider also taking on a facilitative role to iron out differences that may arise between Members. There was also strong support for SPREP to continue to arrange negotiations training. Several delegates called for Pacific summaries of various technical papers issued through AOSIS. Some also called for SPREP to develop capacity to assist the 5 PICs with significant forestry resources to assist these countries on REDD+. PNG was congratulated for its leadership on this issue. Furthermore, it was recommended that SPREP should convene a workshop of insurance experts and climate change focal points to discuss the need for a regional insurance mechanism. This could also be complemented by a science advisory committee to back up the negotiations, which delegates encouraged SPREP to consider establishing, perhaps in partnership with USP. Finally, there was a suggestion for a regional summit to consider success stories and share best practices.

29. PIFACC – While it was noted that the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on

Climate Change had been adopted by the Leaders, the suggestions of the PIFACC review for how PIFACC implementation could be more effective were broadly welcomed. Many speakers welcomed the proposed guide as a useful tool, and called for its aim to be to ensure tangible results on the ground. This will require capacity building at all levels, but nevertheless implementation of actions can commence.

30. The suggestion for working groups under the PCCR was also welcomed, with the caveat that these would need funding to be effective. Donors' roles in supporting the working groups would be crucial.

31. It was also noted that there is a need to maintain linkages with other frameworks, such as the Pacific Plan, perhaps through a joint task force. The PCCR should be made more responsive to the needs of PICs, and promote mechanisms like in-country workshops to help identify national needs. Some countries have already used the PIFACC for developing their national strategy, giving comfort that they are on the right track.

32. The Director thanked Ministers and heads of delegation for the rich debate and noted six key issues:

- i. Priority needs to given to implement tangible practical action at the community level: this is the end point that all other efforts should be working towards.
- ii. Funding must be scaled up as soon as possible, with new predictable financing, and should be done by partnership with and not competition between national authorities and regional agencies, allowing for different national circumstances, and encompassing many aspects of climate change.
- iii. On FCCC preparations, the Secretariat will continue to support the PICs, provide negotiations

training and scale up efforts, as well as facilitating as far as it can, bearing in mind the limitations of resources.

- iv. The importance of pushing for a legally binding agreement with strong targets is clear – SPREP will work with hosts of pre-Cancun forums to prepare for the event. Speaking with one voice is important and SPREP will seek to assist.
- v. Links are needed between regional and national levels, and good use should be made of the CROP task force.
- vi. SPREP will consider the constructive suggestions, such as the science committee and the climate change summit, as clear instructions.

33. The Chair reemphasized that mitigation, adaptation and financing are inseparable. He reminded Ministers to discuss with Finance counterparts the possibilities for a national budget allocation for climate change, and urged that any differences of opinion in our region be resolved in the region and not aired at the international level.

Agenda Item 15.5: Recommendations from the officials segment

34. The high-level segment reviewed and **adopted** the recommendations of the officials segment.

Agenda Item 15.6: Strategic Plan

35. The SPREP Director outlined the consultative process from March to August 2010 that gathered information on country and regional environmental priorities, and the drafting exercise before and during the officials segment of the SPREP Meeting. This process resulted in a draft plan being made available to all Members two months before

the Meeting, and enabled officials to endorse a Strategic Plan 2011-2015, to be forwarded to the high-level segment for adoption.

36. The chair of the strategic plan working group – the head of delegation from Australia – outlined the operation of the working group from 6 to 8 September. The group worked closely with the Secretariat to address all comments Members had provided on the draft plan, ensured that the goals and targets were ambitious, specific and measurable, and improved the clarity of many sections. The group agreed by consensus to retain the four strategic priorities of climate change, biodiversity and ecosystem management, waste management and pollution control and environmental monitoring and governance.

37. Vanuatu acknowledged the contributions from all Members to the plan, which captured the aspirations of the peoples of the region. He proposed that the Secretariat be directed to improve its service delivery, focused on the four strategic priorities of the plan. He also wished to record his country's wish for the proposal relating to sub-regional presences for SPREP to remain on the table.

