



SPREP

South Pacific Regional Environment Programme



**Report of the
Eleventh SPREP Meeting
of Officials
and
Report of the Environment
Ministers' Forum**

Guam
9–12 October 2000

SPREP Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

SPREP Meeting of Officials and Environment Ministers' Forum (11th : 2000 : Guam)

Report of the Eleventh SPREP Meeting of Officials and report of the Environment Ministers' Forum, Guam, 9 – 12 October, 2000. – Apia, Samoa : SPREP, 2001.

iii, 59 p. ; 29 cm.

ISBN: 982-04-0219-0

1. Environmental policy – Oceania – Congresses.
 2. Conservation of natural resources – Oceania – Congresses.
 3. Environmental protection – Oceania – Congresses.
- I. South Pacific Regional Environment Programme. II. Environment Ministers' Forum. III. Title.

363.7099

Prepared for publication in April 2001 by the
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)
PO Box 240
Apia, Samoa
Ph: (685) 21929 Fax: (685) 20231
email: sprep@sprep.org.ws
Website: www.sprep.org.ws

Edited and layout design by SPREP's Publication Unit

Printed by
Quality Print Ltd
Suva, Fiji
quality@is.com.fj

© **South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, 2001**

The South Pacific Regional Environment Programme authorises the reproduction of this material, whole or in part, in any form provided appropriate acknowledgement is given.

Original Text: English

**Report of the Eleventh
SPREP Meeting of
Officials
and
Report of the Environment
Ministers' Forum**

Guam
9–12 October 2000

Contents

Officials' Meeting Report

Agenda Item 1:	Official Opening	1
Agenda Item 2:	Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair	2
Agenda Item 3:	Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures	2
Agenda Item 4:	Matters Arising from Tenth SPREP Meeting	2
Agenda Item 5:	Presentation of Annual Report for 1999 and Director's Overview of Progress since Tenth SPREP Meeting	3
Agenda Item 6:	Action Plan (1997–2000)	3
Agenda Item 7:	Action Plan (2001–2004)	6
Agenda Item 8:	Policy/Institutional Matters	16
Agenda Item 9:	Regional Coordination	18
Agenda Item 10:	Report from Meeting of the Parties to SPREP and APIA Conventions	18
Agenda Item 11:	Items Proposed by Members	18
Agenda Item 12:	Statements by Observers	19
Agenda Item 13:	Other Business	19
Agenda Item 14:	Date and Venue of Twelfth SPREP Meeting	19
Agenda Item 15:	Adoption of Report	19
Agenda Item 16:	Review of Agenda for Ministerial Meeting/Matters for Ministerial Decision	19
Agenda Item 17:	Close	19

Annexes

Annex I:	List of Participants (Joint Participants list for Officials Meeting and Ministers' Forum)	20
Annex II:	Lieutenant Governor of Guam's Speech	30
Annex III:	SPREP Director's Speech	31
Annex IV:	List of Sponsors	34
Annex V:	Agenda	35
Annex VI:	Power Point presentation of SPREP Action Plan Key Achievements 1997–2000	37
Annex VII:	Statement by Observers	38

Environment Ministers' Forum Report

Agenda Item 1:	Official Opening	42
Agenda Item 2:	Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair	42
Agenda Item 3:	Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures	42
Agenda Item 4:	Director's Overview	43
Agenda Item 5:	Matters for Decision	43
Agenda Item 6:	Matters for Noting	44
Agenda Item 7:	Focus Issue	44
Agenda Item 8:	Other Business	44
Agenda Item 9:	Timing of Next Ministerial Meeting	45
Agenda Item 10:	Adoption of Report and Ministerial Statement	45
Agenda Item 11:	Close	45

Annexes

Annex Ia:	List of Participants (Joint Participants list for Officials Meeting and Ministers' Forum)	46
Annex IIa:	Address by Lieutenant Governor of Guam	47
Annex IIIa:	Provisional Agenda	50
Annex IVa:	Letter from the Chair of the Eleventh SPREP Meeting of Officials to the Chair of the Environment Ministers' Forum	51
Annex Va:	Keynote Address from Regional Director and Representative of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	53
Annex VIa:	Guam Environment Ministers' Forum Statement	58

Officials' Meeting Report

Agenda Item 1:

Official Opening

1. The Eleventh SPREP Meeting (11SM) was convened in Guam, from 9 to 12 October 2000. Representatives of the following SPREP countries and territories attended: American Samoa, Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, France, Guam, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Northern Marianas, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu, United States of America and Wallis and Futuna. Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) partners namely: Forum Secretariat, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC) were also represented. Observers from a range of regional, international and non governmental organisations including United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) offices in Apia and Suva, and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) were also present. A list of participants is attached as Annex I.
2. Chair of the Tenth SPREP Meeting (10SM), Cook Islands (represented by Ms I'o Tuakeu Lindsay), called the meeting to order and invited Reverend Alfred Sablan to lead the Meeting in prayer.
3. In officially opening the Meeting, the Lieutenant Governor of Guam, the Honourable Madeleine Z. Bordallo, welcomed the delegates and invited them to enjoy the beauty of the island and the hospitality of its people. She stated that Guam had become more cosmopolitan and developed than ever before and that this may have come at a cost to the environment. She stressed however that her government's commitment to protecting the environment had not changed despite its desire to provide economic opportunities for its people.
4. The Lieutenant Governor stated that while protecting Guam's environment was a fundamental community value, the island's pristine environment was also what attracted visitors to Guam, and for this reason alone, the government would never allow the environment to be sacrificed in the name of economic growth.
5. In closing, the Lieutenant Governor reiterated the value of meetings such as this to strengthen the relationships among governments, island nations and territories to ensure that we are all working in harmony because the legacy we leave our children is the responsibility of everyone. The Lieutenant Governor's speech is attached as Annex II.
6. The Representative of Fiji, Mr Epeli Nasome, gave a vote of thanks to the Lieutenant Governor and expressed his sentiments on the welcome accorded to the delegates to the 11SM and to the Secretariat by the Government of Guam.
7. The Director of SPREP, Mr Tamari'i Tutangata, thanked the Lieutenant Governor of Guam for her presence and for sharing her wisdom and knowledge through her opening remarks. He also thanked the Chair of the 10SM for her advice and assistance to the Secretariat over the past two years. Thanks also were extended to the Work Programme and Budget Subcommittee which had met in Apia during November, 1999.
8. The Director recalled the background which led to the birth of SPREP starting with the decision of the South Pacific Conference held in Guam in 1973 which agreed to include in the SPC's work programme an Ecological Adviser to commence activities at the regional level on nature conservation.
9. In referring to the significance of this Meeting, Mr Tutangata highlighted a number of items that the delegates and the Ministers would need to decide on during the course of the week. Of particular significance were the Review of the 1997–2000 Action Plan; the Draft 2001–2004 Action Plan and Draft Corporate Plan; the proposed organisational structure; financial implications and Members' contributions. Although not included in the Meeting's agenda, Mr Tutangata also sought the Meeting's consideration of a name change for SPREP to better reflect its membership from the Northern and Southern Pacific. In concluding his remarks, Mr Tutangata extended his appreciation to the Lieutenant Governor and people of Guam for their

hospitality. Special thanks were expressed to Mr Jesus Salas and his dedicated staff at the Guam EPA. The Director also paid special tribute to Mr Jordan Kaye of the Guam EPA for his loyal support despite his ill health. The Director's speech is attached as Annex III.

10. Following the cultural entertainment by the Famaguon Guahan group, the Chairperson invited the incoming Chairperson to officially close the ceremony. In closing the Opening Ceremony, the Administrator of the Guam Environmental Protection Agency (Guam EPA), Mr Jesus Salas, echoed the comments of the key speakers regarding the importance of the environment and the work ahead of the Meeting. He then invited delegates to the reception hosted by SPREP.

11. Acknowledgements were also given to local and overseas companies for corporate sponsorship which included donations for coffee breaks, conference satchels, Internet and equipment use. A list of sponsors is attached as Annex IV.

Agenda Item 2:

Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair

12. In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the SPREP Meeting, where a Meeting is not hosted by the Secretariat, the Chair shall be provided by the host. Accordingly, the Chair of the Eleventh SPREP Meeting was Guam. The Rules also provide that the Vice-Chair shall rotate alphabetically whether or not the Meeting is hosted by the Secretariat. Accordingly, French Polynesia was appointed as Vice-Chair. The outgoing Chairperson, Ms I'o Tuakeu-Lindsay, thanked the Director of SPREP and his staff for the assistance rendered her during her term as Chair. Mr Michael Gawel, Representative of Guam took the Chair and noted that this was his first Meeting. He asked the delegates for their cooperation so that the Meeting could deal with the heavy agenda in a timely and efficient manner. The SPREP Director thanked the outgoing Chairperson for her invaluable guidance to the Secretariat in the past two years. He also welcomed the new Chairperson and offered the Secretariat's support and cooperation for the duration of his leadership.

Agenda Item 3:

Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures

13. The Agenda as amended was adopted and is attached as Annex V. The working hours of the Meeting were agreed as proposed by the Secretariat and an open-ended Report Drafting Sub-committee was established to assist with the preparation of the draft Meeting Report. This committee comprised the representatives of Australia, Cook Islands, France, Guam, New Zealand, Samoa and the United States of America.

14. The delegate of Samoa expressed the view that the Work Programme and Budget is the engine that drives the organisation and that it should be discussed in plenary and not in a sub-committee. This view was supported by New Zealand and French Polynesia and the Meeting agreed that Work Programme and Budget matters be discussed in Plenary. The Meeting further agreed that a technical Sub-committee on either the Work Programme and Budget or Staff Regulations could be convened if the need were to arise during plenary discussions on these issues.

Agenda Item 4:

Matters Arising from Tenth SPREP Meeting

15. The Secretariat reported on implementation of matters arising from the 10SM as outlined in the Secretariat's working paper and under ensuing agenda items. The Meeting noted action taken and agreed to discuss some matters arising from the 10SM under other relevant agenda items.

16. The Representative of Samoa sought clarification on the deferment of SPREP seeking UN Observer Status. The Director explained that after discussions with the Forum Secretariat in which the Forum Secretariat undertook to seek greater access by SPREP and other regional organisations to the UN, it was clarified that the current observer status accorded the Forum Secretariat was in fact not just for the Forum Secretariat but for the other organisations in the Pacific as well. He also referred to other developments that had taken place since the last Meeting. For instance, a SPREP Officer had been placed with the Samoan Mission in New York to assist CROP agencies with rel-

evant UN linkage. The results of this secondment had been reported to CROP and are a consistent agenda item at CROP Meetings. He also referred to the proposed secondment of an officer under the aegis of the Forum Secretariat.

17. The Representative of Kiribati noted the use of Peace Corps volunteers in the Capacity Building for Environmental Management in the Pacific (CBEMP) Programme. Whilst accepting the Secretariat's explanation that lack of sufficient financial resources to fund national officers had made the Peace Corps' offer of free technical assistance volunteers most beneficial, she nevertheless urged the Secretariat to also use local NGOs where funds permit.

18. The Representative of the United States of America congratulated SPREP for increased efforts to involve Territories in its work. He further urged the Secretariat to continue to increase such efforts.

19. The Representative of Fiji sought clarification with regard to the inclusion of fresh water environmental management issues in the Work Programme of SPREP which had been raised by Australia at the 10SM. In response, the Director stated that SPREP was closely collaborating with SOPAC on issues of fresh water. The Director of SOPAC explained that the lines between mandates were blurred due to the integrated nature of some issues (such as water quality) and agreed that collaboration between the two organisations would be ongoing on issues of fresh water management.

Agenda Item 5:

Presentation of Annual Report for 1999 and Director's Overview of Progress since Tenth SPREP Meeting

20. The Director tabled the Annual Report of SPREP covering the calendar year 1999. He highlighted a number of challenges faced by the Secretariat and specifically referred to the increasing workload of the Secretariat associated with living up to the expectations under the current Action Plan and the move to output-based performance budgeting, without adequate core financial resources. He likened this to the additional workloads being experienced by Members who were undergoing down-sizing, and moving to output-performance budgets, the major difference being that

SPREP was endeavouring to do this with only very limited additional assistance.

21. He urged Members to recognise the Secretariat's need for strengthened core financial resources, citing the increased ratio of programme staff to core administrative/finance staff; the additional work associated with the move to output-based budgeting and performance monitoring; and additional work programme activities necessary to meet Members' needs. The Secretariat was attempting to implement these increased activities within the constraints of a static budget.

22. The Representative of the United States of America commended the Secretariat on its performance but requested that, in its presentation of Key Achievements, constraints should also be addressed. This, he noted, would enable the Meeting to provide better guidance to the Secretariat in addressing the issues of concern raised by the Director.

23. The Meeting noted the Director's overview and thanked the Secretariat for its informative and well presented Annual Report for 1999.

Agenda Item 6:

Action Plan (1997–2000)

Agenda Item 6.1: Action Plan (1997–2000) Achievements

6.1.1: Technical Report

24. The Secretariat provided a Power Point presentation on Key Achievements under each Programme Area completed during the time of the current Action Plan (1997 – 2000). An outline of the Power Point Slides is attached as Annex VI.

25. Following a specific request from the Meeting for a presentation focusing not only on "achievements" but also on "constraints", the Secretariat outlined the overall constraining factors mostly associated with insufficient core funding. The associated heavy dependence on donor project funds meant the Secretariat was constrained by project/donor timetables which inhibited its ability to be flexible in its response to Members' requests, particularly with regard to provision of assistance with national-level project development.

26. Representatives noted the achievements of the Secretariat but also noted the core funding issue which the Representative of French Polynesia, as previous Chair of the Work Programme and Budget Sub-committee, described as a long-standing matter of serious concern now requiring resolution.

27. The Representatives of Tonga and Nauru called for more technical assistance to address their Waste Management and Coastal Erosion issues. American Samoa also called for hands-on assistance with Waste Management.

28. The Representatives of Kiribati, Tokelau and Tuvalu specifically referred to their need for national capacity building and technical advice. The Representative of Tokelau indicated that Tokelau was pursuing GEF funding following advice from UNDP of potential eligibility.

29. The Representatives of Papua New Guinea and Federated States of Micronesia noted the constraints under which the Secretariat was operating, whilst recognising the value of SPREP's work. Papua New Guinea noted SPREP's strength in international negotiations and Federated States of Micronesia called for an extension of Community Based Conservation Area development in Yap and Chuuk.

30. The Representative of Australia, speaking from a donor perspective, supported the Director's "reform package", noting Australia's flexibility in the Secretariat's use of extra-budgetary funds. He believed that it would assist Members to assess performance under the Plan if appropriate indicators were included to identify the quality, timeliness and quantity of outputs. He expressed particular interest in Member feedback.

31. The Meeting noted the achievements of SPREP during the Action Plan period, expressed confidence in the Secretariat and appreciated the core budget funding constraints which hindered some activities.

6.1.2: Financial Report

Agenda Item 6.1.2.1: Report on Members' Contributions

32. In accordance with Financial Regulation 13, the Secretariat reported to the Meeting on receipt of Members' contributions. The report addressed Members' contributions received during 1999. It also provided an

update on the status of Members' contributions received in 2000, up to 31 July, and the unpaid balances of contributions as at 31 July 2000.

33. The Secretariat advised that it had continued to urge Members to meet their contributions and, in accordance with decisions of the Ninth and Tenth SPREP Meetings, has advised Members that such contributions are vital to the functional operation of the Secretariat.

34. The Secretariat commented that notwithstanding the commitment made by some Members, it was still very concerned at the present overall level of unpaid contributions. Up to 31 July 2000, only eleven Members (out of twenty-six) had paid any contribution during 2000. At 31 July 2000, only Australia, Cook Islands, France, New Zealand and Samoa had fully paid their contributions. Since then Federated States of Micronesia, French Polynesia, Palau, Tuvalu and the United States of America had also submitted contributions and noted the announcement by the Representative of Kiribati that her country had now also remitted Kiribati's contributions to SPREP.

35. The Meeting noted the Report, in particular the implications on the Primary Function Budget of the shortfall in Members' contributions, and advised the Secretariat to more vigorously pursue the collection of unpaid contributions.

Agenda Item 6.1.2.2: Cash Flow and Primary Functions

36. The Secretariat presented its report on Primary and Project Management Functions' cash flow during 1999 and for the period up to 30 June 2000. The 5SM had directed the Secretariat to present to each subsequent Meeting a report summarising cash flow for SPREP finances. The Secretariat advised the Meeting that Project Implementation Function cash flows were not included in this report as these are donor funded, with expenditure only being incurred once funds had actually been received. The report covered only the Primary and Project Management Functions.

37. The Secretariat noted that the cash flow situation had improved with the recent receipt of some Member contributions, in particular those of the United States of America.

38. The Representative of the United States of America asked what the usual cash flow situation was

at the end of each fiscal year and whether there was a deadline for the payment of Member contributions. In response, the Secretariat explained that this varied from year to year between a small deficit or a small surplus. The practice of some Members to pay contributions in advance for the following year at the end of the year, improves the cash flow position. SPREP's standard procedure in the collection of contributions is to encourage Members to pay as early as possible with a reminder in April and July of each year.

39. In noting the paper, the Representative of Samoa raised the concern that the amount of unpaid contributions as at the end of July 2000 was nearly equal to total annual Member contributions and reiterated the need for Members to pay their contributions on time. He further recommended that before Members consider increasing contributions, they should also seriously consider the issue of outstanding contributions.

40. The Representative of Australia sought clarification on a statement by the Secretariat of the reluctance by donors to meet the full cost of administrative fees. The Secretariat responded by reminding the meeting of a decision by a previous SPREP Meeting to seek the increase of administrative fees from the current 10 percent. The Secretariat also put forward a number of reasons for donor reluctance to pay current or increased administration fees. They were:

- some donors saw the administration of projects as the responsibility of the Secretariat;
- large donors saw their current administration cost commitments (10 per cent) as sufficient. In the International Waters Programme the Secretariat has taken a different approach and charges administration fees on a cost recovery basis;
- other donors whose extra budgetary funds were being utilised by the Secretariat to meet the shortfall in administration costs did not see the need to pay additional administration fees for specific projects.

The Meeting noted the report; urged Members with outstanding contributions to remit these as soon as possible; commended those who had contributed; and encouraged Members to continue to remit future contributions early.

Agenda Item 6.1.2.3: Audited Annual Accounts for 1999 and Performance Indicator Audit for 1999

42. The Secretariat tabled the report of the Audited Annual Accounts and the Performance Indicator Audit Report for the year ended 31 December 1999. It pointed

out that in the 1999 Performance Audit Report the Auditor commented that a number of outputs had not been fully achieved due to the lack of financial resources.

43. The Meeting adopted the Financial Statements and Auditor's Report and noted the Performance Indicator Audit Report, for the year ended 31 December 1999.

Agenda Item 6.1.3: SPREP Centre

44. The Secretariat tabled its report to update Members on the SPREP Centre building project.

45. The 10SM gave its approval for the Secretariat to proceed with the construction of the SPREP Headquarters Centre under the guidance of the Headquarters Task Force as soon as sufficient donor funding was obtained. The Task Force comprised representatives of the Government of Samoa and Member countries with diplomatic missions in Samoa (Australia, New Zealand, United States of America) and the Director of SPREP.

