



UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME



ECONOMIC & SOCIAL
COMMISSION FOR
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC



SOUTH
PACIFIC
COMMISSION



FORUM
SECRETARIAT

South Pacific Regional Environment Programme



REPORT OF THE
THIRD MEETING OF THE SPREP STEERING COMMITTEE

Noumea, New Caledonia, 30-31 March 1990

South Pacific Commission
Noumea, New Caledonia
April 1990

© Copyright South Pacific Commission, 1990
The South Pacific Commission authorises the reproduction
of this material, whole or in part, in any form, provided
appropriate acknowledgement is given.

Original text: English

South Pacific Commission Cataloguing-in-publication data

SPREP Steering Committee Meeting (3rd : 1990 in Noumea)
Report of the Third Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee,
Noumea, New Caledonia, 30-31 March 1990

1. South Pacific Regional Environment Programme--Management
I. South Pacific Regional Environment Programme

333.7099
ISBN 982-203-127-0

AACR2

Prepared for publication at
South Pacific Commission Headquarters, Noumea, New Caledonia and
Printed by
Quality Print Limited, Suva, Fiji

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

THIRD MEETING OF THE SPREP STEERING COMMITTEE

(Noumea, New Caledonia, 30-31 March 1990)

REPORT

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

THIRD MEETING OF THE SPREP STEERING COMMITTEE

(Noumea, New Caledonia, 30-31 March 1990)

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Introduction	1
Agenda Item 1 - Opening of the Meeting	1
Agenda Item 2 - Adoption of the Meeting Agenda	2
Agenda Item 3 - The Role of Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) in Relation to Future Steering Committee Meetings	2
Agenda Item 4 - Preparation of Proposals for Inclusion in SPREP's 1991-92 Work Programme	3
Agenda Item 5 - Status of Apia and SPREP Conventions: A Progress Report - SPREP Legal Adviser	3
Agenda Item 6 - Biennial Report to South Pacific Forum and South Pacific Conference	5
Agenda Item 7 - SPREP Financial Report for 1989	6
Agenda Item 8 - Task Team - Emergency Request from Governments	7
Agenda Item 9 - Proposed Budget Revision for 1990	7
Agenda Item 10- Fund-Raising Efforts by the Secretariat	8
Agenda Item 11- Funding of the ASPEI Representative to Steering Committee Meetings	9
Agenda Item 12- The Future for SPREP	9
Agenda Item 13- Report on the Preparation of Ministerial Level Conference on the Environment in Asia and the Pacific (10-16 October 1990, Bangkok)	14
Agenda Item 14- Regional and Other International Conferences	15
Agenda Item 15- UNDP/SPREP Workshop on Sustainable Development	15
Agenda Item 16- Other Business	15

CONTENTS *(Continued)*

Agenda Item 17-	Date and Venue for the Next Steering Committee Meeting	17
Agenda Item 18-	Adoption of the Meeting Report	18
Agenda Item 19-	Closing of the Meeting	18
ANNEX 1 -	List of Participants	19
ANNEX 2 -	Agenda	25
ANNEX 3 -	List of Working Papers	26
ANNEX 4 -	Revised Budget	27
ANNEX 5 -	What Future for the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) (A Review Paper)	30
ANNEX 6 -	What Future for the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (Secretariat Note)	52
ANNEX 7 -	Discussion Paper on the Future for SPREP	73

INTRODUCTION

1. The Third Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee was convened in Noumea, New Caledonia, 30-31 March 1990 to provide on-going advice to SPREP in the implementation of its Work Programme. The Steering Committee made up of a small number of representatives of sub-regions (namely, Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia) and other country groupings (namely, Australia/New Zealand and France/U.K./U.S.A.) gives guidance to the programme in between its two-yearly Intergovernmental Meetings. A list of participants appears as Annex 1.

AGENDA ITEM 1 - OPENING OF THE MEETING

2. The Secretary-General of the South Pacific Commission, Mr. Atanraoi Baiteke, welcomed delegates to this third meeting of the Steering Committee and referred to the important role they had to play in providing guidance and direction to the SPREP Secretariat on all matters relating to the implementation of the Action Plan in between Intergovernmental meetings (IGMs). He stated that the Steering Committee is regarded as the vital link in ensuring that SPREP is kept in touch with the environmental needs of the region.

3. He urged delegates to look beyond this year and to discuss how best the programme can meet the increasing demands for its services, keeping in mind the SPREP mission, that is, to provide a framework for environmentally sound planning and management suited to the specific needs of the region. This mission, he said, is not that of the programme alone but one for all the region's inhabitants who are required to work actively, collectively, unselfishly and co-operatively to conserve the environment for themselves, their neighbours and future generations.

4. The SPREP Co-ordinator, Dr. Vili A. Fuavao, conveyed the gratitude of the Secretariat to the delegates for their assistance in guiding the programme in its work. He referred to the fact that 'Environment' has become a dominant international issue and that the region is increasingly recognising that there is sound economic sense associated with environmental protection.

5. He called upon delegates to recognise the need for a partnership between governments, producers, consumers, academics, environmentalists, and NGOs which would work towards strengthening the assets the region already has through the existence of its environmental programme - SPREP - rather than creating more environment bodies. SPREP, despite budgetary constraints and a small number of personnel, had made considerable progress in the implementation of its 1989-90 Work Programme and looked more than ever to the Steering Committee for direction, advice and assistance through decisions and recommendations to determine how best the programme can be strengthened and to determine SPREP's future direction.

6. A message was conveyed from Dr. Stjepan Keckes, Director, Oceans and Coastal Areas Programme Activity Centre (OCA/PAC), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) who sent his apologies for his inability to attend. He wished the meeting to be advised of UNEP's commitment of US\$ 739,000 for UNEP's 1990-91 biennium and reconfirmed UNEP's commitment to the region through SPREP.

AGENDA ITEM 2 - ADOPTION OF THE MEETING AGENDA

7. The agenda was adopted with inclusion of additional items. The revised agenda appears as Annex 2 and a list of working papers as Annex 3.

AGENDA ITEM 3 - THE ROLE OF NON-GOVERNMENT ORGANISATIONS (NGOs) IN RELATION TO FUTURE STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

8. The SPREP Co-ordinator introduced WP.1 on The Role of Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) in Relation to Future Steering Committee Meetings. The need to consider and discuss potential NGO representation at future Steering Committee Meetings had arisen following a resolution submitted to the Second Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee by NGO representatives to the Fourth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas held in Port Vila, Vanuatu 1989. Such representation was requested in recognition of the potential value of having a closer working relationship between SPREP and South Pacific NGOs and in recognition of the existing participation of ASPEI.

9. Additional views were called for from the Steering Committee for incorporation into a paper for submission to the Third Intergovernmental Meeting to be held in September 1990; especially views relating to (i) determination of the potential representative, (ii) status (observer/adviser/other) of potential representation and (iii) funding support for NGO participation.

10. Delegates agreed that in SPREP officers' normal duty travel throughout the region, the Secretariat should develop a roster identifying existing NGOs, such information to be incorporated into the IGM working paper as background information to discussion. It was also agreed that the objectives being pursued in involving NGOs should be outlined in the Working Paper.

11. It was generally agreed that NGOs had much to offer to future Steering Committee Meetings; that the status of a potential NGO participant be that of "observer"; and that the Secretariat would encourage the NGO community to secure funds for participation.

AGENDA ITEM 4 - PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS FOR INCLUSION IN SPREP'S 1991-92 WORK PROGRAMME

12. The SPREP Co-ordinator outlined to delegates the activities being undertaken in developing the 1991-92 Work Programme. These activities included the distribution of a circular letter to member governments and regional institutions calling for project proposals to be submitted to SPREP before the end of April. The Secretariat reported that it is also assisting governments and institutions in their project proposal preparation by sending them a status report of projects under the 1989-90 Work Programme.

13. In response to a question from the representatives of Melanesia, the SPREP Co-ordinator explained that, as a means of attracting additional funds from international organisations, SPREP had packaged its multifarious projects under eleven programme elements; namely Natural Resource Management, Protected Areas Management and Species Conservation; Coastal and Marine Activities; SPREP POL; Land-based and Water Pollution Prevention; Environmental Education and Training; Environmental Information; Environmental Planning and Administration; Climatic Change and Sea Level Rise; Meeting, Workshops and Training Courses; and SPREP Administration.

AGENDA ITEM 5 - STATUS OF APIA AND SPREP CONVENTIONS: A PROGRESS REPORT - SPREP LEGAL ADVISER

14. The working paper on the Status of Apia and SPREP Conventions: A Progress Report (WP.7) was introduced by the SPREP Co-ordinator who outlined the current status of both conventions and described the activities resulting from the provision, on a Consultancy basis, of a New Zealand Government-funded Legal Adviser. New Zealand is keen to undertake this consultancy as soon as possible but requires clarification of the specific tasks involved.