38. New Caledonia welcomed the Strategic Plan for addressing the recent reforms, including the RIF, welcomed its transparent, action-oriented nature, and the capacity it should give the Secretariat to secure additional funds from donors.

39. The high-level segment then **adopted the SPREP Strategic Plan 2011-2015**.

Agenda Item 15.7: Madang Communiqué

40. In the discussions on the draft environment ministers' communiqué, some

delegations emphasized the importance of developing fall-back positions to take into climate change negotiations, to prepare for the possibility that a legally binding agreement is not accomplished at the Cancun climate change conference. However, while the Meeting acknowledged the validity of this point, it agreed to retain positive and forward-looking language in the communiqué.

42. Following further discussion and redrafting, the Meeting **adopted** the Madang Communiqué and is attached as an Annex.

43. After the adoption of the communiqué the delegations of Vanuatu, Fiji, PNG and the Solomon Islands reaffirmed their interest in the concept of establishing a sub-regional SPREP office in the Melanesian sub-region, and called for the Secretariat to investigate this option. Samoa noted that this would be conditional on the financial capacity of SPREP, and that funding should be focused first on delivering environmental outcomes within countries.

44. Samoa also observed that this question might be better addressed by Forum Leaders. The Director of SPREP noted the discussion and assured delegates that the Secretariat would give the matter appropriate consideration, as recommended by the ICR and allowed for under the Strategic Plan.

Agenda Item 16: Date and venue of Twenty-Second SPREP Meeting

45. The 22nd SPREP Meeting will be held in Apia, Samoa, 19-22 September 2011. PNG noted that the dates were very close to the UN General Assembly, and asked the Secretariat to reflect on this when planning the Meeting.

46. The Meeting accepted with gratitude New Caledonia's offer to host the 2012 SPREP Meeting, and meanwhile looked forward to that country hosting the 2011 Pacific Games.

Item 17: Close

47. The Director of SPREP, delegations of Cook Islands and Samoa made closing statements. The Chair made a closing statement and declared the meeting closed.

ATTACHMENT I: OPENING ADDRESS BY MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION, GOVERNMENT OF PAPUA NEW GUINEA – HON. BENNY ALLEN MP

Colleague Ministers, Delegates, It is not long ago that climate change was an issue brushed aside by politicians and bureaucrats as just an issue of academic debate not worth the attention. There was a lot of skepticism about climate change, and in fact there still exists now. However there is now scientific proof that climate change is occurring and is caused by human activities as the human race aspires to improve lifestyles and embrace modern development.

For PNG proof has come about in the unforeseen weather and climatic events that have hit our shores, the increasingly intense floods and droughts, the sinking islands and salt contaminated ground water. Proof of climate change is apparent everywhere in PNG, especially in our villages.

We all now know that Climate change is caused by increasing release of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere which upsets the natural dynamics of the climate system. The world now knows that to stop climate change we need to reduce the level of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. However there are already climate change impacts we need to deal with and to prepare for. That means we need to rethink how we progress our development efforts. Our development therefore needs to address carbon reduction and at the same time be more climate-resilient.

For PNG we are committed to developing a thriving economy, a fair and happy society and a sustainable environment. But we cannot continue to develop without addressing climate change. We have been taking a global lead in seeking to combat climate change, by basically promoting that our forests be utilized as carbon storage sites. Deforestation and forest degradation

are major contributors of greenhouse gas emissions, through logging and agriculture.

While much of the developed world, destroyed their forest generations ago, we here in PNG should take pride in preserving our forests. The rest of the world is slowly coming to value our forests as the lungs of the planet—not merely as a source for furniture. The stewardship of our forests presents us with an opportunity.

Since 2005 PNG has been working with other rainforest nations to create a mechanism for Reducing Emissions from deforestation and forest degradation or REDD+, to enhance carbon stocks and manage our forests sustainably.