46. The Secretariat reported that funding had been received from the following donor governments: Australia (AU\$1.25 million), New Zealand (NZ\$1 million), Papua New Guinea (Kina 100,000), People's Republic of China (US\$100,000), France (US\$100,000), United States of America (US\$200,000), together with additional funding from the Governments of Australia and New Zealand (up to A\$250,000 and NZ\$250,000 respectively) to make up the shortfall in funds.

47. The contract for basic building construction was issued to C.A.R.E Construction, Samoa at a cost of SA\$4,742,788. Construction commenced during July 1999 and the Secretariat commenced operation in the new Centre on 7 August 2000, following the official opening by the Prime Minister of Samoa, the Hon. Tuilaepa Sailele Malielegaoi on 2 August, 2000.

48. The Secretariat reported that the final total cost had been under budget, at approximately US\$1.935 million, cost savings mainly being due to exchange rate movements. The People's Republic of China had also made a specific grant of US\$120,000 for furnishings and equipment, additional to their financial assistance towards construction costs.

49. The Secretariat also reported on negotiations with two other donors for further facilities to enhance the SPREP Centre. These are the Education and Training

Centre (Government of Japan) and the Information Resource Centre (European Union).

50. The Representative of the New Zealand High Commission in Samoa made a statement in his capacity as a member of the Headquarters Task Force, thanking the Government of Samoa for providing the site of the new SPREP Headquarters and in its efforts at facilitating the construction of the Headquarters. He also expressed his gratitude to Members of the Task Force and to the donors for the successful completion of the project. He also assured the Meeting that whilst the SPREP Centre was modest it was a home the region could be proud of.

51. The Meeting expressed its appreciation to all those involved in the project, acknowledging in particular, the commitment of the Government of Samoa and the Headquarters Task Force and the financial donations.

Agenda Item 6.1.4: AusAID Review of SPREP

52. The Secretariat presented the Summary Report and Recommendations produced by Consultants for AusAID who undertook a Review of SPREP. The Consultant's report included recommendations for the Secretariat, AusAID, other SPREP Members and partner organisations with the aim of strengthening SPREP's work of coordinating environmental protection and natural resource management in the Pacific islands region.

53. The Representative of Australia commented that whilst the AusAID Review had been done before the SPREP Action Plan and Corporate Plan reviews, it had anticipated a lot of the issues raised in those documents. He explained that the objectives of the AusAID Review were to gauge the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of SPREP and its programmes to its Members and Donors. It was noted that while AusAID had commissioned the Consultant's Review, they did not necessarily agree with all of its findings and recommendations. It was further highlighted that recommendations of the Report were generally in line with the reform package proposed by the Secretariat in the Action Plan and Corporate Plan documents. He acknowledged the participation of Members and the Secretariat during the review process and commended the willingness of the Secretariat for its transparency in tabling the Report.

54. The Representative of New Zealand commended Australia on the AusAID Review which he considered

was a frank but constructive critique of SPREP. He highlighted New Zealand's support for three of the points raised, namely: closer assessment and monitoring of large projects and the issue of compromising ownership of projects due to economies of scale; the need to consider increasing the core budget; and recommendations relating to the management and governance of SPREP.

55. The Representative of French Polynesia reflected that the Review was quite a strong critique of SPREP in light of the constraints of available resources and the immensity of the objectives that the Secretariat was expected to meet. He commended the Secretariat for making the document available and added that this was an indication of the Secretariat's desire to be fully transparent to Members and to Donors. He recommended that the issue of transparency be extended to the relationships between the CROP agencies specifically with regard to coordination between the agencies. In response, the Representative of the Forum Secretariat outlined the extant coordination mechanism between the regional organisations and added that working groups comprising representatives from each organisation had also been set up for several key issues.

56. The Secretariat responded to Member interventions by stating that it welcomed the Review particularly since it had coincided with the Secretariat's own internal consultations to formulate the new Action Plan and Corporate Plan. The Secretariat also viewed the Review as a means to confirm that its reform programme was on track and was encouraged to note that this had been recognised in the Review. It was noted that several of the recommendations in the Review pertained to issues that were already being addressed by the Secretariat. The Representative of Niue expressed his appreciation to Australia and the Secretariat for their initiative and commitment in undertaking the Review and urged the Meeting to try and capitalise on the findings of the report as the basis for guiding the other key items of the agenda, such as the Organisational Review and Corporate Plans.

57. The Meeting noted the Summary Report and Recommendations of the AusAID Review of SPREP and commended the Secretariat on its reform efforts. It was agreed that the issues and recommendations of the Review would be further considered during forthcoming discussion on matters such as the revised Action Plan, Corporate Plan and Organisational Structure.

Agenda Item 7:

Action Plan (2001–2004)

Agenda Item 7.1: Draft Action Plan (2001 – 2004)

58. The Secretariat presented the draft Action Plan (2001–2004) for consideration and endorsement. The Secretariat explained that, in recognition of the fact that the Action Plan is a document shared between the SPREP Secretariat and Members alike, the draft had been developed through a highly participatory, consultative process involving a wide range of stakeholders. This consultative process included visits to 14 member countries and territories by the SPREP Secretariat, assisted by a consultant. A Regional Workshop on the Initial Draft Action Plan was held in Auckland, 14–16 June, 2000 at which Members provided in-depth input to the initial draft, especially in relation to the composition of the Key Result Areas and associated processes and interventions. To promote broad regional ownership of the new Action Plan, consultation was also undertaken with, and valuable input received from, a wide range of government departments, non-governmental organisations, other CROP agencies, community and private sector representatives. The basis of these consultations was to review the previous Action Plan (1997–2000), and provide feedback on lessons learned and guidance for future action and direction.

59. The Secretariat noted that the preparation of the Draft Action Plan was constrained by the lack of baseline information on which to assess achievements and constraints experienced during the term of the current Action Plan. It was also noted that in this respect, the AusAID Review provided valuable information that had been utilised during the preparation of the Draft Action Plan. In addition, it was explained that the new Action Plan is the first component of a comprehensive package that includes the Corporate Plan, the Organisation Review and associated Financial Implications that would also be sequentially considered by the Meeting. Following a query from the Representative of French Polynesia, the Meeting accepted that there were no better alternatives for considering the results of these associated reviews.

60. The Representative of the United States of America drew attention to the significance of the title for the draft Action Plan. He suggested that the significance of this change, from *Action Plan for Managing*

the Environment of the South Pacific Region (1997–2000) to *Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the Pacific Islands Region (2001–2004)*, should be acknowledged by Members, and following its adoption, promoted as the guiding document for addressing environmental issues in the western and central Pacific.

61. The Representative of Tonga suggested that the new Action Plan should be simple to understand, particularly in relation to the Vision it is to promote and the goals it anticipates achieving. It should emphasise the key programmes, what is new, and how we are going to measure our success. He also suggested that responsibilities for the implementation of various elements of the Action Plan should be identified.

62. The Representatives of Tokelau and Wallis and Futuna, reflecting on comments of the Secretariat in relation to its intention to better address the needs of territories of the region, requested clearer identification of the services, including performance indicators, that are anticipated under the new Action Plan. The Action Plan was amended accordingly. The Secretariat, in addressing this concern, noted that some donor agencies have a firm policy that restricts the use of their funds to independent States. Other regional agencies appear more successful in delivering services to territories because such services are financed from larger core budgets where such restrictions do not apply. The low level of core funding received by the SPREP Secretariat to date has meant that there have been insufficient funds to routinely extend Secretariat services to Member territories.

63. In response to a question from the Representative of Kiribati relating to possible impositions of the new Action Plan on individual countries, the Secretariat explained that the Draft Action Plan had been prepared on the basis that different Members have different needs and capacities. However, it was noted that the draft is a conscious effort to evolve Secretariat services from the past emphasis on project implementation to one more focused on the provision of technical and policy advice and coordination. The Secretariat also explained that every effort had been made to develop a document that complemented the national programmes and capacities of Members rather than one that would impose additional burdens on them.

64. The Representatives of Tuvalu, Federated States of Micronesia and Cook Islands complimented the Secretariat on the extensive consultative process utilised

to prepare the Draft Action Plan. They generally agreed that the Draft was a significant improvement on the current Action Plan.

65. The Representatives of Australia and Tuvalu suggested a system to prioritise tasks, risks associated with taking no action to address them, the mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating, and the resources and responsibilities for implementation that should be incorporated in the new Action Plan.

66. To provide additional background, the Meeting invited the consultant, engaged to facilitate the preparation of the Draft Action Plan, to present a summary of the processes and information utilised throughout its formulation. The consultant reiterated that various assessments of the current Action Plan, through in-country consultation and through access to assessments such as the AusAID Review, were critical in terms of identifying valuable lessons learned and key issues for inclusion in the new Action Plan. He explained that during the consultative process, the need to accommodate a diversity of needs and capacities among Members and to strengthen relations with other stakeholders, both in the region and beyond, had been emphasised. He noted that three of the Key Result Areas had been retained from the current Action Plan, and strengthened. The fourth KRA, Economic Development, was incorporated to accommodate the general expectation that the Action Plan should be the principal vehicle for mainstreaming environmental consideration and raising an awareness of the importance of the environment in the broader issues of sustainable development. He explained that the Draft Action Plan, while useful as a stand-alone document, should also be considered in association with the Corporate Plan, which provides broad performance indicators, and the Work Programme and Budget, which provides the annual review mechanism for Members.

67. The Meeting agreed that the Secretariat should provide Secretariat services for regional implementation of the Action Plan including monitoring and reporting.

68. The Meeting accepted that the consultative process had been extensive and that the Draft Action Plan was a significant improvement on the current Action Plan. On the basis that amendments suggested during consideration of this agenda item would be incorporated, the Meeting adopted the *Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the Pacific Islands Region (2001–2004)*, as amended.

Agenda Item 7.2.1: Draft Corporate Plan

69. The Secretariat presented to the Meeting for its consideration, a draft Corporate Plan 2001–2004 which defines the vision and core business functions for the Organisation. The Secretariat explained that this draft Corporate Plan is the second Corporate Plan since SPREP became an autonomous intergovernmental organisation following the successful negotiation of the *Agreement Establishing SPREP* in 1993. The draft Corporate Plan, which now covers the same time frame as the Action Plan, was developed to provide guidance to the Secretariat in pursuing the mandate, mission and objectives as outlined in the SPREP Action Plan.

70. The Secretariat outlined the production process of the draft Corporate Plan which involved engagement of a consultancy firm to work closely with SPREP Management and staff. Several in-house consultative sessions were held during July 2000 and the consultants thus produced their final draft based on extensive Secretariat input. The consultants were the same company that had assisted SPREP and Members produce the new Action Plan, adopted earlier by the Meeting, and they were thus readily able to make appropriate linkages.

71. The Meeting agreed that the Corporate Plan is a critical document that should clearly describe the way the Secretariat will service the expectation of Members, as elaborated in the Action Plan. Reflecting on assessment of the current administrative arrangements for the Secretariat, including the AusAID Review, the Meeting accepted that core activities of the Secretariat must be supported from the core budget contributed by Members. It was also agreed that, although the annual Work Programme and Budget provides an opportunity for Members to monitor and evaluate progress in addressing issues identified in the Action Plan, the Corporate Plan should include monitoring processes that identify outputs and performance indicators.

72. It was also agreed that it is difficult to consider the Corporate Plan in isolation from the Organisational Structure, and an understanding of the financial resources available to support Secretariat activities. Subsequently, as a result of the consensus of the Meeting to defer a decision relating to the proposed Organisational Review, the Meeting approved the Corporate Plan in principle. It was agreed that a detailed revision of the Corporate Plan would be prepared for the next SPREP Meeting.

Agenda Item 7.2.2: Organisational Review

73. The Secretariat presented to the Meeting for its consideration, a revised Organisational Structure for the SPREP Secretariat, required by the 10th SPREP Meeting. The Secretariat outlined the background to the need for a revised structure, setting out the linkages between the objectives of the revised Corporate Plan and the proposed structural change. The Meeting was advised that while the proposed restructuring does have implications for the core budget, it had been prepared on the basis that effective delivery of the Action Plan and the Corporate Plan would be reliant on adequate funding being available to support core functions in the Secretariat. While some elements of the proposal had been included to align SPREP with the current practice in other regional organisations, the majority were associated with strengthening the administrative and coordinating functions of the Secretariat, including the provision of policy and technical advice and reducing the Secretariat's involvement in direct project implementation. In addition, consultations with Members during the formulation of the new Action Plan, and the AusAID Review, raised the recommendation that the position of Deputy Director be filled.

74. The Meeting accepted that a new structure was required to support the new Action Plan and Corporate Plan and that core functional positions should be core funded. To assist the Meeting further consider the full budgetary implications for the proposed changes, the Secretariat was invited to present additional information that identified the sources of funding for all positions in the proposed structure, identifying which positions were new or restructured, as well as the grading. The additional information requested included a comparison of the costs of the current structure, relative to the costs associated with the proposed structure; transitional funding arrangements if the proposed structure is implemented; the duty statements for each of the positions; and an assessment of the implications if Members are unable to agree to the proposal.

75. Subsequently, the Meeting deliberated on the proposal at length. In response to a view expressed by several representatives that the proposal appeared to be cumbersome and top heavy, and that the proposed structure suggested an increasing bureaucracy, the Secretariat explained that the new structure proposed a reduction in management positions from six to four. In addition, the Meeting was advised that the staff complement during the next Corporate Plan period would remain stable at 70 to 80 staff.

76. After further discussion it was decided that the Meeting had not had sufficient time, information on the details of the proposed structure, or the full cost implications, to properly assess this important and complex matter. It was decided that any decisions on this matter should be deferred, pending the provision of additional information by the Secretariat. This information should be distributed to Members prior to the next SPREP Meeting, to enable them to decide on this outstanding matter.

Agenda Item 7.2.3: Financial Implications

77. As the Meeting had agreed, under a separate item, to defer discussion on the revised Organisational Structure to the next SPREP Meeting, this item did not take place.

Agenda Item 7.3.1: Work Programme and Budget

78. The Secretariat tabled the Proposed Work Programme and Budget (Amended) for 2001 and Indicative Work Programme and Budget for 2002 and 2003. In tabling the document, the Director noted that the budget had been prepared to reflect the activities indicated in the Action Plan 2001–2004. He also noted that there was some uncertainty in the proposal as the Meeting had not yet approved the proposed Corporate Plan 2001–2004, or the proposed Secretariat Structure.

79. The revised draft budget as presented, included a shortfall in funding of US\$174,570, which was based on the assumption that there would be no increase in Member contributions. The shortfall was to be made up by drawing on reserves (Member Funds).

80. The Meeting adopted the proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2001 amended to include an increase in income from Member contributions to cover a deficit in the revised budget presented by the Secretariat. The Meeting noted the Indicative Work Programme and Budget for 2002 and 2003.

Agenda Item 7.3.2: Programme Issues

Nature Conservation

Agenda Item 7.3.2.1: Biosafety

81. The Secretariat informed the Meeting of the adoption of the Cartagena Biosafety Protocol to the Convention on Biological Diversity on 29 January 2000 and noted that at present only Samoa had signed the Protocol. An increasing number of SPREP Members were

expected to sign on in the near future and the Secretariat expressed a need for the development of a regional strategy that would identify the critical issues raised by the Protocol, the most effective options and a programme of action for addressing them. The Secretariat also informed the Meeting of a regional Biosafety Workshop scheduled for the first quarter of 2001 in collaboration with SPC and the Forum Secretariat. In addition, the Secretariat tabled the Draft Regional Invasive Species Strategy for endorsement by the Meeting.

82. The Representative of New Zealand supported the adoption of a regional Biosafety Strategy; noted the importance of wide linkages including the work of SPC; and informed the Meeting that it has provided funding assistance for the workshop. New Zealand said also that the Invasive Species Strategy should serve as a useful reference and New Zealand could endorse it as an outcome of the region. However, the Strategy needed to give more attention to practical ways of reducing risks of damage to the environment from accidentally introduced exotic pests. He also suggested that it be linked to a work programme and would benefit from external review.

83. The Representative of the United States of America commended the Draft Regional Invasive Species Strategy as proposed and informed the Meeting on the need to include the issue of marine invasive species, taking into consideration that it was a significant issue in the region.

84. The Representative of the United Nations Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Unit informed the Meeting that two delegates from each Pacific island country would be funded for participation at an Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)/SIDS workshop on Biosafety to be held in St Kitts and Nevis, 4-6 December, prior to the First Intergovernmental Committee on the Cartagena Protocol (ICCP). This workshop will focus on information gathering and sharing in preparation for the ICCP.

85. The Meeting endorsed the Secretariat's endeavours to attract donor funding for a position of Biosafety Officer and the development of, and subsequent implementation of a Regional Biosafety Strategy and endorsed the Draft Regional Invasive Species Strategy.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.2: Regional Framework for Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing

86. The Secretariat informed the Meeting of the regional guidelines on access to genetic resources and benefit sharing adopted at a regional workshop held in Nadi, Fiji in March 2000. The guidelines have been developed to ensure that access to PICs' genetic resources are properly regulated and managed.

87. The Meeting noted progress made so far in addressing the issues of access and benefit sharing (ABS) and intellectual property rights and encouraged Members to consider these guidelines for appropriate action at the national level. The Secretariat was also urged that, where necessary, it provide assistance in implementing the guidelines.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.3: Pacific Islands Conservation Trust Fund

88. The Secretariat tabled a paper to inform the Meeting of progress to date with the development of the Pacific Islands Conservation Trust Fund initiative and advised on the establishment of a Steering Committee in October 1999. The Steering Committee had been tasked with the responsibility for completing a feasibility study on the fund's establishment, to continue consultation on design and operation of the fund, and to approach possible donors.

89. The Meeting noted that, in response to the submission of a Concept Paper to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNDP had advised that additional work was required. The Secretariat advised that the Steering Committee would be required to address the issues raised by UNDP at a meeting planned for early 2001. Australia indicated its strong view that in order to attract financial support, any new trust fund should be established under the auspices of a regional organisation such as SPREP, rather than as a separate entity. The Meeting requested the Secretariat keep all Members informed of developments in this initiative including Territories which are now eligible for funding. The Meeting also expressed appreciation to New Zealand for financial support for the work undertaken to date in developing this proposal. Co-financing was also being sought to ensure the Territories would be included in the Trust Fund initiative.

90. The Meeting noted the progress to date in the development of the Pacific Islands Conservation Trust Fund.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.4: SPBCP Conservation Area (CA) Award

91. The Secretariat presented the prize for the “Most Progressive Conservation Area Award 1999” under the South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme (SPBCP) to the Takitumu Conservation Area in the Cook Islands.

92. It was noted that the key objective of this Conservation Area was to protect a bird species (the Rarotongan flycatcher) from extinction and that the bird numbers had increased from 29 to 223 over a 9-year period.

93. In accepting this award on behalf of the community landowners who manage this Conservation Area, the Representative of the Cook Islands thanked SPREP for introducing an award of this kind to enhance conservation efforts throughout the region.