15. The representative of Melanesia explained that the Government of Fiji had acceded to the SPREP Convention.

16. The observer from Australia stated that his country had recently completed ratification procedures for the Apia Convention and that the instrument of ratification would be relayed to the Depository of that Convention (i.e. the Government of Western Samoa).

17. The representative of New Zealand/Australia said that New Zealand had not yet signed or ratified the Apia Convention. He also advised that ratification of the SPREP Convention was a high priority and he expected that the legislation necessary before New Zealand could ratify the Convention, would be passed shortly.

18. The representative of the U.S.A./France/U.K. stated that the United States would be in a position to ratify the Convention by the end of the calendar year.

19. The observer from France explained the ratification procedure for the SPREP Convention and stated that all efforts are being made for such procedure to be completed at the spring parliamentary session (France) of 1990.

20. The representative of Polynesia advised the meeting that the Government of Western Samoa, had indicated its intention to ratify both the SPREP and Apia Conventions by April/May of this year.

21. The representative of Micronesia referred to the actions by the Government of the Republic of Palau in requesting the services of the Legal Adviser which augured well for a possible additional ratification.

22. The observer of the United Kingdom (speaking on behalf of Pitcairn) stated that they would not require the services of the Legal Adviser but nevertheless expected to ratify the SPREP Convention. The likely timing of this is unknown at present.

23. In light of the above notifications, the SPREP Co-ordinator stated that we could optimistically expect the SPREP Convention to come into force by the end of 1990. He also noted that the coming into force of the SPREP Convention requires a number of specific and important actions to be taken. Given that this is likely to happen during 1990, the Steering Committee suggested that there was a need to identify and clarify these actions. The actions and their implication could form the subject of a Working Paper to the Intergovernmental Meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 6 - BIENNIAL REPORT TO SOUTH PACIFIC FORUM AND SOUTH PACIFIC CONFERENCE

24. The SPREP Co-ordinator introduced WP.2, the Biennial Report of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme January 1988 to December 1989 referring delegates to the major activities of the programme over the period. This paper constituted the fourth biennial report of SPREP to both the South Pacific Commission and the South Pacific Forum since the commencement of the implementation phase of the programme in 1982.

25. He outlined the institutional and financial arrangements for the programme, referring to the difficulty of undertaking the many complex activities of the various programme components without the benefit of a clear indication of firm financial support. However he drew delegates' attention to the valuable assistance given to SPREP through the financial support of a number of large international organisations, especially the Programme's strong supporter, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the assistance given by the institutions who make up the Association of South Pacific Environmental Institutions (ASPEI).

26. In response to a question posed by the observer from the Forum Secretariat relating to the level of coordination between SPREP and other bodies on the Climate Change/Sea Level Rise activities, the SPREP Co-ordinator stated that the programme was anxious to avoid duplication of effort on this work and it was for this reason that plans for the holding of a "donors meeting" were currently under discussion by the South Pacific Commission and the Forum Secretariat.

27. The observer from Australia explained that the Climate Change/Sea Level Rise activities under the funding announced by the Australian Prime Minister at the 20th South Pacific Forum in Tarawa, is a technical level activity, still in the project design stage. The Australian government is happy to continue discussions with all parties to ensure that co-ordination of activities on this subject occurs.

28. The adviser of ESCAP stated that one of the preparatory meetings of the Ministerial Level Conference on the Environment in Asia and the Pacific to be held in June 1990 will discuss, among other topics, the global environmental problems of ozone layer depletion, climatic change and sea level rise mainly from the point of view of implications of the issues, impacts to this region, and how the region should respond to meet this challenge. Furthermore, these global issues as they relate to the region will be reflected in the report on the State of the Environment of Asia in the section on Policy Context as environmental trends and projection. This will be discussed in the expert group meeting being organised in April 1990.

29. The adviser from ASPEI stressed his organisation's hope that ASPEI be involved in this large scale Australian-funded Climate Change/Sea Level Rise project, especially in activities associated with training of local people.

30. The observer from the Forum Secretariat supported any action to reduce duplication and stressed the need for greater coordination. In this context it was stated that the Australian project on Climate Change and Sea Level Rise would focus on the monitoring of sea level rise and climatic change whereas the project of SPREP/UNEP/ASPEI were being carried out on the potential impacts of climate change and sea level rise.

AGENDA ITEM 7 - SPREP FINANCIAL REPORT FOR 1989

31. The SPREP Coordinator introduced this Working Paper outlining details of income and expenditure for the year 1989 and referring to the pressure that is placed on SPREP's Voluntary Country Contributions in funding costs associated with the day-to-day functioning of the Secretariat.

32. In the interests of alleviating the pressure on the relatively scarce 'voluntary' country contributions, the observer from the Forum Secretariat suggested that SPREP should investigate the inclusion of, say, a 15% overhead for project administration costs in projects funded by outside donor organisations.

33. Whilst appreciating the SPREP Co-ordinator's views that donor organisations expect SPREP to include staff/administration costs as an "in-kind" contribution to projects, delegates nevertheless endorsed the Forum Secretariat's suggestion and called on the SPREP Secretariat to investigate SPREP incorporating these costs in future project proposals.

34. Delegates, whilst congratulating SPREP, and through them the SPC Finance Section, on the clarity of the financial statement, referred to the need for a more detailed accounting system once the Convention comes into force.

AGENDA ITEM 8 - TASK TEAM - EMERGENCY REQUEST FROM GOVERNMENTS

35. The observer of the Forum Secretariat sought information on SPREP's ability to respond to ad hoc urgent requests for technical advice and action. The Secretariat explained that a contingency fund was maintained for this purpose and gave examples of how this had operated successfully in the past. It was emphasised that SPREP gave high priority to these requests and often utilised support from ASPEI and other institutions when responding to these requests.

AGENDA ITEM 9 - PROPOSED BUDGET REVISION FOR 1990

36. The SPREP Co-ordinator introduced WP.4, Proposed Budget Revision for 1990 outlining revisions associated with recent firm commitments of funds following Memorandums of Understanding signed between SPREP and the International Centre for Ocean Development (ICOD) under the Canada South Pacific Ocean Development Project (CSPODP) Agreement on the one hand, and SPREP and UNEP on the other hand.

37. The revised budget, reflecting the additional support to SPREP is attached as Annex 4. The SPREP Secretariat was congratulated on its efforts in attracting these additional funds which were seen as a reflection of the recognised effectiveness of the programme. Delegates endorsed the revised budget incorporating this additional support.

38. As an assurance to the concerns of the adviser from ASPEI relating to loss of funding mid-way through project implementation, the SPREP Co-ordinator reaffirmed the Secretariat's commitment to ensure that once a decision has been made to implement a project, everything within the power of the SPREP Secretariat would be done to ensure the provision of funds through to the project's completion.

AGENDA ITEM 10 - FUND-RAISING EFFORTS BY THE SECRETARIAT

39. The SPREP Co-ordinator introduced WP.5 which contains details of the fund-raising efforts of the SPREP Secretariat and thanked the Government of Australia for its notification of an additional A\$ 390,800 assistance to the programme as outlined in Working Paper 5.Add 1.

40. The SPREP Co-ordinator acknowledged and paid tribute to his predecessor, Mr. Iosefatu Reti, for his part in the fund-raising efforts by the Secretariat.

41. Delegates agreed that a additional budget revision would be required at the next Intergovernmental Meeting to reflect details of the additional funding secured in this Australian notification, precise details of which are still to be discussed between the Australian government officials and the SPREP Secretariat.

42. The representative of the United States of America/France/United Kingdom, the representative of New Zealand/Australia, the representative of Melanesia and the observer from the Forum Secretariat congratulated SPREP on its fund-raising efforts. The latter speaker also alerted delegates to the potential funding of approximately 3,000,000 ECU's for environmental projects over a 5-year period under Lome IV.

43. The observer of the United Kingdom suggested that this source of funding should be further investigated in relation to potential support for the SPREP Trust Fund.

44. The adviser from ESCAP, in reiterating his organisation's desire to continue its past assistance to SPREP, drew delegates' attention to existing SPREP/ESCAP projects currently being implemented, such as the provision of legal assistance to the Solomon Islands.

45. He also mentioned that ESCAP assistance on environment in the South Pacific are channelled through three routes: (1) joint programmes with SPREP, (2) directly to the countries at their request, and (3) by inviting participants of South Pacific countries to regional or sub-regional workshops and seminars.

AGENDA 11 - FUNDING OF THE ASPEI REPRESENTATIVE TO STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

46. The SPREP Co-ordinator introduced WP.9 on Funding of the ASPEI Representative to Steering Committee Meetings the purpose of which was to discuss a possible anomaly in the decisions made by the First Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee and the Terms of Reference of the Steering Committee.