As a government we have developed a draft national climate compatible development strategy. We are also establishing the new Office of Climate Change and Development. The action plan recognises that economic development and climate change adaptation and mitigation measures must be combined. It further recognizes that the strategy must be incorporated into our national development plans.

PNG is ready to act now to access resources to implement REDD+ in the country. We have identified our emissions abatement measures and projects to begin demonstrating REDD+ aspects. We have a list of low carbon growth projects. We have also identified on ground projects to address our priority climate change hazards. Discussions with our development partners and available funding mechanisms has begun and we look forward to implementing real projects very soon.

We are working continuously to ensure negotiations address our issues and we look forward to Cancun and a positive way forward. Thank you.

ATTACHMENT II: KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY DR RAWLESTON MOORE, GEF SECRETARIAT

Ministers, Delegates, Mr. David Sheppard-Director of SPREP, Agency Officials, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak here at such an important time. Our CEO Monique Barbut was honored by your invitation and I first want to apologize on her behalf for being here. She just lost her father and is bereaving with her family. However she does send her deepest regards and hopes to come to Pacific and meet with you all at the next available opportunity.

As you know, this region holds a special place in Monique's heart. Before coming to the GEF, she spent a good portion of her professional career here. And later when she took the helm of the GEF in July 2006 one of the first mission's she was sure to make was to the Pacific. She knows firsthand the unparalleled beauty of these islands as well as the deep economic and environmental challenges you face

As you remember at that time there was little GEF activity in the region; most projects were either part of a larger global desktop project or consisted of enabling activities to assist in reporting to conventions. And, indeed for many countries the small grants country programme was still just getting started.

Four years later we can tell a much better story. The \$100 million the CEO pledged to you in fact is now in place; GEF-PAS is up and running. We kept our promise to deliver resources to the region.

So the question now is: how is this program working? Is it delivering the way

it is supposed to? And we can easily answer, yes! Currently 29 of the 32 projects have been given approval, by the secretariat.

So it took teamwork and now we can I think you all should be congratulated for your extreme hard work in putting this programme in place. Without your hard work these resources would not have been mobilized for your region, and I can tell that similar island regions in the world have not been able to leverage the kind of resources you have, and they have greater capacity to do so!.

However we still have some work to do to truly reap the benefits. We need to speed up the implementation of the GEF-PAS given at this date we only have 12 projects on the ground up and running: we need to have more projects working on the ground. We recognize there are some capacity issues; and I am here to tell you together we will make sure we are on the same page so this program meets its full potential at the earliest possible date

GEF-PAS of course is what we hope just one step in a larger investment in the region. So the key question now is how do we move forward?

Here I should mention for those that may not be familiar with how our fund works that this spring donors gave us a record replenishment of US\$4.25 billion. This means for GEF5 a 52% increase in new resources compared to GEF 4. Given the difficult economic times I think that this is a considerable achievement. We have listened and understood many of the problems which you been facing with GEF access, and thus for GEF, we have

reduced the project cycle to 18 months. We are also piloting direct access for national communications (up to US\$500,000) and for National Portfolio Formulation Exercises (NPFE). For the NPFE, countries can receive US\$30,000 directly from the GEF Secretariat (without an agency) to do a national planning exercise on how countries would like to utilize their GEF resources over the GEF5.

Remember the NPFE is not compulsory; it is NOT an obligation. It is simply up to the country. If you want to do it then we will provide the resources. If you do not, it will not affect your ability to access the GEF resources which have been allocated to you. We have recognized the need to provide additional help to Focal Points and thus we have increased the amount of resources available to focal points through the Country Support Programme, from US\$8,000 to US\$9,000 per year. The country support programme will now be implemented directly by the GEF secretariat and you will now have the opportunity for extended constituency meetings, where focal points for the environmental conventions (eg UNFCCC and CBD) and NGO representatives can attend. This will naturally facilitate the accurate distribution of information as it relates to the GEF. We have also introduced a facility of flexibility for countries who have smaller country allocations such as those in this region. You can now use your resources as you like in the focal areas, --so for example if you want to use all of your allocated resources on a biodiversity project or a climate change mitigation project you can.