94. The Meeting noted the achievements of the Takitumu Conservation Area Project and offered its congratulations for being the first to win the SPBCP’s Most Progressive Conservation Area Award.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.5: South Pacific Whale Sanctuary

95. The Meeting was reminded of the support accorded by the Forum in 1998 for ‘the development of a proposal to establish a South Pacific Whale Sanctuary’. It noted that the proposal submitted to the 52nd meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) held in Adelaide, Australia in July 2000 had been supported by the majority of parties but had failed to receive the support of 75 per cent of parties required for adoption.

96. The Meeting noted the advice that the sponsors (including Australia, France, New Zealand and United States of America) intend to take the proposal forward again at the 53rd meeting of the IWC. Several Representatives, including those of Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati and Papua New Guinea voiced their support for the creation of a whale sanctuary. It was suggested that Forum Leaders be briefed on developments for the next Forum Meeting in Kiribati.

Pollution Prevention

Agenda Item 7.3.2.6: Pacific Islands Regional Marine Spill Contingency Plan (PACPLAN)

97. The Secretariat tabled a paper to provide an overview of the contents of PACPLAN and outlined the history of the document. PACPLAN sets up a framework

for the activation of a regional response to large marine spills that are beyond the response capability of one country or that have the potential to impact on more than one country. It allocates responsibilities, in the event of marine spill incidents, for the Secretariat, Pacific island Members, non-island Members and industry.

98. The Representative of New Zealand supported the framework in principle. However, he noted that the potential contingent liability it placed on New Zealand, would require PACPLAN to be considered at the highest level in New Zealand before New Zealand could formally endorse the Framework.

99. The Meeting endorsed PACPLAN as the framework for regional marine spill response, while noting the reservations voiced by New Zealand.

Agenda Item: 7.3.2.7: Waigani Convention

100. The Secretariat gave a brief presentation of the objectives and content of the *Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island Countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within the South Pacific Region* (Waigani Convention). In outlining the advantages of becoming a Party, the Secretariat took the opportunity to urge Members to ratify the Convention together with the Basel Convention.

101. The Secretariat noted that there were five ratifications to date: Australia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands.

102. The Secretariat stated that the scenario was for the Convention to enter into force by 2001, so that the first Meeting of the Contracting Parties could consider activities to implement the Convention. Cook Islands, New Zealand and Tokelau expressed support for SPREP’s work on ratification noting that they were considering ratification at the Forum Meeting. New Zealand pledged support for a 3-day workshop in November. It was further noted that Kiribati, Niue and Tuvalu were currently going through the process of ratification/accession. Tuvalu requested assistance with domestic legislation to implement the Convention.

103. The Meeting commended the Secretariat on its work and recalled the importance of the Waigani Convention as the regional mechanism to address the

critical issue of importation into Forum Island Countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to establish a strict control over transboundary movement and management of hazardous wastes; recognised the Waigani Convention as the vehicle to facilitate the regional implementation of the Basel Convention and noted the slow process of ratification of the Waigani Convention. The Meeting further requested countries to investigate and inform the Secretariat of SPREP (by February 2001), of any national barriers to becoming a Party to the Waigani Convention and requested SPREP to seek resources to assist in overcoming such barriers. The Meeting affirmed the respective MOUs with the Basel Secretariat and UNEP and requested the SPREP Secretariat, jointly with the Basel Secretariat to prepare a detailed paper on collaborative arrangements between both Secretariats, consistent with the MOUs, to be circulated to Governments in 2001. Furthermore, the Meeting requested countries to commit themselves to establishing close working relations with the Secretariat of SPREP toward the entry into force of the Waigani Convention as soon as possible and requested them to note the work being undertaken under the SPREP Waste Management, Pollution Prevention and Emergencies Programme and identify activities which could facilitate the implementation of the Waigani Convention.

Climate Change and Variability

Agenda Item 7.3.2.8: Regional Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea-Level Rise

104. The Secretariat provided an update on the development of the Pacific Islands Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea-Level Rise and highlighted the importance of the establishment of a Round-Table process as a mechanism to improve the implementation of the framework, seeking endorsement at the Ministers' Meeting and submission to the Forum Meeting.

105. Strong support for the framework was indicated by several countries.

106. The Meeting noted the progress to develop and further improve the Framework; recognised the importance of the Framework in building partnerships and assisting Pacific island countries understand the response to climate change, climate variability, and sea-level rise; called on the Secretariat, with the assistance of development partners, to facilitate the Round-Table process to further strengthen partnerships, improve co-ordination and focus on the implementation of the

Framework. The Meeting endorsed the Framework, for transmission to the SPREP Environment Ministers' Forum, Guam and subsequent transmission to the Pacific Island Forum Leaders Meeting in Kiribati, October 2000.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.8.1: Strategic Action Plan for the Development of Meteorology in the Pacific Region (SDMP), 2000–2009

107. The Meeting was presented with the Strategic Action Plan for the Development of Meteorology in the Pacific Region (SDMP) 2000–2009 which had been endorsed by the Sixth SPREP Meeting of Regional Meteorological Service Directors (6RMSD) held in Tahiti in July 1999. Project proposals developed in response to the Pacific Meteorological Services Needs Analysis Project (PMSNAP) were also presented to the Meeting for consideration. The proposed development projects would effect short-term improvements in the provision of weather and climate services and products by National Meteorological Services (NMSs).

108. The Secretariat further noted that the establishment of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) Sub-regional Office for the South-West Pacific (SWP) within the SPREP Headquarters in April 1999 had consolidated the work of SPREP and the WMO in further strengthening the capacity of NMSs in the Pacific Region.

109. The Meeting noted the progress made so far in the development of meteorology in the Pacific Region and endorsed both the SDMP and development of associated project proposals. The Secretariat thanked Australia, Fiji, France, New Zealand and United States of America and WMO for their collaborative efforts.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.9: Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme (PICCAP): Phase III

110. The Meeting was informed of progress to date in developing the Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme (PICCAP): Phase III. The Meeting was also advised that PICCAP Phase II had been approved by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through UNDP for US\$1 million over 12 months.

111. A scoping study for activities under PICCAP Phase III had been initiated and financed by the Government of Japan during late 1999 and early 2000. The completed study, based on Pacific island country re-

sponses and PICCAP outputs, was currently being considered by the Government of Japan.

112. Members suggested Phase III should concentrate more on on-the ground activities, reflecting increasing national capacity as a result of earlier stages.

113. The issue of GEF funding for national activities covered by PICCAP III was raised. The UNDP representative stated that national level projects would not be precluded from GEF funding for climate change activities.

114. The Secretariat requested Governments to identify the type and level of regional assistance required in climate change activities. The Secretariat also envisaged fewer regional workshops and travel as a result of the ability of countries to effectively deal with climate change issues.

115. The Meeting noted the information and current progress to date on PICCAP Phase III development and endorsed the steps outlined by the Secretariat to continue to undertake a wide consultative process and project development in time for consideration by the GEF in April 2001, in order to improve the current draft proposal for PICCAP Phase III and urged the Secretariat to address this project with some urgency. The SPREP Secretariat was also encouraged to consider playing a more facilitating and technical coordination role rather than an implementation role.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.10: GEF Project Removing Barriers to Renewable Energy

116. The Secretariat outlined to the Meeting the consultative process used in the development of a proposal to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on removing the barriers for the adoption of renewable energies in the region. The proposal, which had been developed by SPC in collaboration with SPREP and SOPAC and with input from Pacific island countries, had now been endorsed by 14 Pacific island countries for submission to the GEF through UNDP. If approved, US\$400,000 would be made available under a project development window for the detailed development of a full project for the region. The project development process would take at least 12 months with a wide range of national and regional activities and consultations.

117. The Meeting noted the consultative process used to develop the proposal and the information and cur-

rent progress to date on the 'Removing Barriers to the Adoption of Renewable Energies' Initiative and the Secretariat's efforts in catalysing the initiative on behalf of Pacific island Members.

Economic Development

Agenda Item 7.3.2.11: Rio+10

118. The Secretariat provided the Meeting with an update on preparations for the United Nations General Assembly special session for a 10-year review of the outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, held at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992. It was recognised that the 10-year review (Rio+10) to be held in 2002, will provide an important opportunity to consolidate the work of Pacific island States at the international level and input of Government in the preparatory process was being sought.

119. The Representative from Tuvalu noted that there were two major themes to be considered this year by the Commission on Sustainable Development: sustainable energy and sustainable fresh water. Both of these were very important issues to Tuvalu, and the country looked forward to participating in Rio+10, and would support any efforts for regional participation. The Chairman noted that these views would be echoed by most other delegates.

120. The Meeting recognised the importance of the 10-year review of the Earth Summit outcomes (Rio+10); and noted the progress to identify environmental achievements and priorities within the region and the related CROP process.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.12: Strategic Action Programme for International Waters

121. The Meeting was presented with a summary of the status of implementation of the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for International Waters. The Secretariat also highlighted the importance of the SAP with regard to the establishment of the new regional Tuna Commission and for the development of national tuna management and conservation arrangements.

122. The implementation of fourteen demonstration projects under the Programme will commence in the near future. These projects will focus on demonstrating methodologies and best practices for conserving and sustainably managing freshwater resources, coastal fisheries, Marine Protected Areas and waste reduction initiatives.

123. The Meeting noted progress in relation to the implementation of the International Waters Programme.

Processes

Agenda Item 7.3.2.13: Environmental Education Strategy

124. The Secretariat tabled a paper that reported on progress with implementation of the *Action Strategy for Environmental Education and Training in the Pacific Region, 1999 – 2003* which had been endorsed by the 10th SPREP Meeting in 1998. The Action Strategy had been used to guide regional and national activities conducted by both the Secretariat and Members. Activities included teacher training workshops, country-to-country attachment schemes and the development of a pilot training module in environmental education for the SPC's Community Education Training Centre (CETC).

125. The Secretariat recognised the challenges faced by national environment departments particularly with regard to human resources and raised the possibility of delegating environmental education and training to organisations other than environment departments in-country. It further advised the Meeting of plans to confer a Pacific Environmental Citizenship Award to individuals or non-corporate organisations in an effort to encourage active participation from the community in environment protection and conservation.

126. The Representative of Australia drew attention to the recently published Australian National Action Plan "Education for a Sustainable Future" which is available on the internet and is the result of an extensive consultation process.

127. The Meeting noted the progress in implementation of the Australian Education Action Strategy; agreed to urge donors to give greater priority to environmental education and consciousness raising programmes; and further noted the Secretariat's plans for the establishment of a Pacific Environmental Citizenship Award.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.14: Training Needs Assessment Report

128. The Secretariat tabled a paper on the findings of the Environmental Training Needs Assessment (TNA) carried out for eight Members. The TNA identified Member needs relating to environmental management training activities together with key constraints in past and current training programmes conducted by SPREP. The Secretariat advised that it eventually hoped to pro-

vide on-going results-oriented training to address Member needs.

129. Representatives expressed their approval of the document and added that new technologies such as the internet could help to reduce future costs of training in the region.

130. The Meeting noted with appreciation, the Secretariat's efforts to determine Members' priority training needs and endorsed the Secretariat's recommendations in its effort to promote a results-oriented training approach that would be sustainable in the long-term.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.15: Information Strategy

131. In recognition of the need for better information management and dissemination, the Secretariat commissioned an independent review of the Organisation's Data and Information Management. The review resulted in the development of a strategic document, *SPREP Corporate Data Management (CDM) Initiative*, which will serve as a high-level plan for the further development and integration of the SPREP corporate database and the SPREP clearinghouse mandate.

132. The need for strengthening technical and human resource support in the area of information technology (IT) was also highlighted and the SPREP IT Country Attachment Scheme, started in 1999, was one of the ways by which the Secretariat was attempting to meet these needs.

133. The Representatives of Australia, French Polynesia and Samoa commented on the need for IT services to focus on providing an internal support service. There was also a need to recognise and liaise with equivalent services in other agencies, and to provide essential technical support to island countries when the capacity and funding exists, which the Secretariat is currently doing.

134. The Representatives of Tokelau and Tuvalu noted and supported the suggestion that the Secretariat should get involved with IT support to Member countries, especially through Attachments to SPREP and through the proposed development of the computer laboratory in the new SPREP Education and Training Centre.

135. The Meeting noted the strategic direction in Information Management taken by the Secretariat with the CDM Initiative and gave its support for further development of this Initiative.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.16: Global Environment

Outlook No. 3 (GEO-3)

136. The Global Environment Outlook No. 3 (GEO-3) will be the third of a series of biennial worldwide State of the Environment reports by UNEP. GEO-3 is intended to be one of the key documents at the next Earth Summit, Rio+10 in 2002. The Meeting was advised that the timeframe for the report production required that initial inputs, particularly input for Chapter Two "SoE/Policy Retrospective: 1972-2002", would need to have been completed by the end of September 2000. The other key chapter, Chapter Three "Outlook 2002-2032" would need to be completed in early 2001.

137. In light of the restrictive timeframe, the Meeting was advised that GEO-3 would build on GEO-1 and GEO-2 and not be repetitive. UNEP has set up global Collaborating Centres (CC) and Associated Centres (AC) to work with its regional offices. SPREP had been nominated as the CC for the Pacific region and a Memorandum of Understanding had been signed to give effect to the collaboration. SPREP's Environmental Assessment and Reporting Officer would liaise further with Members through national focal points and country visits.

138. The Meeting noted the activities and intended outcomes of the GEO-3 programme.

Agenda Item 7.3.2.17: Energy and Sustainable Development

139. The Secretariat presented to the Meeting, the Pacific Regional Submission to the 9th Session of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) for consideration and endorsement. Consistent with the regional approach taken to past sessions of the CSD, the Energy Sector Working Group of the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) prepared a draft paper on energy for sustainable development. The recent SOPAC Governing Council, Kiribati, endorsed the paper and requested the SPREP Meeting to also consider and endorse its contents. The Secretariat recommended inclusion of additional points.

140. The Meeting agreed with the specific amendments proposed by the Secretariat to the Regional Submission to CSD9 on energy and sustainable development and called upon delegates to send any further amendments to SOPAC for consideration by the CROP Energy Working Group.

Agenda Item 7.3.3 Personnel

Agenda Item 7.3.3.1 Job-Sizing and CROP Remuneration System

141. Following the decision of the FOC and SPREP Special Session, Fiji, November 1999, Mercer Cullen Egan Dell (MCED) were engaged to conduct a Job Sizing exercise within each of the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) agencies in order to develop an approach to remuneration that will be consistent across all CROP agencies. The SPREP Job Sizing exercise was undertaken between March and April 2000 with job evaluations for forty benchmark positions within SPREP.

142. The Secretariat also tabled the Report of the CROP Remuneration Working Group and noted that the Secretariat endorsed the recommendations of this Report. The financial implications of implementing these recommendations were also outlined.

143. The Representative of Australia, in noting that the Job Sizing Review had been conducted using Australian Public Sector baselines as a comparison, urged SPREP members to have discretion in application of any externally driven salary adjustments. The Representative of the United States of America similarly cautioned against making adjustments without fully considering the implications of recommendations in the Job-Sizing Review.

144. Several Representatives requested clarification and further information on how the Secretariat proposed to implement the recommendations of the Working Group Report, particularly with regard to recommended salary levels for support staff. The issue of using Fiji salaries as a comparison base for SPREP support staff was criticised by the Secretariat and it was noted that a market survey in Samoa would need to be undertaken at a later stage to ensure support staff salaries were compatible at the local level.

145. The Meeting noted the Job Sizing exercise undertaken by Mercer Cullen Egan Dell for SPREP as part of the harmonisation process for terms and conditions of all CROP agencies and supported, in principle, the recommendations of the CROP Remuneration Working Group on the condition that no action be taken by the Secretariat until the 2001 SPREP Meeting is able to take a decision on the matter.

Agenda Item 7.3.3.2: Staff Regulations

146. The Secretariat advised the Meeting that amendments to the Staff Regulations would be required in order to reflect the following matters:

- the job sizing exercise carried out in conjunction with other CROP agencies;
- the implementation of an agreed remuneration strategy for professional contract staff;
- the review of benefits and arrangements in respect of performance management and salary stabilisation, for professional contract staff in accordance with the CROP Remuneration Review Working Group Report; and
- the decision by the Samoan Government to grant a 5 per cent general wage increase, effective from 1 January, 2001.

147. The Meeting decided, in view of the deferment of previous relevant submissions (e.g. Job Sizing Report and CROP Remuneration Review), to defer this matter until after the SPREP Meeting had taken a decision on the Remuneration issue.

Agenda Item 7.3.4: Contributions from Members

148. The Secretariat outlined to the Meeting the consequences to the Work Programme and Budget in the event that Members' contributions remained at the current level. It then submitted a proposal to increase Members' contributions to the core budget.

149. The Meeting acknowledged the seriousness of the financial situation of the core functions of the Secretariat.

150. Most delegations indicated their readiness to agree to an increase in Members' contributions by 35 per cent commencing in fiscal year 2001. The delegate of Nauru wished to reflect his country's reservation to any increase in member contribution.

151. Most Members agreed to increase total contributions from Members by 35 per cent in 2001, subject to reservations from delegations which were not able to agree to the proposed increase at this time, but indicated that they would seek their governments' approval on this important issue.

152. The Meeting strongly urged all Members to pay their outstanding contributions in full as early as possible.

Agenda Item 7.3.5: Amendments to Financial Regulations

153. The Secretariat raised the issue that the presentation format of the annual budget and annual accounts as required by the current Financial Regulations is inappropriate to the new performance-based output budgeting process. In addition, the Secretariat noted that a possible change in the organisation and timing of future SPREP Meetings (raised under Agenda Item 8.3.2) would require changes to the Financial Regulations.

154. The Meeting requested the Secretariat to provide suggested revision to the Financial Regulations for presentation to the next SPREP Meeting.

Agenda Item 8:

Policy/Institutional Matters

Agenda Item 8.1: Position of Director

155. This Agenda Item was discussed in closed session.

156. The Chair of the 10th SPREP Meeting advised the Meeting of the Director's wish to extend his employment for his second term. She also advised of events undertaken by the Chair with relation to obtaining guidance from Members on interpretation of the *Rules of Procedure for Appointment of the Director* and further guidance from Heads of other CROP agencies with relation to their practices.

157. The Meeting re-appointed for a further two years the incumbent Director, Tamari'i Tutangata, by consensus.

158. The Meeting gave a strong message to the Director of its support for his reappointment, given the quality of his work.

159. The Meeting agreed to transmit its decision to reappoint the Director, for endorsement by the Ministerial Meeting.

Agenda Item 8.2: Appointment of Auditor

160. In accordance with Financial Regulation 31, as amended at the 10th SPREP Meeting, the Secretariat

sought the Meeting's approval on the appointment of auditors for 2000 and 2001.

161. In the 10th SPREP Meeting, Members decided that the audit tender should be advertised regionally, including in the local market. The Secretariat advised that four tender proposals had been received: one each from auditors in Fiji, New Zealand, Samoa and Vanuatu and that all four tenders satisfied the required criteria.

162. The Representative of New Zealand pointed out that it was common commercial practice to change the Auditor at regular intervals. However, it was also noted that there were financial advantages to SPREP in continuing to use Auditors from Samoa.