47. Following considerable discussion of this agenda item, and assurances from the meeting of the value they attributed to the participation of ASPEI at Steering Committee meetings as an important resource, it was agreed that funding of their future attendance should be discussed on a case-by-case (meeting-by-meeting) basis with the SPREP Secretariat and should be subject to the availability of funds.

48. The SPREP Co-ordinator gave his assurance that the Secretariat would do all possible to ensure that ASPEI participation was funded through SPREP.

AGENDA ITEM 12 - THE FUTURE FOR SPREP

49. The SPREP Co-ordinator introduced the paper WP.6, What Future for the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) (a review paper), (See Annex 5) together with the original paper What Future for the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (Secretariat Note) which had been previously submitted to the Second Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee (See Annex 6), the Steering Committee views on which were requested for inclusion in an up-dated working paper that will be distributed at the Intergovernmental Meeting to be held in September 1990.

50. This review paper was an expansion of a paper previously presented by the SPREP Secretariat to the Second Meeting of the Steering Committee held in Port Vila, September 1989, that meeting having recommended that the Secretariat broaden its original paper to also include:

- information on the nature of the technical/professional staff expansions,
- views of UNEP and other organisations,
- the future relationship of SPREP to the scientific and technical institutions such as ASPEI,
- discussion of who SPREP would be responsible to, and
- SPREP's future relationship to the South Pacific Commission.

51. Following considerable discussion the Steering Committee determined that WP.6 should be given wide distribution to appropriate high level authorities among member countries and other interested parties. The Committee could not reach a consensus to endorse all of the paper's observations, conclusions and recommendations, however. The view of at least one member of the Steering Committee was that it is not within the authority of the Steering Committee to prejudge the institutional future of SPREP; whereas this is certainly a major responsibility of the Intergovernmental Meeting.

52. Delegates agreed that, to accommodate both the majority view and the divergent view relating to the recommendation proposed by the Secretariat for the process of direct SPREP reporting to the Forum Meeting, a revised wording would be appropriate as follows:

"Request the Secretary-General to consider asking the SPREP Coordinator to attend the 1990 Forum Meeting in order to report on the regional environment programme."

53. The meeting endorsed the recommendation that SPREP liaise with SPC on operational matters which bring more functional autonomy to the SPREP Secretariat.

54. During discussion of WP.6 delegates' attention was drawn to two other working papers (WP.6/Add.1 and WP.6/Add.2) that contained additional comments received immediately prior to the meeting from both the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) Pacific Operations Centre (EPOC). In recognition of its importance, the working paper on this agenda item is appended to the report. This working paper now also includes the additional material contained in WP.6.Add.1 and WP.6.Add.2.

55. The observer from the Forum Secretariat stated that the 'Future for SPREP' had been discussed at the recent meeting of South Pacific Organisations Coordinating Committee (SPOCC) held at the Forum Secretariat headquarters in Suva. This meeting of organisations had agreed that a decision on the future of SPREP should await the coming into force of the SPREP Convention. He referred delegates to article 21 of that Convention in which the SPC is entrusted with secretariat functions.

56. He reported that SPOCC recognised a need for greater political input to SPREP and a need for more autonomy but stated that any decision on SPREP's future should be deferred.

57. UNEP stated that any decision taken by the governments of the South Pacific on the future for SPREP is of great importance to UNEP. They view the ratification/accession of the SPREP Convention as the central and most important issue with regard to the future for SPREP and thus call upon the Secretariat to intensify its campaign to bring the Convention into force.

58. Full details of UNEP's views on the future for SPREP are contained in Annex 5.

59. EPOC, too, stressed the importance of the ratification of the Convention to this issue because ratification would establish a separate legal entity and ensure that the administrative arrangements and decision making machinery would be clearly and firmly in place. They foresee, too, that this new legal entity would have political clout and thus could more easily secure funds. EPOC's full views are contained in Annex 5.

60. The adviser from ESCAP stated that his organisation's position vis-a-vis SPREP had previously been made at the Intergovernmental Meeting on the SPREP Action Plan held in 1988. ESCAP would like to see SPREP strengthened and is keen, where possible, to channel available funds to support the programme.

61. The representative of New Zealand/Australia stated that the New Zealand government is currently reviewing its South Pacific policies and this review would be completed by the end of April. This report would give consideration to the future of SPREP. For the moment he could say that the view of New Zealand/Australia is that they are sympathetic to increased autonomy for SPREP, to strengthening it and enabling it to more effectively fulfill its functions.

62. The representative of Melanesia accorded with the view of giving SPREP more autonomy but stressed that it was important for SPREP to continue to come under both the South Pacific Commission and the Forum Secretariat and to benefit from the resources available to both these organisations.

63. The representative of Polynesia stated that his sub-region supported an expansion and strengthening of SPREP, stressing that the issue of the voluntary nature of SPREP's funding needed addressing.

64. The representative of Micronesia stated that his sub-region, made up of a number of small states, saw the importance of having a regional organisation (SPREP) to provide technical assistance. They supported more independence for SPREP's operation to enable it to provide greater technical assistance and expertise. He congratulated the Secretariat on the expanded paper.

65. The representative of USA/France/UK congratulated the Secretariat on its very thorough expanded paper. His sub-group's view was that it was not appropriate to restructure SPREP as an independent entity prior to the Convention coming into force. As well, he questioned the assumption made in the working paper that the creation of an independent entity would result in increased funds. He expressed great difficulty in accepting that the Steering Committee has the mandate to decide issues such as direct receipt of funds from donors, separate letterheads and Forum reporting. He urged delegates to refer these questions to discussion by the forthcoming Intergovernmental Meeting.

66. Considerable discussion and deliberation ensued over these issues and the differing interpretations of SPREP's institutional arrangements as outlined in Resolution 3 of the Report of the Conference on the Human Environment, Rarotonga in 1982, from which SPREP derives its mandate.

67. In the interests of clarification, the Secretary-General of the South Pacific Commission stated that as regards SPREP reporting to the South Pacific Conference, this is only done directly by SPREP when such an action is delegated by the Secretary-General himself.

68. The Secretary-General reiterated his views expressed at both the Second Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee and the recent South Pacific Organisations Coordinating Committee (SPOCC) meeting. The South Pacific Commission (SPC) recognises SPREP as a "different important animal" to other SPC programmes referring to his organisation's wish to gladly give more autonomy to this programme.

69. To assist the meeting in moving ahead on discussion of the Future of SPREP and thus providing some practical guidance for the further deliberations of the Intergovernmental meeting, the representative of New Zealand/Australia suggested that delegates should produce a discussion paper identifying the key questions that the Steering Committee would like to be addressed by the Intergovernmental Meeting. This discussion paper appears as Annex 7. The Forum Secretariat observer questioned whether the Intergovernmental Meeting could deliberate on the relationship between SPREP and the Forum Secretariat. He noted that there would be a need for discussion of this issue at the appropriate level.

AGENDA 13 - REPORT ON THE PREPARATION OF MINISTERIAL LEVEL CONFERENCE ON THE ENVIRONMENT IN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC (10-16 OCTOBER 1990, BANGKOK)

70. Whilst making a presentation of the information document on the preparation of Ministerial Level Conference on the Environment in Asia and the Pacific, the adviser of ESCAP outlined the objectives that it was hoped would be achieved by that Meeting.

71. The presentation highlighted the various decisions of the ESCAP commission and committees concerning date, venue and agenda of the Conference. The Conference will be held in Bangkok, 10-16 October 1990. The papers to be presented at the Conference and preparatory meetings to review those papers where the Pacific countries will also be invited to participate were mentioned.

72. In conjunction with this Conference, ESCAP is also organising an Exhibition on Clean Technology, Cleantech 1990 and an NGO/Media Symposium on the theme 'Communication for Environment'. The purpose of the Exhibition is to create awareness about clean low waste and non-waste technology. The symposium, besides allowing the media and NGO discussion at popular and "grass root" level of issues, will permit interaction with the Ministerial Level Conference.

73. The importance of the participation of the Pacific countries at the Ministerial level was mentioned in the presentation. Through this Committee, the representative of ESCAP further stressed that every effort should be made for Pacific representation in order for the issues of the sub-region to receive proper attention at the Conference.

AGENDA ITEM 14 - REGIONAL AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

74. The observer from Australia reported on Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) developments, particularly the successful meeting at the Coastal Zone Management Subgroup of the Response Strategies Working Group held in Perth (February 1990) at which many Pacific Island governments were represented with coordination by SPREP. He also noted that the IPCC Special Committee on the Participation of Developing Countries will be seeking input into its report, which SPREP and Australia will seek from governments of the South Pacific region. He also noted that Australia will be hosting a regional meeting in late May 1990 on participation of South Pacific governments in the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES).