For GEF 5 we will have a specific window for investment in Sustainable Forest Management and REDD. I know that for many countries in the Pacific in particular the host country for this meeting forest management is a key issue. The GEF has

financed sustainable forest management since its inception, and it is still a rather hidden fact that the GEF is the largest financier of forest management globally. Let me give you a few examples. As of June 2010, a total of US\$74.4 million has been pledged for UN-REDD, in comparison GEF has provided US\$1.6 billion for sustainable forestry management since its inception. In 2007, the GEF launched the Tropical Forest Account, a pilot incentive scheme promoting country investments in multiple focal area projects that yield benefits in REDD+. The \$40 million initiative focused on the three regions of large and mainly intact tropical forests (Amazonia, the Congo Basin, and Papua New Guinea/Borneo) and gave rise to comprehensive projects and programs, such as the GEF Strategic Program for Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin worth \$50 million GEF funding.

A year later, in 2008, the GEF approved a \$13 million regional project aiming to enhance institutional capacities on REDD+ issues in the Congo Basin.

I should also mention that there is a \$9 million GEF/FAO project, which leveraged \$43 million, to help the Brazilian Forest Service further strengthen its national policy and knowledge framework in support of SFM and REDD+. More recently, the GEF approved a \$3 million project aiming to establish a market mechanism for promoting and facilitating voluntary GHG emissions mitigation and offsetting in Colombia. This GEF/IADB initiative contains, as a central element, national capacity building for REDD+ and the generation of Verified Emission Reductions (VERs) from REDD+ pilot projects. So you can see the GEF has a comparative advantage when it comes to Forestry Management and REDD issues.

For GEF 5 there will be a separate

US\$250million funding envelope for Sustainable Forest Management and REDD+, with the possibility that the GEF may provide up to US\$ 1billion to address issues of deforestation. This is a 100% increase compared to GEF-4. Unlike other institutions, the GEF is ready to support the conservation and sustainable management of all types of forests in potentially more than 60 countries worldwide. Also, by pooling investments from different focal areas, the GEF is in a unique position to create multiple environmental and social benefits from REDD+ in a cost-effective way. In that context, an innovative financing mechanism will make sure that REDD+ programs and projects in GEF-5 will go beyond focusing on climate change mitigation and generating quick carbon credits, but contribute also to biodiversity conservation, preserving indigenous people's rights and a new financial mechanism and the Copenhagen Green Fund, the reality is that the GEF is still the only financial mechanism and the only way to get resources in the here and now. How donors plan to meet the growing needs of this region and others to address climate change is still very much evolving: there is no consensus on structure or governance.

So for SIDS and countries in the Pacific who have suffered disproportionately in the past when it comes to funding, there still is no clear answer on how any of these funds in question would truly meet the needs of this region.

Past promises to small island states, most recently in Copenhagen were not met to your satisfaction and the global financial picture is still an uncertain one with several large donors looking to scale back or at least retrench existing aid commitments. So in this environment, given that overall aid could in fact be declining you cannot afford to be quiet;

you MUST be the leading force on these issues. And one way to efficiently do this is through established funds such as the LDCF and SCCF that already have a track record tested and respected by donors.

Also remember that the GEF is a reforming and changing institution. Before Monique came, there were no officers to address the concerns of the SIDS and the LDCs. We now have specific staff to address your concerns.

Also during her tenure between the GEF-3 and the GEF-4, the proportion of funds directed to the Least Developed Countries and the Small Island Developing States rose from 11.9 percent to 18.4 percent.