163. The Meeting agreed that Betham and Co. should be appointed as Auditors for the 2000 and 2001 SPREP Annual Accounts.

Agenda Item 8.3: Rules of Procedures

Agenda Item 8.3.1: Rules of Procedure: Appointment of Director

164. The Secretariat advised the Meeting of the need to revise the *Rules of Procedure for Appointment of the Director* in order to provide clear guidance to future SPREP Chairs on procedures for the appointment of the Director of SPREP.

165. The Meeting was advised by the Secretariat that it believed potential existed for dual interpretation of Rule 8: "Term of Appointment" of the *Rules of Procedure for Appointment of the Director*. The existing Rules are not sufficiently clear about whether or not re-advertisement of the position should be undertaken after the initial four years of the four-plus-two year term, or whether re-advertisement was only necessary at the end of the full six year term.

166. The Meeting agreed that Rule 8 of the *Rules of Procedure for Appointment of the Director* be amended and re-titled as follows to provide greater clarity:

"Term of Service – Rule 8"

The successful applicant shall be appointed for a period of four years in the first instance. The incumbent may seek reappointment, through application, for a further two years. The maximum length of service for any individual is six years".

Agenda Item 8.3.2: SPREP Meetings

167. The Secretariat sought the Meeting's consideration of a changed time-frame for future Meetings to assist the Secretariat in its efforts to more closely consult with its Membership. The 9th SPREP Meeting (Tonga, 1996) had endorsed a proposal for biennial SPREP Meetings and synchronisation of associated events in a set schedule. Such a decision to move to a biennial meeting cycle arose partly from recognition of the high cost to the Secretariat, both financially and in terms of time, in convening annual meetings. Still cognizant of these costs, the Secretariat sought guidance from the Meeting about how best to maintain closer contact with Members, whilst nevertheless proceeding in a cost-effective manner.

168. The Representatives of Australia, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and Tuvalu indicated a preference for annual meetings to encourage greater ownership and to improve the effectiveness of the meetings. However, it also needed to be recognised that this would mean additional work. The Representative of the United States of America noted that it would be more effective to retain the biennial meetings, but increase the meeting time.

169. Several representatives also supported the proposal for regular visits to Member countries by senior Management and technical staff.

170. The Meeting resolved that future Meetings should be held annually. In the case of Ministerial Meetings, the Meeting heard varying preferences and agreed that the matter be put to the Ministerial Meeting for a decision. It was noted that the Work Programme and Budget Sub-committee Meetings should accordingly be discontinued.

Agenda 8.4: Staff Appointments

171. The Secretariat informed the Meeting of two matters relating to Staff Appointments as required under the Staff Regulations in association with (i) re-appointment after advertisement following six years of service and (ii) provision of a Market Allowance.

172. The Representative of Samoa raised issues (general to all CROP agencies) which he hoped the Secretariat would take into consideration in the future. He noted that the SPREP Director had referred to the need, addressed under the six-year rule, to regularly give the

Organisation an infusion of new blood and he stated that this practice was a very appropriate way for Regional Organisations to proceed.

173. He also called on the SPREP Director to exercise due caution in applying the Market Allowance and to adhere to approved guidelines and the principle of transparency. He noted also that the Market Allowance would cease to apply on implementation of the CROP Harmonisation Remuneration package.

174. The Meeting noted the re-appointment of two incumbents to positions following re-advertisement and re-application and noted the Director's action in applying the Market Allowance to two positions.

Agenda Item 9:

Regional Coordination

Agenda Item 9.1: Regional Ocean Policy

175. In response to recommendations from the Pacific Regional Follow-up Workshop on the Implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), held in Tonga, 1999, the 30th Pacific Island Leaders' Forum (Palau, October 1999) endorsed the development of a Regional Ocean Policy and integrated national Ocean policies. It was agreed within the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific that this matter should be considered and endorsed by the governing councils of other regional organisations, including SPREP.

176. The Secretariat indicated that it was seeking guidance from the Meeting as to possible involvement in the development of an Ocean Policy, given the potential resource implications. A decision also needed to be made as to whether this was to be a truly regional policy, or simply one covering the Forum island countries.

177. The proposal was supported by several Members, including Samoa and the United States of America. The Representatives of the Forum Secretariat and SOPAC also spoke in support of the proposal.

178. The Meeting endorsed the development of an appropriate Regional Ocean Policy and supported the involvement of SPREP, provided additional funding could be found for this work.

Agenda Item 9.2: BioNET

179. The Secretariat advised the Meeting of the statement arising from the BioNET-International regional workshop held in Nadi, Fiji in March 2000 and of developments arising from the fifth Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in May 2000.

180. The Meeting noted the recommendations of the BioNET international workshop and the developments arising from the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its fifth Meeting; and accepted, in principle, the establishment and operation of a Pacific loop of BioNET-International (PACINET), subject to the availability of external funding and its consistency with the outcomes of the November 2000 meeting of the coordination mechanism of the Global Taxonomy Initiative.

Agenda Item 9.3: Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP)

181. The Secretariat referred throughout the Meeting to various instances of SPREP's collaboration with other Regional Organisations through the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP) Meetings and efforts taken, in the interests of providing effective support to Members, to ensure complementarity of activities and avoid duplication of work.

182. The Meeting noted the Report tabled by the Representative of the Forum Secretariat in his capacity as CROP Chair.

Agenda Item 10:

Report from Meeting of the Parties to SPREP and Apia Conventions

183. The Secretariat tabled the Report of the Joint Fifth Ordinary Meeting and Plenipotentiary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Apia and the Fifth Ordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPREP Convention, held immediately prior to the Meeting of Officials, in Guam, 9 October, 2000.

184. The Meeting noted the report and recommended that it be brought to the attention of the Environment Ministers' Forum, Guam, 13 October, 2000.

Agenda Item 11:

Items Proposed by Members

185. The Representative of the Marshall Islands raised the possibility of being recognised by the Secretariat as a Small Island State (SIS). Representatives sought clarification from the Forum Secretariat on criteria used to determine SIS status and were advised that no objective criteria existed. Rather, the countries currently designated as SIS, namely: Cook Islands, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue and Tuvalu had received this status as a result of a decision taken by the Forum.

186. The Representative of Samoa encouraged the SPREP Secretariat to develop criteria to be used by SPREP in assessing applications for SIS designation. In addition, the Meeting noted the Director's advice that Pitcairn had indicated a wish to participate in SPREP Meetings on being classified as SIS. The Meeting agreed that the Secretariat inform Pitcairn to formally apply and to clarify its status in respect of the SPREP Treaty.

Agenda Item 12:

Statements by Observers

187. Advisers, other CROP Member representatives and Observers from international and regional organisations were present throughout the Meeting and brief statements were made by the representatives of Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), Forum Secretariat, South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations University (UNU), and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). A summary of statements is attached as Annex VII.

Agenda Item 13:

Other Business

188. There was no other business.

Agenda Item 14:

Date and Venue of Twelfth SPREP Meeting

189. Under the Rules and Procedures of the SPREP Meeting, the venue for every alternate meeting is SPREP's home country. Accordingly, the Meeting agreed that the Twelfth SPREP Meeting be held in Samoa in 2001 at a date to be advised.

Agenda Item 15:

Adoption of Report

190. The Meeting adopted the Report.

Agenda Item 16:

Review of Agenda for Ministerial Meeting/Matters for Ministerial Decision

191. The Meeting reviewed the Provisional Agenda for the Environment Ministers' Forum and the draft Letter containing matters to be brought from the Meeting of Officials to the Ministers for their decision.

192. The Meeting endorsed the provisional agenda and agreed that the matters contained in the Letter from the Eleventh SPREP Meeting be submitted for decision by the Environment Ministers' Forum.

Agenda Item 17:

Close

193. The Chair of the 11SM commended Members in providing guidance to the Secretariat and thanked the Secretariat for its work. Thanks were given by the Meeting to the Chair.

Annexes

Annex I: List of Participants to the Eleventh SPREP Meeting of Officials and Environment Ministers' Forum

American Samoa

Mr. Togipa Tausaga
Director
American Samoa Environmental Protection Agency
Executive Office Building
Pago Pago
American Samoa
Telephone: (684) 633 2304
Fax: (684) 633 5801

Australia

Hon. Dr. Sharman Stone, MP
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for the
Environment and Heritage
Parliament House
Canberra, ACT 2600
Australia
Telephone: (612) 6277 2016
Fax: (612) 6277 8483
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Dr. David Kay
Assistant Secretary, Marine Conservation
Environment Australia
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Telephone: (612) 6274 1224
Fax: (612) 6274 1006
Email: david.kay@ea.gov.au

Mr. Geoff Miller
Director
Pacific Regional Section
South Pacific and Africa Branch
GPO Box 887
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Telephone: (612) 6206 4710
Fax: (612) 6206 4720
Email: geoffrey_miller@ausaid.gov.au

Mr. Richard Bomford
Director
International Regional Unit
Environment Australia
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia
Telephone: (612) 6274 1388
Fax: (612) 6274 1858
Email: richard.bomford@ea.gov.au

Mr. Stephen Moran
Director, Climate Change Section
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
RG Casey Building
Canberra ACT 0221
Australia
Telephone: (612) 6261 3045
Fax: (612) 6261 2594
Email: Steve.moran@dfat.gov.au

Cook Islands

Hon. Norman George
Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for
Environment Service
PO Box 105
Rarotonga
Cook Islands
Telephone: (682) 29 347
Fax: (682) 21 247
Email: secfa@foraffairs.gov.ck
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Hon. V. Vaevae Pare
Under Secretary to the Deputy Prime Minister
Minister of Health and Police, Responsible for the
Telecommunication, Broadcasting and Information,
Division, Natural Heritage, Environment Services,
Customs Border Enforcement and Attorney General
responsible for Crown Law Office
PO Box 26 Avarua
Rarotonga
Cook Islands
Telephone: (682) 20 266
Fax: (682) 24 684
Email: vaine@dpmoffice.gov.ck
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Ms I'o-A-Te-Are-Tini Tuakeu-Lindsay
Director
Cook Islands Environment Service
PO Box 371
Rarotonga
Cook Islands
Telephone: (682) 21 256
Fax: (682) 22 256
Email: iotuakeu@environment.org.ck

Federated States of Micronesia

Hon. Sebastian Anefal
Secretary of Economic Affairs Department of
Economic Affairs
PO Box PS-12 Palikir,
Pohnpei
Federated States of Micronesia
Telephone: (691) 320 5133
Fax: (691) 320 5133
Email: fsmrd@mail.fm
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Hon. Gerson Jackson
Lieutenant Governor of Kosrae
Kosrae
Federated States of Micronesia
Telephone: (691) 370 3003
Fax: (691) 370 3162
Email: gajackson@mail.fm

Mr. Sanphy William
Chuuk
Federated States of Micronesia

Mr. Kandhi Elieisar
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Department of Foreign Affairs
PO Box PS-123 Palikir, Pohnpei
Federated States of Micronesia
Telephone: (691) 320 2641
Fax: (691) 320 2933
Email: foreignaffairs@mail.fm

Mr. John Mooteb
Deputy Assistant Secretary,
SD Unit Department of Economic Affairs
PO Box PS-12 Palikir,
Pohnpei
Federated States of Micronesia
Telephone: (691) 320 5133
Fax: (691) 320 5854
Email: climate@mail.fm

Mr. Moses Pretrick
Environmental Health Specialist
Department of Health, Education and Social Affairs
PO Box PS-70 Palikir,
Pohnpei
Federated States of Micronesia
Telephone: (691) 320 2619
Fax: (691) 320 5263
Email: fsmhealth@mail.fm

Fiji

Hon. Ratu Cokanauto Tu'uakitau
Minister for Local Government Housing and
Environment
PO Box 2131
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: (679) 304 364
Fax: (679) 303 515
Email: env@govnet.gov.fj
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Mr. Epeli Nasome
Director
Department of Environment
Ministry of Local Government, Housing and
Environment
PO Box 2131
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: (679) 311 699
Fax: (679) 312 879
Email: enasome@govnet.gov.fj

France

M. Gabriel Jugnet
Adjoint au Secrétaire permanent pour le Pacifique
(Deputy Permanent Secretary)
27, rue Oudinot – 75358 PARIS 07 SP
France
Telephone: (33-1) 53 69 23 63
Fax: (33-1) 53 69 22 76
Email: gabriel.jugnet@diplomatic.fr

French Polynesia

Hon. Mrs Lucie Lucas
Minister for Environment with Responsibility for
Relations with French Polynesia
Assembly and Economic, Social and Culture Council
Ministry for Environment
Immeuble Royal Confort-2ème Etage
Fare Ute
B.P. 2551 –98713
Papeete, Tahiti,
French Polynesia
Telephone: (689) 542 554
Fax: (689) 542 559

M. Alexandre Ata Moeava
The Special Advisor for External Relations
Office of the President
Government of French Polynesia
BP 2551 –98713
PAPEETE, Tahiti
French Polynesia
Telephone: (689) 47 20 00
Fax: (689) 47 22 02
Email: rex@mail.pf
Alexandre.ata@presidence.pf

M. Karl Boosie
Director of Cabinet for the Ministry of
Environment
Ministry for Environment
Immeuble Royal Confort-2ème Etage
Fare Ute
B.P. 2551 –98713,
Papeete Tahiti,
French Polynesia
Telephone: (689) 54 25 54
Fax: (689) 54 25 59
Email: dircab.men@environment.gov.pf

Guam

Mr. Jesus T. Salas
Administrator and Head of Delegation and
Guam's National SPREP Representative
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
PO Box 22439, GMF
Barrigada
Guam 9613
Telephone: (1-671) 475 1620
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402

Mr. Bradley Hokanson
Chair
Guam Environmental Protection Agency Board of
Directors
PO Box 22439, GMF
Barrigada
Guam, 96921
Telephone: (1-671) 475 1658
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402

Mr. Michael Gawel
Planner IV
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Barrigada
Guam 96913
Telephone: (1-671) 472 8863
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402

Mr. Randel Sablan
Planner III
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Barrigada
Guam 96913
Telephone: (1-671) 475 1658
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402

Mr. Edwin Aranza
Planner III
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Barrigada
Guam 96913
Telephone: (1-671) 472 8863
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402

Ms Elisabeth T. Cruz
Legal Counsel
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Barrigada,
Guam
Telephone: (1-671) 472 8863
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402

Ms Grace Garces
Publication and Information Officer
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Barrigada
Guam 96913
Telephone: (1-671) 472 8863
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402
Email: Grace_O_Garces@alumni.ucsd.edu

Mr. Lance Richman
Special Assistant to the Administrator
PO Box 22439, GMF
Barrigada
Guam 96921
Telephone: (1-671) 477 2797
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402
Email: Irichman@kuentos.guam.net

Mr. Denny Cruz
Special Assistant
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Barrigada
Guam 96913
Telephone: (1-671) 472 8863
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402

Mr. Jesse Cruz
Biologist
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Barrigada
Guam 96913
Telephone: (1-671) 472 8863
Fax: (1-671) 477 9402

Kiribati

Hon. Kataotika Tekee
Minister for Environment and Social
Development
Ministry of Environment and Social
Development
PO Box 234
Bikenibeu, Tarawa
Republic of Kiribati
Telephone: (686) 28 000
Fax: (686) 28 334
Email: mesd1@tskl.net.ki
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Mrs Karibaiti Taoaba
Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Environment and Social
Development
PO Box 234
Bikenebeu, Tarawa
Kiribati
Telephone: (686) 28 000
Fax: (686) 28 334
Email: mesd1@tskl.net.ki

Marshall Islands

Hon. John M. Silk
Minister for Resources and Development
The Cabinet
Government of Republic of the Marshall Islands
PO Box 2
Majuro
Marshall Islands
Telephone: (692) 625 3445
Fax: (692) 625 3649
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Mr. Danny Wase
Director
Marshall Islands Resources Authority
PO Box 860
Majuro
Marshall Islands
Telephone: (692) 625 8262
Fax: (692) 625 5447
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Ms Ellia Sablan
Policy and Planning Officer
Marine Resource Authority
PO Box 860
Majuro
Marshall Islands
Telephone: (692) 625 8262
Fax: (692) 625 5447
Email: ellia_sablan@hotmail.com
(Officials' Meeting only)

Mr Abraham Hicking
Acting General Manager
Environmental Protection Authority
PO Box 1322
Majuro
Marshall Islands
Telephone: (692) 625 3035/5203
Fax: (692) 625 5202
Email: eparmi@ntamar.com
(Officials' Meeting only)

Nauru

Mr. Joseph Cain
Secretary for Industry and Economic
Development
Department of Industry and Economic
Development
Government Office
Republic of Nauru
Telephone: (674) 444 3181
Fax: (674) 444 3745
Email: jcain@cenpac.net.nr

New Caledonia

Mr. Yves Magnier
Member of Government
Government of New Caledonia
BP M2 98849
Noumea
New Caledonia
Telephone: (687) 24 65 51
Fax: (687) 24 65 50
(Ministerial Meeting only)

New Zealand

Mr. Wilbur Dovey
Deputy Director
Environment Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)
Private Bag 18 901
Wellington
New Zealand
Telephone: (644) 473 2136
Fax: (644) 494 8507
Email: wilbur.dovey@mfat.govt.nz

Mr. Craig Hawke
New Zealand Deputy High Commissioner
New Zealand High Commission
PO Box 157
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: (685) 21 711
Fax: (685) 20 086
Email: craig.hawke@mfat.govt.nz

Dr. Keneti Faulalo
Programme Manager
Multilateral/Pacific Regional Environment
Development Cooperation Division
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)
Private Bag 18 901
Wellington
New Zealand
Telephone: (644) 494 8255
Fax: (644) 494 8515
Email: keneti.faulalo@mfat.govt.nz

Mr. Brian Sheppard
Senior Issues Manager – External Relations
Department of Conservation
59 Boulcott Street
PO Box 10-420
Wellington
New Zealand
Telephone: (644) 471 3071
Fax: (644) 471 3049
Email: bsheppard@doc.govt.nz

Niue

Mr. Crossley Tatui
Deputy Secretary to Government
Office of Secretary to Government
Premiers Department
PO Box 40
Fale Fono
Alofi
Niue
Telephone: (683) 4200
Fax: (683) 4344/4206
Email: secgov.premier@mail.gov.nu

Northern Mariana Islands

Mr. Peter Barlas
Acting Director
Coastal Resources Management
PO Box 10000
Saipan, MP 96950
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Telephone: (1-670) 234 6623
Fax: (1-670) 234 0007
Email: crmpbarlas@saipan.com

Mr. Ignacio Cabrera
Director
Division of Environmental Quality
PO Box 501304
Saipan, MP 96950
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Telephone: (1-670) 664 8555
Fax: (1-670) 664 8540
Email: deg.director@saipan.com

Mr. Brian Bearden
Environmental Engineer
Division of Environmental Quality
PO Box 10000
Saipan, MP 96950
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Telephone: (1-670) 664 8500
Fax: (1-670) 664 8540

Mr. Adam Turner
Washington Representative's Office
Coastal Resources Management
PO Box 10000
Saipan, MP 96950
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Telephone: (1 670) 234 6623
Fax: (1 670) 234 0007

Mr. Larry I. Guerrero
Environmental Planner
Commonwealth Utilities Corporation
PO Box 1220
CK Saipan, MP 96950
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
Telephone: (670) 235 6145