AGENDA ITEM 15 - UNDP/SPREP WORKSHOP ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

75. The SPREP Co-ordinator informed the Steering Committee of SPREP co-sponsorship of the above Workshop in which the SPREP Secretariat will participate. The ASPEI observer added that SPACHEE is also a co-sponsor and that ASPEI members will be participating and organising the workshop as well as the Fiji government.

AGENDA ITEM 16 - OTHER BUSINESS

76. The SPREP Co-ordinator reported briefly on his recent visit to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Headquarters and noted that the Government of New Zealand, Australia and France were members of the UNEP Governing Council. He urged the representatives of those governments to request that their delegations to the UNEP Governing Council represent the interests of SPREP and the South Pacific region.

77. He indicated that SPREP was seeking assistance with access to scientific data relevant to the ocean processes and properties aspect of SPREP POL. He requested the representatives of the Governments of New Zealand, Australia and France to assist with the provision of this data and to encourage their governments and appropriate research institutions to participate in SPREP POL. The representative of New Zealand/Australia and the observer from France later expressed the interest of those countries in assisting in this matter.

78. The SPREP Co-ordinator also referred to the proposal to convene a meeting of donor agencies later in the year and explained that this Secretariat's initiative seeks to increase and better co-ordinate aid for addressing environmental issues in the South Pacific region. He noted that this has been discussed with the South Pacific Commission which supports this initiative.

79. A general discussion on the proposed meeting of donors followed in which Steering Committee members expressed support for the idea as a means for supporting organisations to more systematically understand the actions being taken on environmental issues in the region and reduce duplications. The representative from the United States of America expressed strong support for such an initiative and indicated USAID assistance in covering the meeting may be available.

80. The SPREP Co-ordinator pointed out that the meeting will be an opportunity to highlight to donors the environmental needs of the region, especially as expressed by governments in the SPREP Work Programme, and particularly those priority areas which have not gained much support.

81. The observer from the Forum Secretariat also supported the donor meeting initiative as a means of furthering the co-ordination of environmental management in the region. He noted the collaboration being pursued between the Forum Secretariat and SPREP such as for the regional meeting on a proposed Bio-diversity Convention and he looked forward to increased co-operation between the organisations.

82. The SPREP Co-ordinator also informed the Steering Committee of his attendance at a meeting sponsored by UNEP and the Centre for Our Common Future regarding the planning for the 1992 Global Conference on Environment and Development at which the role of SPREP, in assisting and co-ordinating the South Pacific region input into the global conference, was recognised by UNEP and the Centre for Our Common Future.

83. The SPREP Co-ordinator informed the Meeting that the SPREP Environmental Education Officer, Ms. Neva Wendt had tendered her resignation and would be leaving the Programme in July after over 6 years of dedicated service. He paid tribute to Ms. Wendt's many achievements both for SPREP and the countries of the region.

84. All members of the Steering Committee and observers voiced their strong appreciation and gratitude for the tremendous efforts Ms. Wendt has made in the region and wished her well.

AGENDA ITEM 18 - DATE AND VENUE FOR THE NEXT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

85. The Steering Committee agreed that it was not necessary to have another Steering Committee Meeting before the next Intergovernmental Meeting, which is scheduled for 24-28 September 1990.

86. In relation to future Steering Committee and Intergovernmental Meetings, the representative of New Zealand/Australia reiterated the need for working papers to be circulated to all governments well in advance of the meetings as agreed at the Second Steering Committee Meeting. The observer from France expressed appreciation of the Secretariat's efforts to distribute well prepared meeting documents, but stressed the need for these documents to be available in both English/French and for interpretation to be available at meetings as stated in the Steering Committee Terms of Reference, which clearly state that both English and French are the working languages of the Steering Committee.

87. The representative of the United States of America/France/United Kingdom stated that the preceding intervention by the observer from France represented the views of the entire U.S./France/U.K. sub-group in this issue, particularly in recognition of the fact that four of the SPREP member governments are franco-phone.

88. The SPREP Co-ordinator assured the Steering Committee that all efforts would be made to provide and distribute documents for future Steering Committee and Intergovernmental Meetings in both English and French well in advance of the meetings.

89. The Steering Committee noted with concern that the support services that SPC is to provide to SPREP by virtue of Resolution 3 of the Rarotonga Conference have not allowed so far the timely distribution of documents both in English and in French and appreciated the suggestion by the SPREP Co-ordinator to take the matter up further with SPC Management.

90. The observer from France and the representative of United States of America/France/United Kingdom sought clarification on the meaning of "Parties" and their role in relation to the Intergovernmental Meeting. The Secretariat explained that "Parties" referred to governments which have ratified or acceded to the SPREP Convention and that meetings of the Contracting Parties will be the sovereign authority over the administration of the SPREP Convention. The Secretariat further noted that the Meeting of the Parties will have to sort out the relationship of Parties to the Convention, to governments which have signed but not ratified or acceded to the Convention and to governments which participate in SPREP but have not signed, ratified or acceded to the SPREP Convention.

AGENDA ITEM 19 - ADOPTION OF THE MEETING REPORT

91. The Meeting adopted the report.

AGENDA ITEM 20 - CLOSING OF THE MEETING

92. The SPREP Co-ordinator expressed his appreciation to the meeting for the guidance and direction that was given to SPREP. The presence in numbers of meeting participants was a reaffirmation of how important environmental issues have become in the region. Thanks was given to the Chairperson for his guidance and for conducting the meeting. The Co-ordinator stated that the SPREP Secretariat will endeavour to implement the meeting's suggestions and advice and reassured delegates that every effort will be made towards this end.

93. The Chairperson expressed his thanks to delegates to the SPC as host, and to the SPREP Secretariat for the support services and hospitality provided. His appreciation went to the Secretary-General for his involvement in the meeting. Appreciation on behalf of the Micronesian Nations for all of Ms. Wendt's hard and valuable work was also noted. He expressed thanks to the Interpreter for her hard work in facilitating the meeting for the observer from France.

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

**THIRD MEETING OF THE SPREP STEERING COMMITTEE
(Noumea, New Caledonia, 30-31 March 1990)**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

GOVERNMENTS

American Samoa

(Representing Polynesia)

Mr Pati Fai'ai
Executive Director of Environmental
Protection Agency (EPA)
Office of the Governor
PAGO PAGO
American Samoa 96799

Telephone : (684) 633-2304
Telex : GOVERNOR 501 SB
Fax : (684) 633-5801

**Federated States of
Micronesia**

(Representing Micronesia)

Dr Eliuel K. Pretrick
Secretary (Minister)
Department of Human Resources
P.O. Box PS 70
PALIKAR, Pohnpei
Federated States of Micronesia 96941

Telephone : (691) 320-2619
Telex : 729-6807 FSMGOV FM
Fax : (691) 379-2823

- Fiji**
(Representing Melanesia)
 Mr Bhaskaran Nair
 Chairman
 Environment Management Committee
 Director
 Department of Town and Country Planning
 P.O. Box 2350
 Government Buildings
 SUVA
 Fiji
- Telephone : (679) 211 759
 Telex : 2167 FOSEC FJ
- New Zealand**
*(Representing New Zealand/
 Australia)*
 Mr Paddy Gresham
 Acting Deputy Secretary (Technical and Support)
 Ministry for the Environment
 P.O. Box 10362
 WELLINGTON
 New Zealand
- Telephone : (04) 734-090
 Fax : (04) 710-195
- United States of America**
*(Representing U.S.A./
 France/U.K.)*
 Dr James Osborn
 Deputy Mission Director
 U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
 Regional Development Office/South Pacific
 P.O. Box 218
 SUVA
 Fiji
- Telephone : (679) 311 399/321 974
 Telex : 2647 USAID FJ
 Fax : (679) 300 075

OBSERVERS/ADVISORS
ORGANISATIONS

**Association of South
Pacific Environmental
Institutions (ASPEI)**

Dr Bill Aalbersberg
The University of the South Pacific
P.O. Box 1168
SUVA
Fiji

Phone : (679) 313 900
Telex : FJ 2276 USP
Fax : (679) 301 305

**Economic and Social
Commission for Asia and
the Pacific (ESCAP)**

Dr R. Karim
Senior Expert on Environment of IHE Division
ESCAP
United Nations Building
Rajadamnern Avenue
BANGKOK 10200
Thailand

Phone : (662) 282 9161-200 Ext. 1612
Telex : 82315 ESCAP TH
Fax : (66)(2) 28 29 602

Forum Secretariat

Dr Roman Grynberg
Economic Adviser
Forum Secretariat
P.O. Box 856
SUVA
Fiji

Telephone : 312600
Telex : 2229
Fax : (679) 302204

OBSERVERS/ADVISORS
GOVERNMENTS

Australia

Mr Allan Haines
 Director
 Marine Protection Section
 Department of Arts, Sport, the Environment,
 Tourism and the Territories (DASETT)
 G.P.O. Box 787
 CANBERRA ACT 2601
 Australia