What's the bottom line? The GEF is trying to serve you in a better fashion, and meet your needs. We are still the major finance mechanism for climate change and for the foreseeable future the GEF will continue to be. Any new mechanism will take a very long time to be effectively put it place, so until that day comes, if it ever does, we need to work together to have a strong GEF that has the resources and finances to assist you. I promise you the GEF will do its part and we urge you to redouble your own efforts to achieve our common goals.

Ministers, thank you very much.

ATTACHMENT III: STATEMENT BY HON. MINISTER OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT, SAMOA – HON. FAUMUINA TIATIA LIUGA

Ministers, Delegates, Mr. David Sheppard-Director of SPREP, the representative of GEF (Dr Rawleston Moore), Agency Officials, Ladies and Gentlemen.

At the outset, I would like to thank the Government and the people of Papua Niu Guinea for hosting this 21st meeting of SPREP, and for the warm hospitality we have received since our arrival. I would also like to thank the secretariat for the excellent arrangements made for this meeting.

This ministerial session of the SPREP meeting convenes at a time when each SPREP Member government, organization, and members of the civil society, is considering its own contribution to our regional collective efforts to sustainably use, conserve and effectively manage our environment. Meetings and dialogues particularly at our policy level continue since the Copenhagen Conference on Climate Change last December and the consequent endorsement of the Copenhagen Accord that followed. We are also now preparing on how we can constructively contribute to the forthcoming Conference of the Parties to the Biodiversity Convention scheduled next month, and the COPs and MOPS of other key MEAs which are all taking place around the same time. This occasion is therefore a timely and welcomed opportunity for us, as decision and policy makers to discuss ways to strengthen our abilities to both leverage and coordinate the utilisation of available funding, in order to support regional and national initiatives for the benefit of the environment especially our people.

In this context, my delegation on behalf of the SPREP members welcomes the work thus far by the GEF, towards simplifying procedures and access to environmental funding.

I am pleased to note the GEF replenishment of US4.25billion, which is a 52% increase in new resources for GEF 5 compared to GEF 4. I agree that we are still in difficult times, hence this record replenishment is a considerable achievement. I would therefore like to thank our donor SPREP members around the table for this commitment and pledges made to GEF.

Mr Moore, Guidance for approaches to environment financing is an area that is already complex. While the new funds become operational, with separate criteria and access requirements, fiduciary and reporting requirements remain a challenge. I am however encouraged to note that the GEF has reduced the project cycle time to 18 months, and that there is also further assistance towards national profiling and Multilateral Environment Agreement reporting to fulfill member obligations to various MEAs that they are party to.

The difficulties in accessing external funding by PICTs has been identified as a critical issue for this region in the past. In response the SPREP countries decided that a GEF advisor be instituted at the SPREP office in Apia as part of the GEF-PAS programme, where members were assisted with technical advice on how to access GEF funding and frame proposals. Let us not forget that while this advice was kindly availed, states (including

Samoa) continued to access funding from their own bilateral development partners (countries and financial institutions) for national environment programmes.

I have been informed that there are focal area set-asides, plus corporate budgetary provisions, before calculation of STAR national allocations, equivalent to 30% of the total replenishment. These set-asides I believe, can be used to finance regional and global projects, enabling activities, and the sustainable forest management programme. I welcome GEF's flexibility in considering the urgency of maintaining the GEF-PAS coordinating unit within SPREP to serve countries of our region with needs pertinent to the GEF.

Through both initiatives, National systems were strengthened to ensure transparency and accountability in financial management systems, utilising existing national mechanisms that ensured facilitated flow of resources towards our environment needs.

On a wider perspective there are further issues on access and utilisation of available funding at the regional level, and the much needed coordination. These include country concerns with the need to progress projects in unison, which can mean that the slowest of partners can dictate the pace. Countries were also wary that the principles of country-ownership and country-drivenness that guide the Programme might be compromised by regional or multi-country approaches. Equally important therefore, is the development of well-targeted in-country project components and activities are therefore essential to ensure adherence to these principles.