Palau

Mr. Uchel Naito
Environmental Specialist/Consultant
Ministry of Natural Resources and Development
PO Box 117
Koror
Republic of Palau
Telephone: (680) 488 4487
Fax: (680) 488 3380
Email: mrd.naito@palaunet.com

Papua New Guinea

Hon. Herowa Agiwa
Minister for Environment and Conservation Office of
Environment and Conservation
PO Box 6601
Boroko, NCO
Papua New Guinea
Telephone: (675) 325 0180
Fax: (675) 325 0182
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Mr. Godfried Angi
Office of Environment and Conservation
PO Box 6601
Boroko, NCO
Papua New Guinea
Telephone: (675) 325 0180
Fax: (675) 325 0182
Email: angig@daltron.com.pg

Mr. Gunther Joku
First Assistant Director
PO Box 6601
Boroko, NCO
Papua New Guinea
Telephone: (675) 325 0194
Fax: (675) 325 0182

Mr. Norman Changau
Office of Environment and Conservation
PO Box 6601
Boroko, NCO
Papua New Guinea
Telephone: (675) 325 8519
Fax: (675) 325 0182

Samoa

Hon. Tuala Sale Tagaloa
Minister for Lands, Surveys and Environment
Department of Lands, Surveys and Environment
Private Bag
Apia,
Samoa
Telephone: (685) 23 723
Fax: (685) 23 174
Email: tuala@lesamoa.net
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Mr. Tuuu Ieti Taulealo
Director
Department of Lands, Surveys and Environment
Private Bag
Apia,
Samoa
Telephone: (685) 22 481
Fax: (685) 23 176

Mr. F. Vitolio Lui
Deputy Secretary for Foreign Affairs
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
PO Box 1859
Apia,
Samoa
Telephone: (685) 63 333
Fax: (685) 21 504
Email: vito@mfa.gov.ws

Ms Sharon Potoi-Aiafi
Senior Foreign Affairs Officer
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
PO Box 1859
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: (685) 63 333
Fax: (685) 21 504
Email: mfa@mfa.gov.ws
s-potoi@hotmail.com

Tokelau

Hon. Faipule Kuresa Nasau
Minister for Natural Resources and Environment
Office of the Council of Faipule
Government of Tokelau
Tokelau
Telephone: (685) 20 822
Fax: (685) 21 761
Email: nasau@winz.co.nz
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Mr. Falani Aukuso
Director
Office of the Council of Faipule
Government of Tokelau
Tokelau
Telephone: (690) 3133
Fax: (690) 3134
(685) 21 761
Email: falani.aukuso@clear.net.nz

Tonga

Hon. Tonga Tu'i'afitu
Minister for Lands, Survey and Natural
Resources and Head of Delegation
Ministry of Lands, Survey and Natural Resources
PO Box 5
Nuku'alofa
Tonga
Telephone: (676) 23 655
Fax: (676) 23 210
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Dr. Savae Latu
Secretary for Lands, Survey and Natural Resource
Ministry of Lands, Survey and Natural Resources
PO Box 5
Nuku'alofa
Tonga
Telephone: (676) 23 210
Fax: (676) 23 216
Email: uilou@kalianet.to

Tuvalu

Hon. Faimalaga Luka
Minister
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Vaiaku, Funafuti
Tuvalu
Telephone: (688) 20 828
Fax: (688) 20 826
Email: mnre@tuvalu.tr
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Mr. Elisala Pita
Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Vaiaku, Funafuti
Tuvalu
Telephone: (688) 20 827
Fax: (688) 20 826
Email: mnre@tuvalu.tr

Mr. Seluka Seluka
PICCAP Coordinator
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Vaiaku, Funafuti
Tuvalu
Telephone: (688) 20 171
Fax: (688) 20 178
Email: piccap@tuvalu.tr
(Officials' Meeting only)

United States of America

H.E. Ambassador Mary Beth West
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Fisheries
United States Department of State
Bureau of Oceans and International
Environment and Scientific Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20520
United States of America
Telephone: (202) 647 3883
Fax: (202) 647 9099
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Mr. Ruben Alcantara
United States Department of State
Bureau of Oceans and International Environment and
Scientific Affairs
Washington, D.C. 20520
United States of America
Telephone: (202) 647 9099
Fax: (202) 647 3883
Email: alcantararr@yahoo.com

Mr. Tom S. Fellin
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy
U.S. Pacific Command Representative for Guam,
CNMI, FSM and Palau
U.S. Navy Regional Environmental Coordinator
Telephone: (671) 339 3200
Fax: (671) 339 4363
Email: noo2eguam.naug.mil

Mr. Norman Lovelace
Manager
Pacific Insular Area Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
United States of America
Telephone: (415) 755 1599
Email: lovelave.norma@epa.gov

CDR Paula Carroll
Chief
Marine Response Branch
Fourteenth Clr District
300 Ala Moana Blvd, Rm 9212
Honolulu, HI 96850-4982
Hawaii
Telephone: (808) 541 2118
Fax: (808) 541 2166
Email: pcarroll@d14.uscg.mil
(Officials' Meeting only)

Ms Susan Ware Harris
Office of International Affairs
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Rm 5230 HCHB
Washington DC 20230
United States of America
Telephone: (202) 482 6196
Fax: (202) 482 4307
Email: susan.ware-harris@noaa.gov

Mr. Roy N. Tsutsui
Regional Environmental Coordinator Representative
U.S. Navy
Guam
Telephone: (671) 339 5094
Fax: (671) 339 4363
Email: n451@guam.navy.mil

Wallis and Futuna

Hon. Bernadette Papilio
Minister
B.P. 31
Wallis and Futuna
Telephone: (681) 722 504
Fax: (681) 722 054
E-mail: senv@wallis.co.nc

Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP)/Advisers

Forum Secretariat

Mr. Iosefa Maiava
Deputy Secretary General
Forum Secretariat
Private Mail Bag
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: (679) 312 600
Fax: (679) 301 102
Email: iosefam@forumsec.org.fj
Web Site: <http://www/forumsec.org.fj>

Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)

Mr. Yves Corbel
Deputy Director General
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
BP D5 98848,
Noumea Cedex
New Caledonia
Telephone: (687) 26 20 00
Fax: (687) 26 38 18
Email: spc@spc.int
(Ministerial Meeting only)

South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)

Mr. Alfred Simpson
Director
South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)
Private Mail Bag
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: (679) 381 377
Fax: (679) 370 040
Email: Alf@sopac.org.fj

United Nations Environment Programme, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (UNEP/ROAP)

Dr. Nirmal Andrews
Regional Director and Representative for Asia and the Pacific
United Nations Environment Programme, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (UNEP/ROAP)
10th Floor, United Nations Building
Block B, Rajdamern Avenue
Bangkok 10200
Thailand
Telephone: (662) 281 6101
Fax: (662) 280 3829
Email: andrewsni@un.org
(Ministerial Meeting only)

Observers

National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA)

Dr. Jim Salinger
Senior Climate Scientist
National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA)
PO Box 109 695
New Market
Auckland
New Zealand
Email: j.salinger@niwa.cri.nz
(Officials' Meeting only)

Philippine Consul

Mr. Bienvenido Camerino
Philippine Consulate General
PO Box 9860
Guam
(Officials' Meeting only)

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

– Samoa

Mr. Serge Ducasse
Resident Representative
United Nations Development Programme
(UNDP)
Private Mail Bag
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: (685) 20 609
Fax: (685) 23 555
Email: Serg.Ducase@undp.org

Mr. Tom Twining-Ward
Environment Advisor
United Nations Development Programme
(UNDP)
Private Mail Bag
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: (685) 23 670
Fax: (685) 23 555
Email: tom.twining-ward@undp.org

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

– Fiji

Dr. Jenny Bryant-Tokalau
Head, GEF Unit
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Private Mail Bag
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: (679) 312 500
Fax: (679) 301 718
Email: jenny.bryant@undp.org

**United Nations Division for Sustainable
Development (UNSD)**

Mr. Espen Ronneberg
Inter-regional Advisor for Small Island Developing
States
United Nations Division for Sustainable Development
(UNSD)
UN Plaza, DC1-0824
New York, NY 10017
United States of America
Telephone: (1-212) 963 2043
Fax: (1-212) 963 1270
Email: Ronneberg@un.org

The United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan

Mrs Carlene Van Toen
Project Assistant
The United Nations University
Global Environment Information Centre
68-70, Jingumea 5-Home
Shibuya-Ku, Tokyo 150-0001
Japan
Telephone: (813) 5467 1245 (813) 3499 2811
Fax: (813) 3407 8164
Email: vantoen@hq.unu.edu

**Water and Environmental Research Institute of
the Western Pacific – University of Guam**

Mr. Charles P. (Chip) Guard
Research Associate
Water and Environmental Research Institute of the
Western Pacific
University of Guam UOG Station
Mangilao
Guam 96923
Telephone: (1-671) 735 2695
Fax: (1-671) 734 8890
Email: chipguar@uog.edu

**World Meteorological Organization (WMO) – Sub-
regional Office for the South-West Pacific**

Mr. Henry Taiki
Programme Officer
World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
Sub-regional Office for the South-West Pacific
PO Box 240
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: (685) 21 929
Fax: (685) 20 231
Email: wmo.srop@sprep.org.ws
Website: <http://www.wmo.ch>

SPREP Secretariat

PO Box 240
Apia, Samoa
Telephone: (685) 21 929
Fax: (685) 20 231
Email: sprep@sprep.org.ws
Website: <http://www.sprep.org.ws>

Mr. Tamari'i Tutangata
Director

Ms Neva Wendt
Head of Division, Environmental Education,
Information and Capacity-building

Mr. Gerald Miles
Head of Division, Environmental Management and
Planning

Mr. Ray Wright
Head of Division, Finance and Administration

Mr. Iosefatu Reti
Project Manager, SPBCP

Ms. Pisaina Leilua-Lei Sam
Executive Officer Management

Mr. Andrea Volentras
Environmental Legal Officer

Mr. Jacques Mougeot
Environmental Law Officer

Mr. Herve Dropsy
Information Technology Manager

Mr. Bruce Graham
Coordinator/Waste Management and Pollution
Prevention

Mr. Sefanaia Nawadra
Marine Pollution Officer

Ms. Audrey Dropsy
Training Officer

Ms. Seema Deo
Environmental Education Officer

Mr. Fatu Tauafiafi
Information and Publications Officer

Mr. Andrew Wright
Project Manager, International Waters

Mr. Penehuro Lefale
Climatology/Meteorological Officer

Ms. Dorothy S. Kamu
Personal Assistant to Director

Ms. Apiseta Eti
Personal Assistant to Deputy Director

Ms. Saunoa Mata'u
Conference and Travel Officer

Ms. Lupe Silulu
Registry Supervisor

KVA Consult Ltd.

Mr. Epa Tuioti
Consultant
PO Box 1882

Apia
Samoa

Telephone: (685) 25 345/24 233/21207

Fax: (685) 22 087

Email: kva@kvaconsult.com

kvaconsult.@samoa.ws

Website: <http://www.kvaconsult.com>

<http://www.samoa.ws/kvahtml>

Language Professionals Ltd

15 Day Street
Newton, Auckland
New Zealand

Telephone: (649) 379 2040

Fax: (649) 379 2041

Email: catherine@langpro.co.nz

Web Site: <http://www.langpro.co.nz>

Interpreters:

Mr. Patrick Delhay

Dr. Emy Watt

Ms. Valérie Hassan

Translators:

Ms. Dominique Toulet

Mr. Olivier Richard

Mr. Pierre Pellerin

Technician:

Mr. Alan Doyle

Annex II: Lieutenant Governor of Guam's Speech

Hafa adai, and good evening to all of the delegates to this Ministerial Meeting of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme. Welcome to Guam, it is our privilege to be your host.

For those of you visiting our island for the first time, I hope you like what you see and please make sure to tell everyone back home just how beautiful and inviting our little island can be. Of course, if you don't like what you see. Please don't tell anyone except us and we'll try to fix the problem. After all, we are in the tourism business, and we don't like to spread bad news about our island.

Seriously, we do always want to put on our best face and we also want to put our best foot forward, for our visitors and guests. If you've been to Guam before (and I know some of you are frequent visitors) and especially if it has been a while since you stopped by, you may have noticed a few changes. Guam has become more cosmopolitan than ever and more developed than it has ever been. The strategy of the Gutierrez-Bordallo administration over the past six years has been to promote the core values of family and community while emphasising common-sense government, and economic growth. The up-side of this strategy is the creation of jobs and a strong private sector economy and the hope of a prosperous future for everyone of our people. Of course, the downside of promoting economic growth is the added threats to the environment that can accompany development.

However, in Guam, protecting our environment is a fundamental community value for many of us because it is part and parcel of what attracts our visitors and makes our island such a wonderful place in which to live. For those reasons alone, our administration will never allow the environment to be sacrificed in the name of economic growth. We cherish our children, our manhoben. We honor our parents and elders, our manamko. And we want to be sure that the water they drink, the food they eat, and the air they breathe, won't make them sick. We want to make sure that the world around them is clean, and healthy, so we can all live

long and productive lives in a world free from environmental hazards. We believe that we must not destroy this wonderful place that God has created and that each of us has a sacred obligation to pass on a clean, safe, beautiful island to our future generations.

I remember first coming to Guam as a teenage girl. The island was so different in those days, so incredibly beautiful and pristine. I tried to imagine the beauty of the land the original Chamorros discovered. It must have been truly spectacular. In the centuries that have passed, our environment and resources have often paid a price. Of course, after the war the military was everywhere but there were still many huge tracts of land that were virtually untouched by human hands.

Well, times have changed, the military presence has been reduced but now development is everywhere and those huge tracts of untouched land have become fewer in number and have gotten a lot smaller in size as our population has increased. And yet, our commitment has not changed to make decisions today that will live on long after we are gone, continuing to protect and nurture the living world around us. We have not lost our sense of the past, or our dedication to the future. We can protect our island's environment, while still providing the economic opportunities that will benefit all of our people.

While we have much further to go, meetings and conferences such as this one today move us closer to making sure that the relationships among the governments, and island nations and territories are strengthened and making sure that we are all working in harmony, for the same end result. Because the legacy we leave our children is the responsibility of everyone in this room, in each of our countries and islands, everyone on this planet. Each of us must do our part. Preserving our environment and restoring its wonders are for our common good.

Thank you, Si Yu'os Ma'ase' and best wishes for a very successful meeting.

Annex III: SPREP Director's Speech

The Lieutenant Governor of Guam the Honourable Madeleine Z. Bordallo; Ms I'o A-Te-Are-Tini Tuakeu-Lindsay, Chairperson of the SPREP Meeting; Distinguished Delegates and Observers; Senior Officials of the Government of Guam and Invited Guests; Ladies and Gentlemen.

It is a real pleasure and honour for me to join the Honourable Lieutenant Governor of Guam, Mrs Madeleine Z. Bordallo in extending a warm *Hafa Adai* and welcome to this Official Opening Ceremony of the Officials segment of the 11th SPREP Meeting; the governing body of the SPREP Secretariat.

It is well known that the first global Conference, under the auspices of the United Nations, on the Human Environment held in Stockholm in 1972 gave birth to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). But what may not be so well known is that, in a much more humble way that Stockholm Conference also resulted in the cross-pollination of ideas in the Pacific on nature conservation.

In fact, it was right here in Tumon Bay, at the Hilton Hotel in 1973 that such cross-pollination took place and produced a rather special seed.

I was fortunate in being part of a two-person delegation from the Cook Islands for that cross-pollination occasion, the occasion being part of the annual, regional get-together known as the South Pacific Conference. As many of you know, that Conference was the governing body of the SPC or South Pacific Commission as the Secretariat of the Pacific Community was known. As part of the outcome of that Conference and the cross-pollination occasion in particular, the SPC was directed to include in its work programme for the first time, an Ecological Adviser to commence activities at the regional level on nature conservation.

For me personally, my participation at that Conference was significant in several ways including two factors:

- First, it was not just the first time that I had the privilege of visiting Guam but it was also the first time that I crossed the equator to the northern part of the Pacific.
- Second, the nature conservation seed which that Conference produced, grew to become the South

Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) in 1982. SPREP was then a programme with its technical secretariat housed in the SPC but having its own, unique decision-making process.

With that distinction of having its own decision-making process, it was inevitable that SPREP should become an independent organisation. And so it did. SPREP relocated to Samoa in 1992 and by 1995, the SPREP Agreement which established SPREP as an autonomous organisation, had come into force.

It is appropriate, even inevitable, that at this crucial stage of SPREP's growth in service to its members, its governing body should now meet here at Tumon Bay, Guam the setting from which the SPREP seed began to sprout onto the regional scene. Having been part of SPREP's regional cross-pollination process 27 years ago, I consider myself to be most fortunate to be a part of this 11th SPREP Meeting.

My sincere hope, Madam Chair, distinguished delegates and observers is that by the end of this week, you will also consider yourselves to be fortunate in being part of this Meeting and especially in setting the right course for the SPREP Secretariat to address your priority sustainable development issues.

The significance of this Meeting in nurturing the growth of SPREP is obvious from a glance at our Provisional Agenda. Such significance is not based on the number of items on our agenda, numerous as those are; nor is it based on the rather voluminous documentation that we, in the SPREP Secretariat, have had to prepare to guide your deliberations in accordance with your instructions and expectations.

It is in the nature of the items on the agenda and the decisions that you, distinguished delegates and your Ministers, will make during this week which will make this Meeting one of the most important in SPREP's short but eventful growth as an autonomous organisation.

I refer in particular to the Review of the current Action Plan covering the period 1997 – 2000; the Draft Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the Pacific Islands Region over the next four years and the related Draft Corporate Plan; proposed organisational structure;

financial implications and Members' contributions. Other significant items include:

- the proposal for a Pacific Islands Conservation Trust Fund;
- proposal for a Regional Strategy to address the implementation of the Biosafety Protocol to the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- Regional Framework for Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing;
- Proposal for a Pacific Islands Regional Marine Spill Contingency Plan;
- Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within the South Pacific known as the Waigani Convention;
- Proposal for a Regional Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea Level Rise;
- Strategic Action Plan for the Development of Meteorology in the Pacific Region;
- Phase III of the Pacific Islands Climate Change and Assistance Programme (PICCAP);
- Initiative for 'Removing Barriers to Renewable Energy';
- Regional preparations for Rio plus 10;
- Strategic Action Programme for International Waters;
- Environmental Education Strategy;
- Training Needs Assessment Report;
- Information Strategy;
- Global Environment Outlook 3; and
- the Proposal to develop a Regional Ocean Policy.

Needless to say, the discussions and decisions of the Ministerial Forum on Friday together with the inputs of this Senior Officials segment of the SPREP Meeting, will be the key to the region's environment protection and management efforts well into this millennium.

Clearly, Madam Chair and Distinguished Delegates, for you to reach sound conclusions on such a relatively lengthy list of significant regional issues over the next three days will require intense and focused efforts.

I sincerely hope that the documentation that we, in the SPREP Secretariat, have prepared to assist your deliberations is equal to your expectations and to the heavy responsibilities entrusted to you by your respective governments.

One thing I am certain of is that we could not have asked for a better setting than this magnificent conference facility provided by our host, the Government of Guam,

through the Hyatt Regency Hotel in which to deliberate on such weighty issues.