Telephone : (06) 246 7207/ 274 1440
 Telex : TERDIV AA 62162
 Fax : 0011-06-274 1123

Mr Peter Heyward
 Environment Section
 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
 CANBERRA ACT 2600
 Australia

Telephone : (06) 261 2351
 Fax : (06) 261 3424

Mr Chris Wheeler
 Pacific and PNG Branch
 Australian International Development
 Assistance Bureau (AIDAB)
 G.P.O. Box 887
 CANBERRA ACT 2601
 Australia

Telephone : (06) 276 4000
 Telex : 62631
 Fax : (61) 6 248 7521

OBSERVERS/ADVISORS (Continued)
GOVERNMENTS

France

Mr Alain Gouhier
 Second Délégué français à la Commission du Pacifique Sud
 Délégation française
 B.P. 8043
 NOUMEA
 Nouvelle-Calédonie

Telephone : (687) 26.16.03
 Telex : 3095 NM DELFRA

United Kingdom

Dr Nick Willoughby
 Fisheries Adviser
 British Development Division in the Pacific (BDDP)
 Private Mail Bag
 SUVA
 Fiji

Telephone : (679) 301 744
 Telex : FJ 2289 BDDP SUVA
 Fax : (679) 301 218

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION
COMMISSION DU PACIFIQUE SUD
P.O. Box D5
NOUMEA CEDEX
New Caledonia
Telephone : (687) 26.20.00
Fax : (687) 26.38.18

Mr Atanraoi Baiteke
Secretary-General

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (SPREP)
PROGRAMME REGIONAL OCEANIEEN DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT (PROE)

Dr Vili Fuavao
Co-ordinator

Ms Neva Wendt
Project Officer (Environmental Education)

Mr Paul Holthus
Project Officer (Scientist)

Mr Peter Thomas
Project Officer (Protected Areas)

Mrs Lisa Weaver-Gosselin
Secretary (SPREP)

Miss Marie-Thérèse Bui
Project Assistant (SPREP)

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION SECRETARIAT
South Pacific Commission
P.O. Box D5
NOUMEA CEDEX
New Caledonia

Ms Dominique Toulet
Interpreter

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**THIRD MEETING OF THE SPREP STEERING COMMITTEE
(Noumea, New Caledonia, 30-31 March 1990)****A G E N D A**

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Meeting Agenda
3. The Role of Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) in Relation to Future Steering Committee Meetings (WP.1)
4. Preparation of Proposals for Inclusion in SPREP's 1991-92 Work Programme
5. Status of Apia and SPREP Conventions: A Progress Report (WP.7) - SPREP Legal Adviser
6. Biennial Report to South Pacific Forum and South Pacific Conference (WP.2)
7. SPREP Financial Report for 1989 (WP.3)
8. Task Team - Emergency Request from Governments
9. Proposed Budget Revision for 1990 (WP.4)
10. Fund-Raising Efforts by the Secretariat (WP.5)
11. Funding of the ASPEI Representative to Steering Committee Meetings (WP.9)
12. The Future for SPREP (WP.6)
13. Report on the Preparation of Ministerial Level Conference on the Environment in Asia and the Pacific (10-16 October 1990, Bangkok) (WP.8)
14. Regional and Other International Conferences
15. UNDP/SPREP Workshop on Sustainable Development
16. Other Business
17. Date and Venue for the Next Steering Committee Meeting
18. Adoption of the Meeting Report
19. Closing of the Meeting

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

**THIRD MEETING OF THE SPREP STEERING COMMITTEE
(Noumea, New Caledonia, 30-31 March 1990)**

LIST OF WORKING PAPERS

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Working Paper 1 | - | The Role of Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) in Relation to Future Steering Committee Meetings |
| Working Paper 2 | - | Biennial Report on the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme January 1988 to December 1989 (<i>Biennial Report to South Pacific Forum and South Pacific Conference</i>) |
| Working Paper 3 | - | SPREP Financial Report for 1989 |
| Working Paper 4 | - | Proposed Budget Revision for 1990 |
| Working Paper 5 | - | Fundraising Efforts by the Secretariat |
| Working Paper 5.Add.1 | | Advice by the Government of Australia of Additional Funding during 1990 |
| Working Paper 6 | - | What Future for the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) (a review paper) |
| Working Paper 6.Add.1 | | Comments by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (EPOC) |
| Working Paper 6.Add.2 | | Additional Comments by UNEP |
| Working Paper 7 | - | Status of Apia and SPREP Conventions. A Progress Report - <i>SPREP Legal Adviser</i> |
| Working Paper 8 | - | Preparations for the Ministerial-Level Conference on the Environment in Asia and the Pacific (10-16 October 1990, Bangkok) |
| Working Paper 9 | - | Funding of the ASPEI Representative to Steering Committee Meetings |
| Information Paper 1 | - | General Comments by Vanuatu on Items under the Provisional Agenda |

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS
FOR PERIOD 1 JANUARY 1990 TO 28 FEBRUARY 1990

in USD

	<u>ACTUAL</u>			<u>BUDGET</u>
	TOTAL	SOURCES OF FUNDS		
		Voluntary	Extra-Budget	
<u>INCOME</u>				
Balance 1 Jan 1990	77,762	77,326	436	
SPREP Country Fund	151,937	151,937	0	
Extra-Budgetary Funds	13,734	0	13,734	
<u>TOTAL RECEIPTS</u>	243,433	229,263	14,170	
<u>EXPENDITURE</u>				
4001 Natural Resource Management	0	0	0	20,000
	0	0	0	20,000
4002 Protected Area & Species	0	0	0	160,000
	0	0	0	160,000
4003 Coastal & Marine Activities				199,752
1. Surveillance Transoceanographique	5,000	5,000	0	
	5,000	5,000	0	199,752
4004 SPREP POL	0	0	0	110,000
	0	0	0	110,000
4005 Land-based & Water Pollution Prevention				10,000
1. Pesticides Project	425	425	0	
2. Aluminium Can Recycling Project	3,738	3,738	0	
	4,164	4,163	0	10,000

<u>SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME</u>				<i>in USD</i>
<u>SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS</u>				
<u>FOR PERIOD 1 JANUARY 1990 TO 28 FEBRUARY 1990</u>				
	<u>ACTUAL</u>			BUDGET
	TOTAL	SOURCES OF FUNDS		
		Voluntary	Extra-Budget	
4006 Environmental Education & Training				203,000
1. In-Country Teacher Training	1,607	0	1,607	
2. Environmental Theatre	2,607	0	2,607	
3. Curric Development Support-Vanuatu	13,271	0	13,271	
4. Palau Environmental Video	8,000	0	8,000	
5. Palau Environmental Poster	1,000	0	1,000	
6. Envl Education "Grassroots" W/Shop	5,000	0	5,000	
<u>Carry-over Projects from 1989</u>				
99. SPREP Programme Assistance (BDDP)	3,518	0	3,518	
98. Coastal Zone protection Kits	0	0	0	
	35,004	0	35,003	203,000
4007 Environmental Information	0	0	0	30,000
	0	0	0	30,000
4008 Environmental Planning & Administration	0	0	0	110,000
	0	0	0	110,000
4009 Climate Change and Sea Level Rise	0	0	0	47,500
	0	0	0	47,500
4010 Meetings, Workshop & Training Courses				
1. Steering Committee Meetings	5,571	5,571	0	14,000
2. 5th Consultative Meeting	0	0	0	54,000
3. Regional Envl Media W/shop	0	0	0	55,000
4. Inter-governmental Meeting	0	0	0	55,000
5. Biological Diversity Meeting	0	0	0	30,000
6. Protected Area Management W/shop	0	0	0	70,800
	5,571	5,571	0	278,800

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME
SUMMARY OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS
FOR PERIOD 1 JANUARY 1990 TO 28 FEBRUARY 1990

in USD

	<u>ACTUAL</u>			<u>BUDGET</u>
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>SOURCES OF FUNDS</u>		
		<u>Voluntary</u>	<u>Extra-Budget</u>	
4011 SPREP Administration				
1. Project Personnel				296,300
SPREP Co-ordinator	12,151	0	12,151	
Environmental Education Officer	8,175	8,175	0	
Scientific Officer	12,052	12,052	0	
Prot. Areas Mgmt. Officer	7,988	7,988	0	
Secretary & Project Assistant	8,931	8,931	0	
SPREP AVA Officer	1,350	1,350	0	
Temporary Assistant	0	0	0	
	50,646	38,496	12,151	296,300
2. Staff Travel				60,000
SPREP Co-ordinator	1,583	0	1,583	
Environmental Education Officer	9,799	9,799	0	
Scientific Officer	9,174	9,174	0	
Prot. Areas Mgmt. Officer	2,417	2,417	0	
General	0	0	0	
	22,972	21,390	1,583	60,000
3. Equipment				7,000
Expendable	1,047	1,047	0	
Non-expendable	748	748	0	
Operating Maintenance	0	0	0	
	1,794	1,795	0	7,000
4. Reporting Costs				50,000
Printing	20,935	20,935	0	
Mailing & Sundries	3,687	3,687	0	
Communication	3,203	3,203	0	
	27,824	27,825	0	50,000
<u>TOTAL PAYMENTS</u>	152,976	104,240	48,737	1,582,352
BALANCE 28 FEBRUARY 1990	90,457	125,023	(34,567)	

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

THIRD MEETING OF THE SPREP STEERING COMMITTEE
(Noumea, New Caledonia, 30 - 31 March 1990)

**WHAT FUTURE FOR THE SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL
ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (SPREP)**
(a review paper)

PURPOSE OF THE PAPER

To review the Secretariat's paper to the Second Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee on what future for the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme. This is in accordance with the recommendation of the Second Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee at Port Vila, Vanuatu, 13-14 September 1989.