As you will already be aware, the Pacific SIDS and the Pacific Islands region have

made notable recent progress under a regional framework that enhances PICs' access to GEF resources. Over US\$ 100 million in funding has been committed through projects at various stages of approval for the region over the last four years. This followed a fifteen-year period since the GEF was established in 1991 during which Pacific SIDS received in total only \$86 million of GEF resources over a 15 year period, and is considered well below our regions environmental investment resource needs.

However, our regional experience points out that GEF-PAS provided valuable lessons to Pacific SIDS, the GEF Secretariat, implementing agencies, CROP agencies donor agencies and participating international NGOs. It gave us the Pacific SIDS early confirmation of an indicative lump sum figure of resources that is accessible to us. It allowed for better planning, scheduling and coordination of project development, tied to national sustainable development goals in country. This has encouraged closer synergies among agencies and between sectors, and better accounting for crosscutting concerns regionally, and it has allowed SIDS to draw on the experience of CROP and implementing agencies, and to develop regional consensus.

I am pleased to note with much appreciation, that the Pacific SIDS are allocated totals of \$28 million for climate change, \$43.81 million for biodiversity, and \$10.08 million for land degradation, for an overall STAR total of \$81.89 million under GEF 5. While it appears a little less than the previous allocation under GEF4, we are also reminded that once national activities are defined, requests for additional resources will become unavoidable. We urge that not only GEF but also development partners will be in a position to show flexibility and willingness

to respond positively. I would urge each member state of SPREP that is entitled to GEF to also start pursuing this currently available opportunity.

Ladies and Gentlemen, There has been available funding from the UNFCCC special funds such as the LDCF, SCCF, Adaptation Fund to mention the key ones for our region. The WB now joins the race with its Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience (PPCR). In light of the WB serving also as the trustee for the GEF, Confusion is likely, particularly with this entry of the financial institutions that member states are used to as bilateral partners for conditional financing. However, I am confident that with our experiences with the ADB and World Bank, chances of duplication will be avoided. Close coordination between the member governments' Ministries of Finance and Environment Ministries is also possible, and will or has become the normal mode of practice on a daily basis. This same coordination at the national level can be replicated at the regional level among crop agencies, ensuring expedited development, submission and implementation of GEF projects.

The level of investment that the SPREP countries considers commensurate with environment degradation is reflected in the large number of activities encompassed in the SPREP past and present work programme and plans. At the same time, states have progressed bilateral projects within the environment sector, with responses to impacts of climate change attracting most funds. Funding for Adaptation under the LDCF and SCCF, and in particular the entitlement of direct access is applauded with the recent activation of the Adaptation Fund. We welcome the support of our development partners, and strongly encourage that the GEF and

its implementing agencies continue with this excellent movement. I believe that these GEF special funds will be the main ones for Pacific SIDS to access financial support for Adaptation. Hence we would welcome more security for these specific sources.

On that note, I would like to acknowledge with much appreciation the additional funds approved towards the operational focal point, country support programme, and we hope that this is a beginning of more resources for this purpose to come.

I am likewise pleased to share with you our experience in Samoa with the establishment of our national GEF office. During GEF 3 all of Samoa's externally funded projects were part of regional programmes in SPREP, SOPAC and SPC. In GEF 4, this regionality in approach continued but with our NAPA sector projects taking off in partnership with UNDP as Implementing Agency. Samoa took an investment in establishing a national GEF office which is now into its fourth year, and its work was entirely directed towards expediting access to GEF4 resources. As a result all of Samoa's allocation under GEF PAS and GEF 4 has been committed to projects that are at various stages of implementation. Despite such success Samoa's National GEF office needs to be strengthened further, as we would also like to share our experience in this area with our fellow SPREP Pacific Island Countries and Territories (PICTs).