Earlier in this statement, I referred to the fact that I had crossed the equator to this island in the Northern Pacific for the first time in 1973. Since that time, I have had the privilege of visiting Guam on about seven or eight occasions as well as the other island SPREP Members north of the equator.

Over that same period, the winds of change have been clearly blowing across all our islands whether in terms of our politics, private sector development, economic and social development, the depletion of our natural resources and so on.

I am sure that many of us know that part of the winds of change blowing across our region relate to the insistence by representatives of our islands North of the equator in recent years to ensure that the titles of organisations in which they are Members reflect the fact that their membership is from both the southern and northern Pacific.

Thus, the mother of regionalism, the South Pacific Commission became the Secretariat of the Pacific Community in 1997 but retained the acronym SPC. Last year the South Pacific Forum became the Pacific Islands Forum. This means that only three regional institutions still have the term "South" in their titles.

Hence, although I have not received a formal proposal from any Member to change the title "SPREP", I should like to suggest that it may be timely for us to consider this issue at this Meeting. I am conscious that since SPREP also deals with climate and meteorological matters, we should try and prevent the winds of change climbing to cyclonic strength before responding to the inevitable.

Madam Chair, distinguished delegates, it is for this reason that I am bringing this matter to your attention. Might I suggest further that should Members wish to consider this matter in this meeting that you also consider the possibility of retaining the acronym "SPREP" which would stand for 'Secretariat of the Pacific Region Environmental Programme'.

I should like to extend through you, Honourable Lieutenant Governor, to the Governor, Government and People of Guam my appreciation for the warm hospitality and enthusiastic support which has been extended

to us, in the SPREP Secretariat since our arrival. I should also like to thank Mr Jesus Salas, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for his unfailing conviction and brimming confidence over the last two years in bringing this 11th SPREP Meeting here. Some of you may not know how heavy a responsibility it is for any Government to host the SPREP Meeting.

Unlike almost all of our sister regional agencies, host governments for SPREP Meetings must pay the difference of the cost of having the meeting in the host country in comparison to Apia. This means that, amongst other things, Guam has had to pay the cost of bringing Secretariat staff required to service this meeting, including me, to Guam from Apia.

I should also like to pay a special tribute to Mr Jordan Kaye of the Guam EPA. Jordan has been a part of the SPREP meeting scene over recent years and has worked tirelessly alongside Mr Salas to bring this Eleventh SPREP Meeting here. He underwent a serious surgical

operation recently and is still receiving treatment for that operation. Unfortunately, Jordan at this time is back in hospital but I am certain that he is with us in spirit.

Thank you also to all the staff of the Guam EPA for your highly efficient and effective support of this meeting and of the Secretariat. I am confident that with your support, this 11th SPREP Meeting will achieve its objectives in the time allocated.

I am also confident, Madam Chair, distinguished delegates and observers, that the outcome of this Meeting will place the region on the soundest footing possible in terms of the region's environmental agenda. I wish you all the very best in your deliberations over the next three days.

Dangkolo na Si Yu'os Ma'ase

Kia Manuia.

Annex IV: List of Sponsors

Government of Guam Agencies

Bureau of Women's Affairs
Guam Visitors Bureau
Guam Power Authority
Antonio B. Won Pat Guam International Airport Authority
Guam Economic Development Authority
Guam Telephone Authority
Department of Public Works
Guam Housing Corporation

Corporate Community

Kuentos Communications, Inc.
Winzler and Kelly Consulting Engineers
Dillingham Construction Pacific Basin Ltd.
Xerox
Mobil Oil Guam
Shell Guam
Kloppenburg Enterprises Inc.
Hawaiian Rock Products
Nissan Motors
Toyota Rent a Car
Otte Consulting

Others

Lucy Kono, Micronesia Community
GEPA Employees Association

Field Trip Participants

National Park Service
University of Guam Marine Laboratory
Department of Agriculture, Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources
US Department of Agriculture
Andersen Air Force Base

Display Booths

US Department of Agriculture
National Weather Service, National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
Guam Economic Development Authority

Annex V: Agenda

1. Official Opening
2. Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair
3. Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures
4. Matters Arising from Tenth SPREP Meeting
5. Presentation of Annual Report for 1999 and Director's Overview of Progress since Tenth SPREP Meeting
6. Action Plan (1997-2000)
 - 6.1 Achievements
 - 6.1.1 Technial Report
 - 6.1.2 Financial Report
 - Report on Members' Contributions
 - Cash Flow and Primary Functions
 - Audited Annual Accounts for 1999
 - Report from Work Programme and Budget Sub-committee Meeting, November 1999
 - 6.1.3 SPREP Centre
 - 6.1.4 AusAID Review of SPREP
7. Action Plan (2001-2004)
 - 7.1 Draft Action Plan (2001-2004)
 - 7.2 Corporate Plan
 - Draft Corporate Plan
 - Organisational Review
 - Financial Implications
 - 7.3 Work Programme and Budget
 - 7.3.1 Work Programme and Budget
 - Proposed Work Programme and Budget for 2001
 - Indicative Work Programme and Budget for 2002 and 2003
 - 7.3.2 Programme Issues
 - Nature Conservation***
 - 7.3.2.1 Biosafety
 - 7.3.2.2 Regional Framework for Access to Genetic Resources and Benefit Sharing
 - 7.3.2.3 Trust Fund
 - 7.3.2.4 South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme (SPBCP) Conservation Area (CA) Award
 - 7.3.2.5 South Pacific Whale Sanctuary
 - Pollution Prevention***
 - 7.3.2.6 PACPLAN endorsement
 - 7.3.2.7 Waigani Convention

Climate Change and Variability

- 7.3.2.8 Regional Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea Level Rise
 - 7.3.2.8.1 Strategic Action Plan for the Development of Meteorology in the Pacific (SDMP), 2000–2009
- 7.3.2.9 PICCAP Phase III
- 7.3.2.10 GEF Project – Removing Barriers to Renewable Energy

Economic Development

- 7.3.2.11 RIO + 10
- 7.3.2.12 Strategic Action Programme for International Waters

Processes

- 7.3.2.13 Environmental Education Strategy
- 7.3.2.14 Training Needs Assessment Report
- 7.3.2.15 Information Strategy
- 7.3.2.16 Global Environment Outlook 3 (GEO 3)
- 7.3.3 Personnel
 - 7.3.3.1 Job Sizing
 - 7.3.3.2 Staff Regulations
- 7.3.4 Contributions from Members
- 7.3.5 Amendments to Financial Regulations

8. Policy/Institutional Matters

- 8.1 Position of Director
- 8.2 Appointment of Auditor
- 8.3 Rules of Procedure
 - Appointment of Director
 - SPREP Meetings

9. Regional Coordination

- 9.1 Regional Oceans Policy
- 9.2 BioNet
- 9.3 Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP)

10. Report from Meetings of the Parties to SPREP and Apia Conventions

11. Items Proposed by Members

12. Statements by Observers

13. Other Business

14. Date and Venue of Twelfth SPREP Meeting

15. Adoption of Report

16. Review of Agenda for Ministerial Meeting/Matters for Ministerial Decision

17. Close

Annex VI: Power Point Presentation of SPREP Action Plan Key Achievements 1997–2000

Biodiversity and Natural Resources

- Increased area under conservation;
- Progress in species conservation;
- Building community capacity;
- Support to biodiversity related conventions;
- New options for financing conservation;
- Effective partnerships for conservation.

Climate Change and Integrated Coastal Management

- National coordination of climate change;
- Strengthened Meteorological Services;
- Effective participation in the UNFCCC;
- Continued monitoring of sea level rise;
- Regional Framework established.

Waste Management, Pollution, Prevention and Emergencies

- Stockpiles of Hazwaste identified;
- Waste characterisations completed;
- RPA for land-based sources of pollution;
- PACPOL/PACPLAN for marine pollution;
- Increasing awareness of waste and pollution issues.

Environmental Management, Planning and Institutional Strengthening

- Increased coastal management skills;
- Initial capacity building for SoE;
- Environmental legislation developed;
- Increased Pacific input to conventions;
- Strengthened environment units.

Environmental Education, Information and Training

- Strategic approach to environmental education/teacher training;
- Training needs assessed (8 countries);
- Media awareness and training;
- Country attachment scheme;
- Development of information clearing-houses.

Strategic Output 6: SPREP Secretariat - Management and Corporate Services

- Increased access to project funds;
- SPREP Centre completed;
- Transition to output based budgeting;
- New monitoring and reporting process;
- Regional and international coordination.

Annex VII: Observer Statements

United Nations Development Programme

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, thank you for giving UNDP the opportunity to participate in this important 11th SPREP Meeting as an observer, and to make a statement today at the end of the deliberations.

As you know, UNDP has been supporting the Pacific region, through SPREP, for a number of years and currently contributes more than 62 per cent of the secured project funding. The "South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme" (SPBCP), the "Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme" (PICCAP) and the "Capacity Building for Environmental Management Programme" (CBEMP) have been ongoing for a number of years. More recently we have approved the Implementation of the "Strategic Action Programme (SAP) of the Pacific Small Island Developing States" under the GEF Focal Area of International Waters, and this, together with a number of new project proposals in the pipeline, will guarantee that UNDP's commitment to, and close partnership with SPREP will continue well into the new millennium. Having almost two thirds of the SPREP project funding coming from one single source, UNDP/GEF is, however, not necessarily healthy and we strongly encourage SPREP to continue their current efforts to attract a wider range of donors and partners.

We have listened carefully to the discussions of this meeting and will do our utmost to ensure that the interests and concerns of the region in the area of environment will be adequately reflected in future UNDP/GEF funded initiatives. UNDP supports the process of consultation and transparency that led to the new Action Plan for 2001–2004 and the Corporate Plan, and also welcome the steps SPREP has taken to realign the organisation in line with the evolving needs of the region, taking into account the recommendations from the AusAID funded review. From a donor perspective, I am pleased to say that UNDP is satisfied with the way SPREP has executed the UNDP/GEF funded projects, and particularly with the way it has fulfilled the important role of assisting countries in addressing their obligations under the global United Nations conventions. If I had to add a note of caution, it would be that there remains a need for a more comprehensive and system-

atic assessment of the actual quantitative and qualitative outputs of the activities. UNDP is encouraged by the on-going efforts SPREP is dedicating to the identification of a clear baseline and subsequent benchmarks and indicators to monitor future progress.

Finally, I would like to congratulate the Director for his appointment for another two-year period. UNDP and SPREP have common interests and complementary responsibilities and we are looking forward to working with Tam, the SPREP Secretariat and the SPREP member countries, including the territories, in order to reflect the environmental priorities and aspirations of the region through projects funded by UNDP/GEF.

Private Mail Bag
Apia, Samoa
Phone: (685) 23 670/1/2
Fax: (685) 23 555
E-mail: registry.ws@undp.org
<http://www.undp.org.ws>

The United Nations University

Honorable Secretariat and Delegates.

It is my pleasure and honour to be here this week as an observer representing the United Nations University (UNU). I would like to thank the SPREP Secretariat for conducting these important meetings and for allowing me to briefly highlight our Inter-linkages Initiative, which we feel may be of significant relevance to SPREP members. Particularly, considering the sentiments voiced by delegates here this week in regards to the strain on capacity and resources they face during MEA implementation. Furthermore, UNU's work is in line with proposed actions detailed in SPREP new action plan (2001–2004) "to aid in the provision of assistance to nation to become active parties to international conventions". The Inter-linkages initiative has been established to aid nations, regional organisations and international bodies in combating the capacity burdens encountered during the negotiation and implementation of multilateral environmental agreements. The 3-year initiative has been designed to take advantage of the natural synergies that exist between issues, and thereby

save time and resources. UNU's programme is divided into three categories, framework building, capacity building and information dissemination. Research activities focuses on five key areas, including, the promotion of synergies between finance, scientific mechanisms, information systems, institutional arrangements and issue management. At present, UNU research activities are intended to promote the development of regional and national model frameworks. UNU will hold a regional workshop to examine regional ecosystems, issues related to inter-linkages and the implementation of programmes supported by international bodies, this December in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. At the meeting, tool-kits will be developed for distribution among regions. We are also in the process of identifying nations to conduct national case studies, to examine a cluster of conventions and the challenges to their implementation. UNU's inter-linkages efforts are designed to provide practical tools targeting negotiators and other national delegates. To learn more about UNU's inter-linkages work you are welcome to visit the web-site at <http://www.Reic.or.jp/interlinknes>.

World Meteorological Organization

Your Excellencies, dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen.

It is indeed a privilege for me to address the distinguished participants at the Eleventh SPREP Meeting of Officials. On behalf of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) I have great pleasure to express the appreciation to Mr. Tamari'i Tutangata, Director of South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) for the invitation extended to the WMO to participate in this meeting and to convey to you the greeting of Professor Godwin. O. Patrick (G.O.P) Obasi, the Secretary-General of the World Meteorological Organization.

Your Excellencies.

For half a century, from 1950, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) has served the people of the world and the international community as a United Nations system's authoritative voice on the state and behaviour of the Earth's atmosphere, its interaction with the land surface and oceans, the climate it produces and the resulting distribution of water resources. The WMO and its National Meteorological and Hydrological Services (NMHSs) have contributed to the advancement of

meteorology, hydrology and related geophysical sciences and their applications to sustainable development of the nations. Now WMO, composed of 185 Members, comprising 179 States and 6 Territories. As you are aware that five new Members from the Pacific Region have recently join WMO namely: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Niue, Samoa and Tonga.

The close cooperation between WMO and the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) has been increasing as a number of joint activities were carried out by both organisations, such as the training workshop on Climate and Information Prediction Service (CLIPS) in conjunction with the Sixth SPREP Meeting of Regional Meteorological Service Directors (6RMSD) in Tahiti in July 1999. This was followed up by a training workshop, in disaster management in collaboration with the South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC) in Fiji, in October 1999. WMO, World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) conducted a successful multidisciplinary conference in climate and human health held in Apia in July 2000. In addition WMO/GCOS/SPREP Pacific Island Regional Implementation Workshop on Improving Global Climate Observing Systems which was successfully conducted in August 2000. WMO also was represented at the Seventh SPREP Meeting of Regional Meteorological Services Directors which was held in August this year.

WMO is looking further to strengthening the collaboration with SPREP and other regional organizations in all aspects of Meteorology, operational hydrology, and environment-related activities for the benefit of the Members of all organisations in the region.

WMO participated strongly in the Pacific Conference on Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea level Rise, which was held in Cook Islands in April 2000. WMO recognises the importance of the outcome of the Conference and support the development of the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea Level Rise as a sound basis and foundation for developing an ongoing coordinated approach to enhance the preparedness of the countries in responding to the impacts of climate change. We wish also to assure you of our support and active participation in the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan for the Development of Meteorology in the Pacific Region (2000-2009). We are sure that you are aware of the contribution of WMO to the form of the

Plan and the Meteorological Needs Analysis that was carried out during the past a few months. We would like to assure you of WMO's support to the implementation of the Strategic Plan in support of those NMSs in the Pacific to enable them to maintain their basic systems for the benefit of all Members. In this regard, WMO would also like to place on record its appreciation for the significant contributions made by development partners to the efforts of the NMSs in the Pacific.

WMO's Regional Programme provides a framework for the implementation of global WMO programme at the national and sub-regional level. One of its main long-term objectives is to assist and support in building the meteorological capacities of Member countries, either individually or as a group of countries, in cooperation with regional and sub-regional economic groupings and to enable the national Meteorological and Hydrologi-

cal Services to play their full role in sustainable development of their countries. Furthermore, within its overall efforts to reinforce its support to NMHSs of the Region, a WMO Sub-regional Office for the South-West Pacific was established in Apia in 1999 to serve Members in RA V (South-West Pacific). We would like to take this opportunity to reiterate our thanks to the Government of Samoa, for hosting the Office in Apia and to SPREP for their continued support to the Office.

We would like to assure you that WMO will assist the Members in raising the capabilities of their National Meteorological Services and to make the necessary contribution to assist them in their endeavours and further strengthen its collaboration with SPREP and others.

Thank you.

**Report
of the
Environment
Ministers' Forum**

Guam
12–13 October 2000

Environment Ministers' Forum Meeting Report

Introduction

1. The Eleventh SPREP Meeting at Ministerial level was convened in Guam, on the 12 and 13 October, 2000. Ministers, Ambassadors and Ministerial Representatives from the following countries attended: Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, French Polynesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and United States of America, together with representatives of the following countries and territories: American Samoa, France, Guam, Nauru, New Caledonia, New Zealand, Niue, Northern Mariana Islands and Wallis and Futuna. Representatives of the Forum Secretariat; Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC); South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC), United Nations Environment Programme, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (UNEP/ROAP); United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Offices in Apia and Suva and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) also attended. A list of participants appears in Annex I of the Officials' Meeting Report.

Agenda Item 1:

Official Opening

2. The Official Opening of the Environment Ministers' Forum – Eleventh SPREP Meeting was held on the evening of 12 October 2000, at the Governor's Residence, Guam. Mr. Jesus T. Salas, Administrator of the Guam Environmental Protection Agency welcomed Ministers and Delegates to Guam. He outlined the importance of the environment to the social and economic development of Guam and referred to the enormous challenge that his agency, the Guam EPA is facing to ensure that the environment is not compromised in the pursuit of economic growth.

3. Mr. Salas then delivered the welcome address by the Lt. Governor of Guam who was unable to attend due to her other commitments. In her speech, the Lt. Governor welcomed the participants to the Ministerial Meeting and invited them to enjoy the beauty of the

island and the hospitality of its people. She mentioned that her government recognised the important link that the clean and safe environment of Guam has with the growth of its economic development sector especially in tourism and stated that Guam will continue to give the environment the priority it deserves. This statement is attached as Annex II(a).

4. The Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for the Environment of the Cook Islands, Hon. Norman George, on behalf of the delegations thanked the Government and people of Guam, Mr. Salas and staff of the Guam EPA for the warm welcome and hospitality accorded to the delegates to the SPREP Meeting.

5. The Opening Ceremony concluded with entertainment provided by the Famaguon Guahan group.

Agenda Item 2:

Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair

6. In accordance with the Rules of Procedures of the SPREP Meeting, where a Meeting is not hosted by the Secretariat, the Chair shall be provided by the host. Accordingly, Guam was appointed as the **Chair** of the Ministerial Meeting. The rules also provide that the Vice-Chair shall rotate alphabetically whether or not the Meeting is hosted by the Secretariat. The Vice-Chair of the last Ministerial Meeting (Tonga, 1996) was Federated States of Micronesia. Under the principle of alphabetical rotation, therefore, **Fiji** was appointed **Vice Chair** of the Ministerial Meeting.

Agenda Item 3:

Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures

7. The Provisional Agenda was adopted as amended (Annex III (a)) and hours of work, as suggested by the Secretariat, were agreed.

Agenda Item 4:

Director's Overview

8. The Director of SPREP welcomed Ministers and sincerely thanked them for their presence at this important Meeting, which he anticipated would provide the SPREP Secretariat with a clear direction, guiding it in its work over the next few years. He referred to the challenge before the Secretariat to be even more responsive to the different capacity and needs in the region. He expressed the wish to work more closely with the Ministers, by providing advice when required, to facilitate national environmental management and protection efforts through SPREP technical assistance and advice to countries and territories.