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 In its discussion of the working paper 'What future for the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme', the Second Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee in Port Vila, Vanuatu, 13-14 September 1989 recommended that the Secretariat expands the paper in the following areas:
- (a) the nature of the technical/professional staff expansions,
 - (b) the need to explore the views of UNEP and other organisations,
 - (c) the future relationship of SPREP to the scientific and technical institutions such as ASPEI,
 - (d) to whom SPREP would be responsible, and
 - (e) the future relationship to the South Pacific Commission.
- 1.2 This paper, therefore, intends to add to the existing paper (attached) and thus will endeavour not to duplicate and/or repeat the contents of that paper. As such, it is of underlying importance that this paper is discussed in the context of the existing paper.

2. VIEWS OF FOUNDING ORGANISATIONS

2.1 UNEP

Any decision taken by the governments of the South Pacific on the future for the SPREP is of great importance to UNEP for two obvious reasons. UNEP, ESCAP, SPEC and SPC were the founders of SPREP and SPREP is a part of UNEP Regional Seas Programme acting as the Secretariat for the South Pacific component of that programme.

- (a) UNEP feels that Ratification/Accession of the SPREP Convention is the central and most important issue with regard to the future for SPREP. As such, the SPREP Secretariat should intensify its campaign to get the ten ratifications/accessions required to bring the Convention into force.
- (b) Once the Convention is in force, the Meeting of the Contracting Parties becomes the ultimate sovereign body and legislature of the SPREP with the following functions (in addition to those described in Section 3.5 of the attached papers):
 - formulate the legal and policy matters for the SPREP;
 - provide a sound financial base including decisions (in conjunction with the intergovernmental meeting) on the level of government contributions and the establishment of a 'SPREP Trust Fund';
 - decide the role of non members (non contracting members usually do not participate in the discussion of legal and policy matters);
 - decide the political issues relating to the different status of the contracting parties (independent states, free compact status and territories), and

- define the role of the SPREP Secretariat and the authority under which it operates.
- (c) Assuming that the meetings of Contracting Parties will be defined as the highest authority guiding and supporting the work of the SPREP Secretariat, arrangements should be made to ensure the highest possible degree of functional autonomy for the SPREP Secretariat in all programme, administrative and functional matters.
- (d) The future relationship of UNEP towards SPREP will remain unchanged, provided that SPREP remains part of UNEP's Regional Seas Programme. UNEP's assistance to SPREP will continue to be directed towards SPREP projects and activities falling within the broad mandate and priorities of UNEP.

2.2 Forum Secretariat

(Refer Agenda Item 12 of Meeting Report)

2.3 ESCAP

- (a) It is important that the SPREP Convention be ratified as early as possible. Upon ratification some of the issues which were discussed will begin to fall in place.

Ratification will establish a separate legal entity, members of which will be the signatory Governments. This will ensure that the administrative arrangements and the decision making machinery of the organisation will be clarified and put in place. The Apex Governing Body will be made up of Government officials or Ministers who will perhaps meet annually or biennially. Under this, I assume will the steering committee made up of officials who will be responsible for formulation of policies and programmes and approval of the budgets. Management will be responsible for the implementation of the policies and programmes and also for securing the necessary funding from various sources of the carrying out of such programmes.

- (b) The newly established legal entity will have regular source of funds for its running costs from the annual contributions of the signatory Governments. A formula for determining such annual contributions will need to be worked out. It could be simple such as in the case of the FFA or more complicated taking into account a number of macro-economic variables such as GDP, population, government finance and external reserves. The new entity will have the political clout to enable you to secure funds more easily from donors.
- (c) After ratification, the new entity will operate as a very specialised body such as FFA or CCOP/SOPAC. Given the political clout it will have and the interest in environment by donors which seems to be the "in-thing", it appears that there are grounds for optimism with regard to your long term ability to secure fundings.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- 2.4 Much has been said on the advantages/disadvantages of SPREP becoming an independent agency similar to FFA or SOPAC but responsible to SPC and Forum Meeting or remaining as a regional programme hosted by SPC but with more functional independence and operational autonomy. There may also be other options. However, a detailed study to include budgetary considerations cost effectiveness and programme efficiency on all possible SPREP future options, is perhaps required. The Secretariat does not have the technical capability and/or resources to undertake such a comprehensive and important evaluation. Should it be decided that such a study should proceed, it should be carried out in consultation with the Steering Committee and the Secretariat. On completion the study should be referred to the Intergovernmental Meeting for review and further distribution.

- 2.5 In spite of the above (2.3) it is prudent that this Committee should have an explicit indication of whether or not an independent SPREP is consistent with the current thinking of the membership.
- 2.6 In pursuing the views of the founding organisations of SPREP on the future for SPREP, as directed by the Second Meeting of the SPREP Steering Committee, the discussions were usually broad and covered the wide spectrum of SPREP activities including visibility and perceptions of the SPREP. While it is most important to discuss the long-term future of the SPREP, some organisations recommended that in the meantime, the following actions be addressed. The Secretariat endorses these recommendations and fully supports them:
- (i) In keeping with the SPREP Action Plan which set up the SPREP Secretariat as an independent entity within SPC (Section 3.1). SPREP should be more autonomous in its operations even while housed at the SPC.
 - (ii) To emphasise that SPREP is an autonomous programme jointly sponsored by SPC, Forum Secretariat, UNEP and ESCAP, SPREP should have its own compliments slips and letterhead where the four sponsors are listed. It will go a long way in diffusing the notion that SPREP has evolved into a full SPC Programme and will assist in the fund-raising efforts of the Secretariat by clearly identifying SPREP as an independent, jointly sponsored programme.
 - (iii) Because SPREP is also a Forum Secretariat Programme, it should have direct access to the South Pacific Forum Meeting. The SPREP Co-ordinator should table the SPREP annual report at the Forum Meeting as at the South Pacific Conference instead of the current situation where the SPREP report has been incorporated into the umbrella report of the SPC to the Forum Meeting. As of late, environment issues have become major agenda items in the Forum Meeting. It is critical then for the future of SPREP that the Forum Meeting clearly identifies with SPREP as its regional environment programme. FFA and other institutions have benefitted enormously from having the direct access to the Forum Meeting.

3. TO WHOM SPREP WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE, AND THE FUTURE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

3.1 In light of the views of the founding organisations of SPREP given above, the Secretariat wishes to elaborate and expand some of these views.

3.2 The governments of the South Pacific, when adopting in 1982 the SPREP Action Plan in Rarotonga, recognised:

'SPC as host organisation for the SPREP Secretariat and established the Secretariat of SPREP as an independent entity within SPC' (Conference Report, Resolution 3)

3.3 The Meeting of the Parties will be the ultimate sovereign body and legislature when the SPREP Convention enters into force.

3.4 It is also desirable that SPREP should continue to have access to the South Pacific Forum Secretariat and the South Pacific Commission. Both organisations are staffed by competent professionals of different backgrounds and have a variety of Programmes in which SPREP can largely benefit from collaborating with them. Further, SPREP will have the additional benefits of associating with the Forum Secretariat and South Pacific Commission which are internationally recognised organisations of the same objective, i.e. to assist the governments of the South Pacific Region. The exact relationships between SPREP and the Forum Secretariat and the SPC need to be identified clearly. It is crucial that the legal implications of such a relationship do not intrude or compromise the authority of the Meeting of the Parties. This may seem to be an insurmountable task. The fact that all members of the Meeting of the Parties are members of either the Forum Secretariat and/or SPC may play a role in making this task conceivable. On the other hand, the Meeting of the Parties may decide that SPREP becomes an independent and separate entity altogether.