The impacts of such strengthening is testament to the expeditious manner in which Samoa's GEF5 project for Land Degradation that integrates biodiversity, land degradation, and climate change, was completed. In fact the Samoan government approved its GEF5 project of US\$5.32 million last week, and is already on its way to GEF through the UNDP.

Let me end by making reference to the Copenhagen Green Fund, and the notion that the GEF plays a critical role in getting resources in this fund with immediacy. In agreement with such notion, and should the Copenhagen Accord reaches consensus and resources become available, a significant amount of resources will start flowing into the region and could be well over the usual in the past. Hence I am pleased to inform that the Cartagena Dialogue continues later next month in Costa Rica and the group of Ministers that have been working tirelessly to ensure this fund becomes a reality urgently. Progress of this group has been positive so far, striving towards a more positive outcome in Cancun later in the year. We are at same time hopeful that the fast-track financing under the Copenhagen accord will come to fruition soon, although at the bilateral level, the European Union, Australia and New Zealand have already made a start.

Meanwhile, our region, particularly SPREP members need a mechanism to facilitate easy access, implementation monitoring of these funds' utilisation. The feasibility study of a regional finance mechanism has started and we look forward to its findings. At the national level, parallel assessments are being carried out of which I hope our members could rise to such a challenge to complete national finance coordination mechanisms to institutionalise in-country linkages up to a future regional mechanism,

We all need to work together, and help each other out, but also help ourselves first. It is my sincerest hope, that the SPREP members will continue to work closely with GEF as well as our own development partners to ensure sufficient resources are availed, and that synergies are also realized in the funding of our environment management needs

At last but not least, Mr Moore, Please convey our warm condolences to Ms Monique Barbut in her time of sorrow, and I wish you a pleasant journey home at the end of the meeting.

Thank you.

ATTACHMENT IV: PACIFIC ENVIRONMENT MINISTERS' COMMUNIQUÉ

1. The 21st Meeting of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme convened in Madang, Papua New Guinea, 6 - 10 September 2010. The high-level segment was attended by Ministers from Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, and Vanuatu; and Heads of Delegation from American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, France, French Polynesia, New Zealand, Niue, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and the United States of America.
2. Heads of Delegation thanked the Government of Papua New Guinea and the Provincial Government and people of Madang for the kind hospitality extended to them during their stay in Madang.
3. The Ministers and Heads of Delegation of the Pacific region responsible for environmental conservation and management, having met in Madang, Papua New Guinea during this International Year of Biodiversity, **affirmed** that:
 - biological diversity is the foundation of the well-being of our communities and cultures;
 - in the face of the predicted irreparable damage to the ability of ecosystems to provide the goods and services on which people depend, all must work together to conserve biodiversity, use it sustainably and respond to threats to its integrity; and
 - the loss of biodiversity is compounded by the overwhelming threat of climate change, and the region's response to climate change must be linked to its efforts to conserve and manage the region's species and ecosystems.

They further:

2011-2015 Strategic Plan

4. **Adopted** the new Strategic Plan 2011-2015 as the guiding document for regional environmental priorities and the work of SPREP to address these in the coming five years. They welcomed the consultative process that led to development of the plan, and endorsed the vision of *'The Pacific environment, sustaining our livelihood and natural heritage in harmony with our cultures.'*
5. **Adopted** the four priorities of the Strategic Plan as climate change, biodiversity and ecosystem management, waste management and pollution prevention, and environmental monitoring and governance.
6. **Encouraged** the Secretariat to prioritise and facilitate systematic monitoring and reporting on outputs and contributions to outcomes at the national level in order to demonstrate results.

7. **Directed** the Secretariat to ensure that resource allocation reflects the priorities in the Strategic Plan with core resources prioritised to core functions in the first instance, and to secure the resources and to facilitate and implement partnerships to meet the goals of the Strategic Plan.

8. **Requested** donor agencies and partner organisations to note that the Strategic Plan outlines the key environmental priorities for Pacific countries and territories and urged them to support implementation of the Strategic Plan.