Agenda Item 5:

Matters for Decision

9. The Chair of the Eleventh SPREP Meeting transmitted to the Ministerial Meeting, the Report of the Eleventh SPREP Meeting and a letter outlining items that the Meeting wished to bring to the attention of the Ministers, seeking their endorsement on the following items:

- SPREP Action Plan;
- Corporate Plan;
- Position of Director;
- Apia, SPREP and Waigani Conventions;
- Regional Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea-Level Rise;
- Ministerial Meetings.

The letter from the Chair of the Eleventh SPREP Meeting is attached as Annex IV(a).

10. The Ministers undertook the following action:

Action Plan

11. The Ministers endorsed, by consensus, the *Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the Pacific Islands Region (2001–2004)*.

12. In so doing, the Ministers: **Commended** the Secretariat, Members and other partners for their work in developing the Action Plan; **welcomed** the increased emphasis on the “advisory” rather than the direct im-

plementation role of the Secretariat; and **called upon** the Secretariat to further develop synergies between the SPREP Action Plan and the Asia-Pacific Action Plan recently endorsed at Ministerial level in Japan.

Corporate Plan

13. The Ministers endorsed, in principle, the main elements of the Corporate Plan and agreed that, following the need for more work in developing alternative Organisational structures, the Corporate Plan be submitted to the next SPREP Meeting for endorsement. Further, the Ministers urged the Secretariat to correspond with Members, present alternative Organisational structures, along with a complete matrix of performance measures before these are addressed by the next SPREP Meeting.

Financial Matters

14. Most Members agreed to increase total contributions from Members by 35 per cent in 2001, subject to reservations from delegations which were not able to agree to the proposed increase at this time, but indicated that they would seek their governments' approval on this important issue. The Ministers strongly urged all those Members with unpaid contributions to meet their commitments to the Organisation and to take steps to ensure that this matter would be resolved as soon as possible.

15. The Ministers applauded the Representative of New Caledonia for his undertaking to increase New Caledonia's contribution by 40 per cent for the 2001 financial year.

Position of Director

16. The Ministers agreed by consensus to the reappointment of Mr. Tamari'i Tutangata as SPREP Director for a further two-year term. They strongly commended him on his work and for his forward looking management/leadership approach and called for evaluation in two years time, of the Action Plan (2001–2004) to coincide with his end of term.

17. The Ministers also noted the revision of the *Rules of Procedure for Appointment of the Director*, which gave clear guidance on the re-advertisement process after four years of a SPREP Director's six-year term.

Apia, SPREP and Waigani Conventions

18. The Ministers:

- **reaffirmed** the Apia and SPREP Conventions as the foundation for a regional legal framework addressing environmental issues and agreed to revitalise these instruments;
- **recalled** the importance of the Waigani Convention and strongly urged Members to become Party to the Convention enabling its entry into force at the earliest;
- **further encouraged** Members to seriously consider becoming Party to the Basel, Apia and SPREP Conventions as soon as possible; and
- **agreed** to put into effect, through ratification by a two-thirds majority, a number of technical amendments to the Apia Convention.

Regional Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea Level Rise

19. The Ministers endorsed *the Regional Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea Level Rise* and agreed to its transmission to the Pacific Islands Forum Meeting in Kiribati, October 2000.

Ministerial Meetings

20. The Ministers agreed to meet on a two-yearly, rather than four-yearly basis.

Agenda Item 6:

Matters for Noting

21. There were no matters for noting.

Agenda Item 7:

Focus Issue

Agenda Item 7.1: Global Agreements

22. The SPREP Director introduced the "Global Agreements" Focus Issue noting that global agreements provide significant opportunities for the region to have its voice heard but they also present a significant chal-

lenge in terms of the human resources and political commitment required at a national level.

23. He introduced the Regional Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Dr Nirmal Andrews, representing the Director General of UNEP, Dr. Klaus Topfer who gave a Keynote address on "*Global Environmental Agreements: Challenges for the International Community*". Dr Andrews' presentation is attached as Annex V (a).

24. As one of the United Nations family to play a key role for making effective preparations for the Rio +10 process, UNEP proposes to convene a sub-regional consultation early next year to identify the priority environment and sustainable development issues of the Pacific island countries. UNEP will be willing to assist in the implementation of the SPREP Action Plan in collaboration with the SPREP Secretariat and, in so doing, catalyse an effort to synergize the process with the preparations for Rio +10. Regional Director, UNEP/ROAP indicated that a concerted effort would be required to give project shape to the identified priorities of the region. UNEP, in partnership with other United Nations agencies and SPREP, would be willing to co-organise a sub-regional round table conference in conjunction with the Rio +10 preparatory meeting and based on wide-ranging consultations.

Agenda Item 7.2: South Pacific Whale Sanctuary

25. A discussion on the South Pacific Whale Sanctuary proposal was introduced by Dr Sharman Stone, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister for the Environment and Heritage, Government of Australia.

26. She referred to work by the Governments of Australia and New Zealand on a proposal to the International Whaling Commission (IWC) to establish a South Pacific Whale Sanctuary. She drew attention to a letter to Ministers from the New Zealand Minister of Conservation, Minister of Local Government and Associate Minister of Maori Affairs, the Hon. Sandra Lee, outlining the reasons for a Sanctuary. The proposed Sanctuary would link breeding grounds in the SPREP region with the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary, which protects their Antarctic feeding grounds.

27. The Ministers welcomed efforts to establish a South Pacific Whale Sanctuary through the International

Whaling Commission, and agreed to continue to support efforts to promote the adoption of a sanctuary, whale conservation and associated eco-tourism development.

Agenda Item 8:

Other Business

28. There was no other business.

Agenda Item 9:

Timing of Next Ministerial Meeting

29. It was agreed that the next Ministerial Meeting be held in two year's time within the framework of SPREP's Meeting schedule and preferably in 2002 before Rio +10. The time and venue will be considered at the next SPREP Meeting.

Agenda Item 10:

Adoption of Report and Ministerial Statement

30. The Meeting adopted the Report of its proceedings and the Guam Environment Ministers' Forum Statement (attached as Annex VI (a)).

Agenda Item 11:

Close

31. The Meeting closed with appreciation to the Chair, the Secretariat and to the delegates for their deliberations.

Annex I(a): List of Participants

See the Joint list of participants which is attached as Annex I in the Officials' Meeting Report. This section is on pages 20–29 of this same publication.

Annex II(a): Address presented by Administrator of Guam EPA on behalf of Lieutenant Governor of Guam

Buenas Noches yan Hafa Adai Lieutenant Governor of Guam, the Honorable Madeleine Bordallo;

Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Fisheries;

Ambassador Mary Beth West;

U.S. Commander Naval Forces Marianas, Rear Admiral Tom S. Fellin;

Deputy Prime Minister of the Cook Islands, The Honorable Norman George;

Lieutenant Governor of Kosrae, Federated States of Micronesia, The Honorable Gerson Jackson;

Director of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme, Tamari'i Tutangata;

Distinguished Ministers and Delegates to the Eleventh SPREP Meeting of Officials and Ministers;

Taipei Economic and Cultural Office, Guam, Director General Leo Lee;

Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is indeed an honor to open this Ministerial Meeting. When I was given the opportunity to open the Apia and SPREP Convention meetings on Monday, I focused my comments on how important it is, for the delegates to make the necessary decisions, and to initiate changes aimed at strengthening the existing Regional Legal Framework through the Apia and SPREP Conventions and related Protocols.

I want to reiterate those same sentiments to this august body, whose members are the environmental focal points and decision-makers of their countries and territories.

In the same vein, I want to also ask, that as we continue our work for that much needed framework, that we maintain a holistic and integrated view of our environmental concerns. This is indeed, posited, in the Draft Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the Pacific Island Region for 2001–2004. In fact, the need to further integrate the environment with the social and

economic development of our countries, is noted as a strategic issue that was a lesson learned from the previous Action Plan.

I invite you to observe your surroundings at our meeting venue tomorrow, to see and validate that this is not theory, but reality. But we still have a long way to go.

The tourists teeming in Tumon, our venue site, demand that the clean environment they find, remain clean: the beaches, the air, the water, and that environmentally sound development is ensured by local government involvement.

Our residents deserve no less— have a right to no less. Without giving it much thought, we depend on clean air and clean water to sustain our island society, our very way of life.

We, in Guam, must, therefore, be cognizant of the strategies for capacity building as we focus on the four key result areas: nature conservation, pollution prevention, climate change and variability and economic development, to achieve sustainable development. As we all must.

From our island's standpoint, the protection of our environment, our heritage, is critical. Protecting our environment fuels our economy by attracting visitors. Protecting our environment through compliance and preventive maintenance, saves financial resources in the long run. Protecting the environment by sound planning practices, helps protect the public's health and welfare. Protecting the environment is protecting the public good.

My agency, the Guam Environmental Protection Agency, as the focal point of the environment, is mandated to safeguard our people's rights to a healthy environment. We do this through permitting processes, regulations and enforcement, monitoring, giving technical advice and providing environmental awareness through education. To leverage our capabilities, we also involve other agencies and organizations, and form partnerships with the private sector.

The SPREP Action Plan gives us an important tool to help us focus our internal resources to better ourselves, to help our neighboring island countries and to give us,

one voice in the global forum, to protect our regional resources.

We have started on the road of implementing our version of the Action Plan, but this important forum, our meeting tomorrow, will focus our efforts.

Nature conservation, pollution prevention, climate change and variability and economic development, affect what defines us as islands. What is especially critical to our islands, are our enclosed coastal zone resources, surrounded by the seas. An integrated approach for the overall management and protection of our watersheds and minimisation of nonpoint source pollution will better protect our natural resources and these areas that define our countries as islands – our coastlines and reef barriers. As island nations with distinct cultures and environments, we should incorporate those insular needs on how to better protect our natural resources. Economic growth will have its effect on coastal zones. We should anticipate and plan for this effect, with a vigorous sustainable development emphasis.

In a regional forum such as this, we are reminded of the bigger picture of how the policies, laws and regulations we implement in our islands affect our region and how, what happens – what is negotiated in the global arena, affects our region and our islands.

To those outside the environmental business, it may not be easy to see how “All Living Things of the Earth are One” – how everything is interconnected. The greatest challenge we are faced with in conveying this very motto, which is Guam EPA’s motto, is educating the public on its true meaning. We have challenges every day trying to communicate this. For example, knowing how a healthy watershed affects drinking water quality or a healthy coral reef, will make the job of environmental protection easier, because everyone will know that the maintenance of the quality of our environment is everyone’s responsibility – not just governments or NGOs.

Education is key to making our jobs easier — to protecting our environment through this new millennium. During Monday’s Opening Ceremony of the Officials Meeting, the Honorable Madeleine Bordallo reminded

us that the legacy we leave our children is the responsibility of everyone. Indeed, those of us involved in the 11th SPREP Meetings are charged, through the agencies we work for, to protect, conserve and maintain a safe and clean environment.

We must get our children involved in receiving this legacy. Through education and early practices of good environmental ethics, we will leave a lasting legacy.

Children are vitally interested in the environment, and rightly so. When presented with accurate information, our children not only learn facts, but they also begin to develop critical thinking skills required by the scientific method. They also begin good environmental habits at a young age which they will take with them throughout their lives.

Many environmental issues today, from global warming and climate change to the use of pesticides, have been discussed widely in the media, and children have picked up perspectives that reflect “conventional wisdom” rather than scientific fact. We should educate to ensure that conventional wisdom is reality.

Focusing on environmental education, cooperation throughout the region and integration with the global community, I believe are the keys to help us through the challenges of the new century.

Our meeting tomorrow will require us to formulate strong statements on our cooperative efforts through the Apia and SPREP Conventions and to modify those very same conventions to facilitate our global involvement and interaction. I know that we take our responsibilities seriously, and as environmental stewards, with passion and compassion, therefore will, and I say this with conviction, will do our utmost, our very best in providing guidance.

As we once again adjust our course, and set forth in this millennium to safeguard our environment, our islands, our region, our people and our children, I wish us all Good Fortune and God Speed.

Si Yu’os Ma’ase yan si Yu’os in fan Binendisi.

Environmental Educator of the Year Award

As part of the official opening ceremony, the SPREP Director and Guam EPA Administrator jointly presented the Guam Environmental Educator of the Year Award.

The inaugural *Environmental Educator of the Year Award* is presented to someone who:

- understands and appreciates the vital importance of protecting our natural resources;
- believes in education as a powerful force for positive change;
- motivates, mentors and connects citizens in order to protect our resources;
- and leads by personal example.

The Guam EPA Environmental Educator of the Year was awarded to Ms. Alicia U. Diego.

Ms. Diego is an elementary school teacher in the Gifted and Talented Education Programs in Talofofu Elementary and Inarajan Elementary Schools.

Annex III(a): Provisional Agenda

1. Official Opening
 2. Appointment of Chair and Vice-Chair
 3. Adoption of Agenda and Working Procedures
 4. Director's Overview
 5. Matters for Decision
 - SPREP Action Plan (2001–2004);
 - Corporate Plan;
 - Financial Matters;
 - Position of Director;
 - Apia, SPREP and Waigani Conventions; and
 - Regional Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea Level Rise.
 6. Matters for Noting
 7. Focus Issue
 - 7.1 Global Agreements
 8. Other Business
 9. Timing of Next Ministerial Meeting
 10. Adoption of Report and Ministerial Statement
 11. Close
-

Annex IV(a): Letter from the Chair of the Eleventh SPREP Meeting of Officials to the Chair of the Environment Ministers' Forum

12 October 2000

The Chair
Ministerial Meeting
Eleventh SPREP Meeting
Agana
Guam

Eleventh SPREP Meeting – Issues for Ministerial Endorsement

Dear Sir,

Officials of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) Member countries and territories met in Guam from 9–12 October 2000 to consider matters relating to institutional arrangements, policy, finance and work programme implementation.

The Report of the Eleventh SPREP Meeting is attached for the information of the Ministers. The Meeting particularly wished to bring the following issues to your attention, respectfully seeking your endorsement:

SPREP Action Plan (2001–2004)

Following an extensive period of consultation with Members, Regional Organisations and Non-government Organisations a revised draft of SPREP's Action Plan 1997–2000, was deliberated upon and approved by the Meeting. The Meeting requested that the revised draft *Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the Pacific Islands Region (2001 – 2004)*, as amended, be submitted for Ministerial consideration and endorsement.

Corporate Plan

Many elements of the Corporate Plan were agreed in principle. However, in recognition of additional work required especially on the Organisational Structure and Performance Indicators, the Meeting agreed to postpone endorsement until it can be further considered by the next SPREP Meeting.

Financial Matters

Following lengthy deliberation on the Work Programme and Budget, the Meeting agreed to increase total contributions from Members by 35% in 2001, subject to reservations from delegations which were not able to agree to the proposed increase at this time, but indicated that they would seek their governments' approval on this important issue. They strongly urged all those Members with unpaid contributions to meet their commitments to the Organisation. The Meeting requested Ministers to take steps to ensure that this matter would be resolved as soon as possible.

Position of Director

The incumbent SPREP Director will complete four years in the position on 16 January 2001. Under the Rules, the Director is appointed for a period of four years in the first instance and, with agreement of the SPREP Meeting, may be reappointed for a further two years. The Meeting agreed by consensus Mr Tamari'i Tutangata, be offered an additional two year term.

Apia, SPREP and Waigani Conventions

Officials from countries which are Party to the *Convention on the Conservation of Nature in the South Pacific* (the Apia Convention) and the *Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region* (the SPREP Convention, also known as the Noumea Convention) met on 9 October, 2000 immediately prior to the SPREP Officials' Meeting in a Joint Extraordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties. As well, recognising SPREP's role as Secretariat to the Waigani Convention (once it enters into force), the Officials Meeting discussed the importance of entry into force of the Waigani Convention as a priority. Accordingly, Members requested the Ministers to:

- reaffirm the Apia and SPREP Conventions as the foundation for a regional legal framework addressing environmental issues and agree to revitalise these instruments;
- recall the importance of the Waigani Convention and strongly urge Members to become Party to the Convention enabling its entry into force at the earliest;
- further encourage Members to seriously consider becoming Party to the Basel Convention as soon as possible; and
- put into effect, through ratification by a two-thirds majority, a number of technical amendments to the Apia Convention.

The Report of the Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Apia and SPREP Conventions is attached.

Regional Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea-level Rise

The Meeting finalised the Regional Framework for Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea-level Rise and recognised its importance in building partnerships and assisting Pacific Island Countries understand and respond to Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea-level Rise. It is recommended to the Ministers for endorsement and for transmission to the Pacific Island Forum Leaders' Meeting in Kiribati, October, 2000.

Ministerial Meetings

The Ministers are asked to consider whether the Ministerial Meeting should continue to be at four yearly intervals or at two yearly intervals.

On behalf of the Eleventh SPREP Meeting, I respectfully request you to bring to the attention of the Ministers, the above matters for their formal endorsement.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Gawel

**Chair
Eleventh SPREP Meeting**

Annex V(a): Keynote Address from Regional Director and Representative of UNEP Global Environment Agreements—Challenges for the International Community

Excellencies, Distinguished delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen.

It gives me great pleasure to be here today and address such a distinguished gathering. Let me first extend to you all a very warm LTNEP welcome on behalf of Dr. Klaus Töpfer, our Executive Director. I would also like to observe that this important meeting convened by the Government of Guam, SPREP and the co-sponsors would go a very long way in shaping the course of sustainable development in the Pacific.

When I was contacted by the SPREP Director and a good friend of UNEP, Mr. Tamari'i Tutangata to give a keynote statement, I considered it quite a privilege and gladly accepted. However, the topic which I have been asked to speak about - Global environmental Agreements- is a challenging task, owing to the complex scientific, economic and legal dimensions and sheer number of these agreements. I should emphasize however, that as a driving force behind the creation and administration of many of the major environmental conventions, this is a topic which we at UNEP attaches a great deal of importance to. May I suggest the main question as I see it, is the challenge inherent in these global environmental conventions and this challenge has to be faced by the international community. I hope to be able to shed some light on these environmental issues and problems, which transcend national boundaries and therefore require effective international instruments and agreements to keep them in on course,

A Global Snapshot of Environment and Development

When the first satellite pictures of the earth became available, they not only ushered in a new era of space exploration but also gave rise to a new ecological paradigm for the study and assessment of the environment. I would like to share a poignant excerpt from the seminal report of the World Commission on Environment and Development, which captured this sense very well:

“From space we see a small and fragile ball dominated not by human activity and edifice but by a pattern of clouds, oceans, greenery and soils. Humanity’s inability to fit its activities into that pattern is changing planetary systems fundamentally. This reality from which there is no escape, must be recognized and managed”.

Decades of rapid economic growth and development, often labeled as the culprits of global environmental degradation, nevertheless have a more positive face too. Development, in many quarters, has boosted food production, created employment, brought about rural electrification, better education, healthier citizens with longer life spans, and notable advances in medicine, science, and technology. The problem with the development paradigm therefore does not lie in economic growth per se, but the natural resource intensity or quality of growth. Particularly during the latter half of the twentieth century, development has entailed a burst in the vicious cycle of extraction, production, consumption, and disposal of limited natural resources. For example:

Global Trends in Production and Consumption of Environmental Resources:

Global wood consumption has more than doubled since 1950; Paper use has increased sixfold; Fish consumption has grown fivefold; Water and grain consumption have tripled., Steel use and fossil fuel burning have climbed *fourfold*; More than a doubling of the global population from 2.5 billion to well over 6 billion today.