- 3.5 SPREP has been operating under this undefined situation since its inception more than eight years ago. The Intergovernmental Meeting has the sovereign authority over the SPREP Work Programme. At the same time, SPREP has remained responsible, by reporting, to both the South Pacific Conference and indirectly to the Forum Meeting. So far, there has not been a major problem and perhaps this system, with a modification allowing direct reporting to the Forum, should be allowed to continue.
- 3.6 It is emphasised that if there is agreement that this direction should be pursued, then in the first instance what could be worked towards is a notion of functional autonomy. This would include greater independence in the areas such as entering into agreements with support organisations, authorisation of financial commitments, employment of staff, communications and publications policy, etc. The issue of location is of less importance at this stage and may in fact be easier to resolve once the Secretariat has functional independence.
- 3.7 Consideration should also be given to SPREP becoming a member of the South Pacific Co-ordinating Committee (SPOCC). As a regional programme to which 27 Pacific islands and metropolitan governments are members, SPREP should be represented at meetings of SPOCC. This is particularly relevant for SPREP as it is already a joint programme of three of the organisations participating at the SPOCC meetings (Forum Secretariat, SPC, ESCAP) and due to the nature of environmental problems and issues, i.e. they often cut across sectoral and political boundaries and require a co-ordinating mechanism, which in the case of the South Pacific region is SPREP.
- 3.8 It must be emphasised that SPREP is the programme of the countries and Territories of the South Pacific and ultimately it is to these member governments that SPREP must always remain responsible.

4. RELATIONSHIP OF SPREP TO ASPEI

- 4.1 The Secretariat applauds the significant contribution of ASPEI to the implementation of the SPREP Work Programme. It has also recognised that ASPEI is an advisory body to the SPREP. SPREP turns to ASPEI for advice on technical and scientific components of its Work Programme. It is similarly important to point out that SPREP remains the sole regional co-ordinating programme for the environmental activities in the region. Clearly, SPREP and ASPEI have important roles and within these roles it is anticipated that the relationship between SPREP and ASPEI will grow in a spirit of co-operation towards a more productive and harmonious working relationship.
- 4.2 It is crucial that ASPEI membership increases to tap into the enormous resources available particularly the Australian and New Zealand institutions. This is in conformity with the recommendation of previous Steering Committee and Intergovernmental Meetings. The expansion of ASPEI is necessary to keep pace with the increased roles and scope envisaged for SPREP in dealing with the environment problems facing the region. SPREP must have a sound and broad technical base to call upon when needed. ASPEI should invite appropriate Australian and New Zealand institutions to join the association. ASPEI membership has, since its formation, not expanded greatly and this is perhaps due to Australian and New Zealand institutions not being aware of the organisation and its role and functions.
- 4.3 The implementation of the Work Programme is the responsibility of the SPREP Secretariat. As such, the Secretariat retains the authority to use an outside consultant and/or subcontract a component of its Work Programme to individuals and/or institutions outside the ASPEI, when it is necessary to implement aspects of the work programme in an effective, timely manner.

- 4.4 Through the Consultative Meeting and its representative at the SPREP Steering Committee, ASPEI has for at its disposal to enable direct input into the SPREP Work Programme.
- 4.5 The Statutes of ASPEI as agreed by the members in 1986, are attached (Attachment A)

5. NATURE OF TECHNICAL/PROFESSIONAL STAFF EXPANSION

(Note: The Intergovernmental Meeting on the SPREP Action Plan, Noumea, New Caledonia, 27 June - 1 July 1988, had endorsed proposals for the Secretariat expansion. This section presents the staff expansion adopted in that Meeting).

- 5.1 After several years of first hand experience, our vision of SPREP has now become clearer. We have come to appreciate, through SPREP, that co-operation between the peoples and governments of the region can build a future that is more prosperous, more just and more secure. Technology and science now gives us the ability to look deeper into, and better understand, our environment and natural resource potentials and to manage them on a sustained yield basis for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations.
- 5.2 Over the past seven years, the SPREP has maintained its "common touch" with the needs of the people of the region. Its officers have worked diligently in co-operation with the governments and institutions of the region to provide advice and to develop and implement projects covering a wide range of country and regional needs in the environmental management and resource conservation fields. More importantly, the governments now meet once every two years to review past activities of the Programme and to decide on the priorities for future action. These meetings provide a focus for the co-ordination of regional environment activities and the framework within which SPREP will carry out its functions as the region's environmental co-ordination agency.

- 5.3 The important role of SPREP as a referral centre to provide environmental information as requested by member governments and to identify sources of financial and technical assistance which could be made available to the island countries has also been greatly appreciated, as evident from the increasing number of government requests for assistance received by the Secretariat. (Some 161 separate projects for the 1989-1990 Work Programme and even more project submissions, expected for the 1991-1992 biennium).
- 5.4 The activities of the Secretariat have not been limited to those undertaken in co-operation with its member governments and institutions within the region. It has also endeavoured to seek co-operation with other regional and international organisations with similar interests in the South Pacific region, working for the interests of SPREP's member governments.
- 5.5 Apart from the activities undertaken jointly between SPREP and organisations which were members of the former Co-ordinating Group, the Secretariat has also been involved in activities initiated by other international organisations, such as IUCN, IMO etc. As SPREP becomes better known to other UN agencies (UNESCO, WHO, FAO) and donor agencies (ADB, World Bank etc), the programme's co-ordinating role will be expected to expand as support for Work Programme activities increases and joint co-operative ventures with these agencies are developed and implemented. Clearly, in respect of the latter, it is logical and in the best interests of the region that activities of other agencies and international organisations which come within the scope of the Action Plan, should also be undertaken in co-operation with, or co-ordinated through SPREP.
- 5.6 In order to ensure that SPREP is able to cope with this ongoing increase to its co-ordinating role and associated programme activities, it is imperative that the Secretariat be adequately staffed and well supported by an assured level of financial input from participating governments and collaborating agencies and organisations.

Environment Impact Assessment Officer

- 5.7 In a number of Pacific Island countries, the environmental impact of major development projects such as tourism, urban expansion, ports, industries, forestry, mining and commercial fisheries and agriculture are clearly evident. These impacts could have been mitigated or avoided through the prior use of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) procedures.
- 5.7.1 As a result of these experiences, the governments are turning increasingly to SPREP for advice and assistance in conducting EIA on development projects and in training local personnel in this field.
- 5.7.2 Before EIA procedures can be applied effectively in the region, two important needs must be met. The region needs to develop the capacity to carry out environmental assessments of major development projects, and governments' EIA capabilities need to be broadened to cover a cross-section of trained personnel in different ministries.
- 5.7.3 The SPREP encourages its member governments to use EIA to plan economic development in an ecologically sustainable manner. A regional EIA training course was held with ADB support at the University of the South Pacific in 1989. A regional programme to strengthen EIA capability in the South Pacific countries is being jointly proposed by SPREP and UNEP for implementation over the next 5 years (1990-1995), and is the subject of discussion in the following paragraphs. Funding for the initial two years has been pledged by UNEP.

5.7.4 The SPREP/UNEP Regional EIA programme initiative comprises three main elements:

- (i) the development of an EIA Task Team of experts already working in the region who could be available to provide advice individually or who could make up ad hoc teams when necessary to conduct an EIA of a major development project in any of the countries of the South Pacific; and
- (ii) the development and implementation of an in-country or subregional training course in EIA to assist with the strengthening of government EIA capabilities, and
- (iii) develop EIA guidelines suitable for the region.

5.7.5 Members of the Task Team could include specialists from organisations (CCOP/SOPAC, CSC, SPEC) and institutions (ASPEI and non ASPEI members) within the region, the staff of both SPREP and UNEP and technical services and planning officials from within the member governments of SPREP.

5.7.6 The regional EIA Task Team would have the following functions:

- undertake EIAs for governments on request (short term);
- assist in drafting and reviewing of appropriate EIA legislation;
- on request, provide the governments with an independent review of EIAs performed by developers or outside consulting firms;
- advise governments on legislation, administrative procedures and EIA requirements;

- support the development of government policy requiring the application of EIA;
- provide training to governments on the use of EIA by various ministries and planning bodies;
- develop the application of EIA as a tool for implementing National Conservation Strategies.

5.7.7 The training course programme would concentrate on advocating a multidisciplinary, inter-departmental approach to environmental assessment and the use of in-country expertise. Emphasis would be placed on the value of 'scoping' activities, the availability of additional expertise where this may be required and the critical review of Environmental Impact Statements prepared by project proponents. Course follow-up activities would also be developed.

5.7.8 It is envisaged that an EIA Officer position would be established within SPREP to organise and co-ordinate the work of the EIA Task Team, to assist the governments with measures being undertaken to adopt appropriate EIA procedures, and to plan and supervise in-country training activities in EIA.