Climate Change.

9. **Noted** with concern the ongoing issues of global climate change and the resulting impacts on Pacific islands including threat to the survival of some of these islands.

10. **Endorsed** the leadership role played by SPREP in supporting climate change activities in the region; in particular its leading role in the effective coordination and implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation efforts, including on coordination and harmonisation of climate change financing in the region.

11. **Urged** Members of SPREP to enhance capacity at the national level to continue access and coordination of financing from bilateral partners and multilateral sources, noting the principles adopted at the 2010 Forum Leaders' Meeting.

12. **Noted** the commitment of all Members to move towards a durable, environmentally effective and legally binding outcome in the UNFCCC as quickly as possible and to use COP16 in Cancun to achieve this objective.

13. **Urged** all countries to fulfil their voluntary commitments enshrined in the Copenhagen Accord including the implementation of mitigation commitments and actions, enhanced adaptation actions and commitments to fast-start and longer-term financing. They welcomed the fast-start pledges of developed countries and the delivery of fast-start funding to date.

14. **Directed** the Secretariat to continue to provide technical information and support to Pacific island countries and territories (PICTs) on climate change issues and negotiations, including assisting PICTs with a preparatory meeting prior to UNFCCC COP16 in Cancun.

15. **Reiterated**, in relation to climate change issues and negotiations, the value and significance of cooperation and exchange of information between SPREP Members and with the Secretariat.

16. **Endorsed** the approach to revision of the PIFACC to take account of the findings of the mid-term review and developments over the first five years of its operation. Furthermore, timely support from donors to implement the PIFACC over the next five years was called for.

Conservation of the Ocean.

17. **Emphasised** the critical importance of ensuring the sustainable development, management and conservation of our ocean.

18. **Reiterated** the critical role of SPREP in the promotion of, and support for the management and conservation of island, coastal and marine ecosystems through its new Strategic Plan.

19. **Welcomed** the decision of the Pacific Islands Forum Leaders in Port Vila in August 2010 to endorse the Framework for the Pacific Oceanscape, noting with appreciation the role of SPREP in its development, and welcomed their request to CROP agencies to implement the Framework in partnership with other relevant organisations.

20. **Directed** the Secretariat to work with CROP agencies and to develop a recommended approach for SPREP in implementing the Framework in the context of the Strategic Plan for consideration by the 22nd SPREP Meeting.

Biodiversity

21. **Noted** with concern the increasing challenge and need for greater commitment to achieve the 2010 biodiversity targets and the continuing high rate of biodiversity loss and decline of ecosystem services in the Pacific.

22. **Commended** the Republic of Kiribati for establishing the Phoenix Islands Protected Area, the world's largest marine protected area, and its successful inscription as a World Heritage Area; the United States for the establishment of its new Pacific marine monuments; and the successful inscription of the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument as a World Heritage Area; and New Caledonia's lagoons and coral reefs that were inscribed as a World Heritage Area in July 2008.

23. **Encouraged** other Pacific island countries and territories to take similar action to conserve and manage important terrestrial and marine ecosystems.

24. **Noted** the importance of having a One Pacific Voice at the forthcoming 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity in Nagoya, Japan, to ensure that COP decisions, including on developing post 2010 strategic plan goals and targets, take into account the needs of SIDS, as well as at other international conventions, in particular the UNFCCC.

25. **Noted** and **welcomed** the collaborative work of Republic of the Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Palau, which aims to conserve 30% of their nearshore marine resources and 20% of their terrestrial resources by 2020 as part of the Micronesia Challenge.

26. **Noted** the success of the regional pre-COP 10 meeting held in Nadi, Fiji, and

27. **Directed** the SPREP Secretariat to support Pacific island countries at the CBD COP10 meeting in Nagoya and at the UNFCCC COP16 meeting in Cancun

Madang, Papua New Guinea, 9 September 2010