The combination of these trends has caused the world economy to push up against the planet’s ecological limits. A recent study indicated that carbon emissions which are known to be one of the main causes of global warming, are nearing their peak, while carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere have reached record levels. Biologists warn that we have entered a period of mass extinction of species --the largest die-off since the time of the dinosaurs roaming our planet.

An estimated one quarter of the world’s mammal species are threatened with extinction, as are nearly 13 percent of the plant species.

UNEP Global Environment Outlook 2000 Vanishing borders

A biotic intermingling of unprecedented proportions is taking place as species and microbes that were once neatly contained within geographic boundaries are now let loose by trade and travel. Wind and ocean currents, rainfall, rivers, and streams carry pollutants hundreds or even thousands of miles from their sources. For example, the forest fires which ravaged large areas of In-

Indonesia during 1997, caused transboundary air pollution, known as the haze phenomenon, which affected most of the neighbouring countries by posing a serious risk to public health and economic losses as a result of decreased tourism. On an even larger scale, ozone depletion, climate change and marine pollution are undermining the ecological and economic security of nations, as well as threatening the very survival of low-lying and vulnerable small island nations. It can be easily appreciated that environmental challenges, more often than not, transcend national boundaries.

Global Environmental Conventions

Combating environmental problems of an international scope therefore, requires appropriate legal instruments and interventions, but also an international reach and global commitment, which is what the major global environmental conventions, such as those on Climate Change, Ozone depletion, Biodiversity, and Hazardous wastes are trying to do.

The emergence and strengthening of international environmental agreements is an encouraging sign of the dynamic trend of international cooperation. In fact, one of UNEP's greatest achievements over the past 30 years has been its key role in helping to broker and support new global and regional environmental treaties. To this end, UNEP has established a Division of Environmental Conventions, which among other things, ensures that our own programme of activities is aligned with and complements those of the conventions.

It is important to bear in mind that while most of the global environmental conventions provide a nonbinding basic instrument for implementing activities, their respective protocols build upon the existing framework in greater detail and are legally binding, often including target dates and benchmarks for carrying out stated implementation activities. This sounds quite good on paper, but some of you may ask, "does this actually work" on the ground. Allow me to cite the excellent example of the Vienna Convention on ozone-depleting substances and its Montreal Protocol of 1987. At the time, this was considered to be the most ambitious attempt ever to combat environmental degradation in a specific area on an international scale. Governments from poor countries as well as the rich committed themselves to ultimately phase-out ODS, in use extensively for decades in the multi-billion dollar industries, ranging from computer-chips making to air-conditioners. As you can see, the collective actions of national gov-

ernments, scientists, private enterprises, and individual consumers have brought about decisive results:

The Montreal Protocol on Ozone Depleting Substances: Success Story

- In 1987, the protocol was signed on the spot by 24 nations;
- Ratified by more than 170 countries to date;
- By 1997, global production of the most significant ozone-depleting substance- CFCs- was down by 87 percent from its 1987 level.

But it is equally significant to note that similar developments in other conventions such as Biodiversity, Climate change and Basel conventions have not yet materialised to the same extent, partly because these protocols have been established quite recently. The Biodiversity Convention's Protocol on Biosafety and the Basel Conventions Protocol on Liability and Compensation, for example, were open for signature only this year.

Climate change negotiations

The Kyoto Protocol on the other hand has been around for three years, and yet has not managed to receive a significant number of ratifications by national governments, including industrialized (Annex 1) countries in order to enter into force. The sluggish progress of implementing the protocol is a reflection of the enormous challenges posed by the control of greenhouse gas emissions. It is also a result of the diverse political and economic interests that have to be balanced in order to reach a workable agreement. The Kyoto Protocol and its Buenos Aires Plan of Action will virtually affect all major sectors of the economy, making it one of the most far-reaching agreements on environment and sustainable development ever adopted. There is great expectation from COP 6 at The Hague next month towards moving another step closer.

In spite of the compelling evidence which points towards melting glaciers and global warming, in real terms it is the global economy, rather than the global atmosphere that is more of a determining factor in the eventual outcome of the climate negotiations. The challenge for the international community, private sector, and civil society is to arrive at the same conclusion they reached with ozone depletion — that a major industrial transition is imminent and that economic rewards and environmental benefits will go to countries that adopt inno-

vative technologies and strategies which do not contribute to GHG emissions. It is possible to discern that this is the trend towards which the international community is inevitably moving but the positive impact of this environmental change will depend on the scale and extent and the speed with which it can be brought about.

From the very beginning of the climate change debate, UNEP's aim has been to be an influential environmental voice in efforts to limit climate change and its impact mainly through the following means:

UNEP's Main Role in Advancing the Climate Change Negotiations

- Catalyzing scientific assessment on climate change;
- Launching public awareness and information efforts; and
- Advocating innovative solutions to climate change globally

Over a decade ago, UNEP and WMO established the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), whose groundbreaking First Assessment Report provided the scientific basis for talks leading to the adoption of the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. UNEP is committed to building upon our current enabling activities to support the implementation of the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, and strengthen its contribution towards international action on climate change. For example, we have been quite active in organizing national Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) workshops in about a dozen countries in Asia and elsewhere in different parts of the world. The CDM is a key element of the Kyoto Protocol, which acknowledges the vulnerability of developing countries to the impacts of climate change and the lack of capacity to address the issue. The CDM will provide credit for financing emissions-reducing or emissions-avoiding projects in developing countries. This promises to be an important new avenue through which the international community and private sector will transfer clean technologies to promote sustainable development. I would be interested to learn more about your own experiences, projects and programmes on climate change and explore ways in which UNEP can be of assistance, for example through capacity-budding workshops to develop and promote CDM projects in the Pacific island countries.

Regional environmental conventions: Pacific perspective

So far, I have spoken only of the global environmental conventions - which is really the thrust of this speech.

It is equally, if not more important to also actively support the numerous regional environmental conventions, which are much closer to home and of greater relevance to the people of the Pacific island countries. There is for example, the Convention on the Conservation of Nature in the South Pacific (Apia Convention), the SPREP or Noumea Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region and the Waigani Convention. The Waigani Convention, provides at the regional level, a pragmatic and strong pillar to the Basel Convention on the Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes, while taking into account the specific situation and needs of the Pacific island countries. Ratification of the Waigani and Basel Conventions will also greatly facilitate the implementation of the upcoming and related Persistent Organic Pollutant (POP) Treaty.

In some ways, the ratification and support of regional environmental agreements are more likely to positively impact the environment than their global counterparts, because the parties at regional level often share a common cultural, geographic, and economic characteristics, and can therefore conduct the negotiations with a lot more consensus on the kind of responsibilities which each party must undertake to fulfil their regional environmental obligations. When linked to and mutually supported by the corresponding global environmental conventions, these become potent and effective instruments for engendering sustainable development.

In the ultimate analysis, the international community will have to confront the challenge inherent in global as well as regional conventions, namely in engaging the energies of all stakeholders towards enhanced global environmental management. Finance and transfer of technology are as central to environmental change today as they were at the Earth Summit in Rio. However, the role of the private sector and business and the entire civil society is crucially recognized today for the importance of investments and environmentally sound technology. This was emphasized by more than 100 Environment Ministers at the Global Ministerial Environment Forum (GMEF) convened by UNEP at Malmo, Sweden earlier this year.

The goal must be to open the floodgates of human ingenuity and technological innovation. Experience suggests that economies often respond rapidly and positively to incentives and pressures. As evidenced by the case of the Montreal Protocol, given the right policy environment, the private sector will roll out environ-

mentally friendly and cost-effective products and services faster than many now believe possible.

Synergizing the Inter-linkages amongst Conventions

Presently, there are more than a hundred environmental agreements of a bilateral, regional, and global reach. Many of these address related environmental concerns and thereby complement and reinforce the aims and objectives of each other, while a few agreements may even contradict or undermine the ability of other treaties to be fully implemented. Coordinating policies and strategies between the Conventions and other environmental agreements will both enhance their impact and avoid actions on the part of one that contradicts the objectives of another. Synergies among the agreements clearly exist and should be fully developed. For example, finding avenues to slow the loss of forests in areas that are high in biodiversity and are large carbon storehouses should be explored. Similarly, climate change impacts upon biodiversity, wetlands, species habitat, and land-use patterns. This has been recognized by the secretariats of the respective global conventions and there has been a growing trend of collaboration amongst the various Conventions.

While a number of treaty secretariats are pursuing synergies with one another, the Parties themselves have been adopting decisions that promise to push such collaboration even further. In May of this year, the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted a decision on "cooperation with other bodies". This decision seeks greater collaboration with the Climate Change Convention and its Kyoto Protocol on such shared concerns as dry and sub-humid lands, forest biodiversity, coral reefs, and incentive measures.

UNEP is also working to ensure that the policies pursued under existing conventions remain as mutually supportive as possible. Through our Division of Environmental Conventions, we are identifying synergies and promoting collaboration amongst international agreements. By helping establish synergy and mutual support between the programmes of the Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas

and by streamlining UNEP's support to them while focusing on filling strategic gaps and adding value, the Conventions programme will render a valuable service to the conventions, and promote their effective implementation. Finally country parties of the

conventions will benefit from the programme's work since it will provide them with insights and ideas of promising means of streamlining and rationalizing the implementation of conventions.

Within the context of the overall international response to global changes, it is recognized that there is need to facilitate joint action aimed at finding solutions to global environmental concerns through an issue-management approach. I wish to draw your attention to an important development namely the establishment of an *environmental management group* (EMG), following a resolution adopted at the 54th Session of the United Nations General Assembly last year. As indicated in the proposed terms of reference, the primary objective of this group is to promote coordinated approaches for a broad spectrum of environmental issues within the United Nations system. Through the EMG, UNEP hopes to contribute further to enhance linkages and coordination within and among environment-related conventions and national governments.

While there is a feeling that the pace of international negotiations and ratification of multilateral environmental agreements is often stymied by debates over national sovereignty issues, the experience and trend since Rio, only eight years ago, points to a remarkable accomplishment in terms of establishing issue-based global environmental conventions, securing wide-ranging ratification in many cases, institutionalizing collaborative mechanisms for implementing activities, and setting up protocols, which outline certain rules and regulations, which all contracting parties must comply with. But what happens when not all countries are bound by the same rules, or when a particular country fails to comply with the rules of environmental governance, as enshrined in the Convention text or Protocol? This not only undermines the system of voluntary compliance and self-regulation by countries, but also fails to provide a level playing field, particularly for those developing countries who incur considerable financial costs for compliance.

Moreover, regulation, monitoring and enforcement of the myriad global environmental conventions and their protocols is not something the relatively small convention secretariats, or even UNEP can or is mandated to do. This was a major concern voiced by the Global Environmental Forum in Malmo, Sweden in May 2000. The Ministerial forum responded to this important issue by suggesting that there may be an urgent need for

a greatly strengthened institutional structure for international environmental governance that has the capacity to effectively address wide-ranging environmental threats in a globalizing world.

Just to share with you some recent developments and debates which would in some way mould an institutional architecture, equipped with the mandate and mechanisms to oversee and regulate the international environmental conventions, there has been a proposal, from some quarters to establish a World Environment Organization (WEO). This concept has been discussed in a number of fora and most recently, the initiative has generated interest from the EU Presidency. The proposed establishment of a World Environment Organization is seen by some to be instrumental in the creation of a universal environmental governance system, bringing together developed, developing, and least-developed countries under a common set of international principles.

I should stress that this is only one of many other proposals essentially aimed at strengthening global environmental governance and coordinating the collective efforts of the major environmental agreements. The clamour for greater transparency, accountability and regulation of our planet's finite ecological riches is ever increasing and we all must rise to the occasion and either keep up with the changing times and growing environmental consciousness or be left behind in the global quest for sustainable development.

Rio + 10

Before concluding, I would like to draw your attention to a major event on the sustainable development calendar, which we at UNEP are eagerly looking forward to, as it will shape the environment and development landscape in the twenty-first century. Certainly, the success of "Rio +10" will, in no small measure, depend upon the level of participation and representation of a multitude of stakeholders, including the governments, sub-regional bodies, NGOs, private sector, and civil society in the Pacific, who, together can be expected to play a defining role in improving the environment in the Asia-Pacific region.

As one of the leading agencies of the United Nations family entrusted with making effective preparations for the "Rio + 10" process, UNEP shall be convening a Sub-regional Consultation sometime during the first half of next year to determine the priority environment and sustainable development issues of the Pacific island countries to be clearly conveyed to the "Rio + 10" forum. In this regard, we very much look forward to working closely with SPREP in organizing this important preparatory meeting, which no doubt, would build upon the outcomes of your deliberations here in Guam. UNEP will be willing to assist in the implementation of the SPREP Action Plan in collaboration with the SPREP Secretariat and in so doing make an effort to synergize the process with the preparations for Rio + 10.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I thank you for your attention and for giving me this valuable opportunity to share with you our conviction that the effective functioning of environmental conventions is essential to cope with the regional and global dimension of our environmental problems, which no one country can be expected to manage on its own. I hope this is one of the messages and priorities which will emerge from the sub-regional consultation process in advance of "Rio + 10".

To end on an inspiring note, I want to leave you with an excerpt from the Malmö Declaration, which I feel captures the essence of the kind of planet we all would like our children and subsequent generations to inherit:

"At the dawn of this new century, we have at our disposal the human and material resources to achieve sustainable development, not as an abstract concept but as a concrete reality. As unprecedented developments in production and information technologies, the emergence of a younger generation with a clear sense of optimism, solidarity and values, women increasingly aware and with an enhanced and active role in society – all point to the emergence of a new consciousness".

Thank you very much.

Annex VI (a): The Guam Environment Ministers' Forum Statement

Ministers of Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, the Federated States of Micronesia, French Polynesia, Kiribati, the Marshall Islands, New Caledonia, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tokelau, Tonga, and Tuvalu, along with representatives of American Samoa, France, Guam, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, the Northern Mariana Islands, the United States of America, and Wallis and Futuna, meeting in Guam, 13 October 2000, on the occasion of the 11th SPREP Meeting:

Expressing their appreciation to the Governor, Government (especially the Guam Environmental Protection Agency) and people of Guam for their generous hospitality in hosting the 11th SPREP Meeting including the Ministerial Forum;

Recalling the Ministerial Statement from the Roundtable of Pacific Ministers on Sustainable Development (Auckland, 1998), the Ministerial Statement on Environment and Development, (Nuku'alofa, 1996), and the Forum Communiqué (1993) stating all development in the region "must be both economically and ecologically sound";

Recalling also the outcomes of the Asia/Pacific Ministerial Conference on Environment and Development held at Kitakyushu, Japan in August 2000;

Welcoming progress made within the SPREP Region in the implementation of the Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the South Pacific (1997–2000);

Further recalling with pleasure the recognition of the special case for Small Island Developing States (SIDS) as detailed in the Barbados Programme of Action and the outcomes of the United Nations Special Session on SIDS;

Recognising the significant challenges that remain at national, regional and international levels to mobilise the essential commitment and financial resources required to promote sustainable development consistent with sound environmental protection measures that are to be addressed through the Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the Pacific Islands Region (2001–2004);

Reaffirm their commitment to environmental protection for sustainable development;

Adopt the Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the Pacific Islands Region (2001–2004) that will assist people of the Pacific islands to be better able to plan, protect, manage and use their environment for sustainable development by focusing on pollution and waste management, biodiversity conservation, climate change and variability, and economic development;

Stress that the development and strengthening of institutional capacity, human resources, communications and information systems will be essential to the implementation of the Action Plan;

Agree to put in place or strengthen arrangements at the national level to implement the Action Plan (2001–2004), including support for national focal points, the mainstreaming of environment within national policies and programmes, the further strengthening of partnerships with NGOs and the private sector; and a national consultative process that will link the development of regional programmes to national priorities;

Request that the SPREP Secretariat pay particular attention to the establishment of baselines for monitoring and reporting environmental performance and to the implementation of the Action Plan;

Highlight the importance of effective management and conservation of coastal and oceanic resources to the environment and livelihoods of Pacific Island people, and in this regard, welcome the successful conclusion of the Convention for the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Central and Western Pacific and other global fisheries arrangements and call upon members to become Parties to these instruments, look forward to the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for International Waters and support the development of a Regional Ocean Policy;

Welcome the efforts to establish a South Pacific Whale Sanctuary through the International Whaling Commission and **agree** to continue to support efforts to pro-

mote the adoption of a Sanctuary, whale conservation and associated eco-tourism development;

Highlight the urgent need to improve the management and disposal of solid and hazardous wastes in island countries throughout the region;

Agree to strengthen the SPREP Secretariat, to focus on its advisory and programme development capacity;

Call on traditional development partners and the international community to provide further support for the implementation of the Action Plan (2001-2004), including the Regional Trust Fund for Nature Conservation currently being established;

Call on the SPREP Secretariat to develop, with CROP partners, a collaborative framework for mainstreaming environmental protection within the region's development agenda;

Reaffirm the Apia and SPREP Conventions as the foundation for a regional legal framework addressing environmental issues and agree to revitalise these instruments;

Urge Members not yet Parties to the Apia and SPREP Conventions to accede or adopt these Conventions as soon as possible;

Recall the importance of the Waigani Convention and strongly urge member countries to become Parties to the Convention enabling its entry into force at the earliest;

Further encourage member countries to seriously consider becoming Parties to the Basel Convention as soon as possible;

Highlight the importance of effective participation by Pacific Island governments in key international conventions and agreements, including the Global Environment Ministers Forum;

Call on the international community to support Pacific efforts to participate in these international negotiations, in particular the Global Environment Ministers Forum,

the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on Biological Diversity and Rio + 10;

Reiterate their deep concerns about the adverse impact of human-induced climate change, natural climate variability and sea level rise on all Pacific Islands, especially low-lying atolls;

Recognise the importance of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol, which provide first steps towards effective global actions to combat climate change;

Encourage all countries to make every effort to work towards resolution of all outstanding negotiating issues at the Sixth Conference of the Parties (COP6) in The Hague and thereby ensure the environmental integrity of the Kyoto Protocol and that its implementation will result in real and measurable reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and the early entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol, preferably by 2002;

Endorse the Pacific Islands Framework for Action on Climate Change, Climate Variability and Sea Level Rise, and roundtable process, as a comprehensive means of catalyzing action and strengthening partnerships at all levels to address these important issues and call for its immediate implementation;

Recognise that Rio +10 presents a significant opportunity for the international community to re-invigorate the sustainable development agenda at all levels;

Call on the SPREP Secretariat and the international community to assist them prepare for and participate in the 2002 Summit;

Agree to meet as Ministers on a biennial basis and preferably to convene the meeting in 2002 before Rio+10 at a time and venue to be determined by the next SPREP Meeting;

Agree to transmit this Statement through the Government of Kiribati to the next Pacific Islands Forum, Kiribati.