Environmental Contaminants Officer

5.8 The SPREP Convention requires its parties to either individually or jointly take all appropriate measures to prevent, reduce and control pollution from vessels, land and air-based sources and sea-bed activities. Specific articles refer to the control of the disposal of wastes and the storage of hazardous wastes. The Protocol on the Prevention of Pollution by Dumping contains considerable institutional arrangements (Article 15) requiring SPREP staff responsibilities, including the transfer of information on prohibited (Annex I) and regulated (Annex II) substances and disposal at sea (Annex III). The Protocol concerning co-operation in combating pollution emergencies has extensive institutional requirements (Article 9) of the SPREP staff regarding emergency incidents of environmental contaminant pollution.

- 5.8.1 Pollution problems due to contaminating substances are occurring and will continue to occur, perhaps at accelerating rates, in the countries of the region, if control measures are not undertaken immediately.
- 5.8.2 A SPREP review of South Pacific environmental legislation pertaining to pollution control and contaminant substances revealed that this was seriously inadequate. Where legislation does exist, it is not enforced and often regulations have not been written. Both infrastructure and technical back-up were also found to be absent in most countries.
- 5.8.3 To provide assistance to member governments with measures being undertaken or to be undertaken to prevent, reduce and control pollution to their environment, thus fulfilling their obligations under the SPREP Convention, and to assist the Secretariat meet its responsibilities under this Treaty, it is proposed that an Environmental Contaminants Officer (ECO) position be established within SPREP, initially for a period of three years.
- 5.8.4 Generally, the ECO would provide a query/response service for South Pacific countries and would co-ordinate and assist both in planning and seeking funds for projects throughout the region. His/her specific brief could be as follows:
- (a) To co-ordinate obligations and institutional arrangements for member countries regarding emergencies, dumping and banned and restricted substances under the SPREP Convention.
 - (b) To liaise with the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), the Australian Department of Transport and Communication, the U.S. Coast Guard, UNEP and other interested agencies on the holding of oil spill response and contingency planning workshops, oil spill contingency plan development (national and regional) and the transport of oil and other hazardous substances.

- (c) To liaise with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) on monitoring the use, disposal and clean-up of radioactive materials in the South Pacific region.
- (d) To implement the recommendations of the SPREP Pesticide Report in co-operation with the SPC Plant Protection Officer, to maintain a South Pacific pesticide data base and to provide information as required on human health and environmental aspects of pesticide use.
- (e) To liaise with the Pacific Basin Hazardous Waste Research Consortium concerning their activities in the region and to maintain links with the International Register for Potentially Toxic Chemicals (IRPTC) and keep member countries informed of its listings.
- (f) To co-ordinate with WHO and national public health departments in the application of the WHO Strategy on Control of Environmental Health Hazards as they relate to environmental contaminants.
- (g) To liaise with the U.S. Environment Protection Agency's oil pollution and toxic wastes programmes in the U.S. Pacific Territories, for application to other island countries, as appropriate.
- (h) To develop a training programme in environmental monitoring, control and disposal, and in all aspects of safe use of environment contaminants.

SPREP Training Officer

5.9 Following the 1986 Regional Conference on the SPREP Work Programme for 1987-88 and the signing of the SPREP Convention, an assessment of SPREP's future likely training responsibilities was undertaken. This has resulted in an indicative training programme incorporating the following elements:

(1) Coastal Resource Management and Planning Workshop:

These are in-country workshops usually lasting two weeks involving all government agencies with resource management responsibilities impinging on the coastal or marine environment. Sub-regional participation is organised where appropriate. Two workshops were held in 1987 and one in 1988. More workshops will be organised in future until a regional coverage is obtained.

(2) SPREP Convention Related Training

To assist the countries which are Parties to the Convention and its Protocols to meet their obligations, the following training opportunities are being planned in co-operation with other international organisations:

1988	Regional Workshop on Oil Spill Contingency Planning.
1989	Regional Workshop on Hazardous Substances - Transport, Handling and Storage.
1989/90	Development of a series of practical in-country Pollution Emergency Response training courses.

(3) Protected Area Management and Planning

The following training opportunities in protected area management have been, or will be, provided under the programme.

- 1987 onwards Sponsorship of Pacific island people to the Protected Area Training Course in Turangi, New Zealand. Two islanders were trained in 1987, and it is expected that at least one scholarship will be offered each year.
- 1988 A workshop on Traditional Knowledge, Customary Tenure and Nature Conservation was held in March 1988.
- 1989/90 The development of a Protected Area Management and Planning Course specialising in marine protected areas is being planned.

(4) Environmental Education

- 1988 Regional Environmental Education Curriculum Development Workshop.
- 1989 Regional EIA Workshop.
- 1990 Regional Environmental Media Workshop.
- 1990/91 In-country teacher training workshops.
- 5.9.1 The Intergovernmental Meeting on Climatic Change and Sea Level Rise in 1989, recommended a training programme and a public awareness campaign on the potential impacts of climate change on the countries of the region. As such, in-depth studies on the potential impact of expected climatic changes on natural environment and socio-economic structures and activities for six countries will be undertaken in 1990. Seminars and public lectures are being organised for nine countries in the region starting October/November in 1990.

- 5.9.2 The on-going development and planning of a cohesive long-term environmental training programme for SPREP, based on the needs and requirements of the countries of the region will be essential if SPREP is to maximise the benefits of its training activities and to gather support from international donor agencies for such a programme.
- 5.9.3 From previous experience with the development, planning, organisation and conduct of regional and in-country courses in the South Pacific, the successful implementation of the programme described above would place a very heavy burden on SPREP's existing staff to the detriment of progress in their specialist areas.
- 5.9.4 Notwithstanding the above difficulties, SPREP has an important responsibility to assist the countries meet their training needs in the field of environmental management which is rapidly gaining recognition as a priority area for government action. The Secretariat's ability to effectively meet this demand in the future would be significantly enhanced by the appointment of a Training Officer.
- 5.9.5 The Training Officer will be responsible to the SPREP Co-ordinator and will act in a support role in co-ordination with the project officers to carry out the following functions:
- (i) Long-term planning, development and review of the SPREP Training Programme,
 - (ii) Development and planning of specific courses, workshops, etc. in liaison with other SPREP officers, consultants and country representatives including the preparation of course materials.

- (iii) Identification and liaison/co-ordination with other relevant regional and international organisations and institutions e.g. ICOD, CCOP/SOPAC, UNEP, IUCN, WHO, ADB, ESCAP, World Bank, CSC.
- (iv) Logistical planning and organisation of specific courses together with the co-ordination and participation in the conduct of courses.
- (v) Review and evaluation of course and course materials and the preparation of course reports and recommendations to the host government and sponsoring organisations.
- (vi) Maintenance of participants' records and co-ordination of post-course monitoring and follow-up.

6. SUGGESTED ACTIONS FOR STEERING COMMITTEE ENDORSEMENT

It is recommended that the Steering Committee endorse the following actions:

- 6.1 Request SPC and Forum to send the papers on What the Future for SPREP to appropriate high level authorities in all SPREP member governments.
- 6.2 Authorise the SPREP Co-ordinator to begin the process of reporting directly to the Forum Meeting by attending the 1990 Forum Meeting to represent the regional environment programme.
- 6.3 Liaise with SPC on operational matters which bring more functional autonomy to the SPREP Secretariat.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Committee reviews and discusses this paper, together with the attached, and if deemed appropriate:

- (a) approve it for consideration by the next Intergovernmental Meeting on the SPREP Action Plan,
- (b) comment on the appropriateness of the mission and approach for SPREP, its structure and functions as proposed in the paper as the basis for pursuing independence and self-reliance for the Programme.
- (c) comment on the recommendations of the founding organisations and the SPREP Secretariat, section 2.5 of the paper.

**STATUTES OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC
ENVIRONMENTAL INSTITUTIONS**

1. There shall exist a South Pacific Association of Environmental Institutions.
2. Membership of the Association shall be that of the participating Institutions of the SPREP:
 - (a) Research and Monitoring Network, and
 - (b) Environmental Education, Training and Information Network.
3. At each Consultative Meeting of the above Networks, Institutional Representatives shall elect from amongst themselves, for the subsequent biennium, a Chair of the Association.
4. The functions of the Association shall be those outlined in the Aims and Objectives, which may be amended at Network Meetings as considered necessary.
5. The functions of the Chair of the Association shall be:
 - 5.1 to represent the views of Network members between Consultative Meetings;
 - 5.2 to facilitate the co-ordination and operation of programmes and activities adopted at the Consultative Meetings;
 - 5.3 to co-ordinate the response of Association Members to Governmental and other Agency requests which may be made between meetings;
 - 5.4 to draw to the attention of governments any environmental and resource problems which are identified by Network Members, and to urge governments to take action, where appropriate.
 - 5.5 to co-operate with SPREP Secretariat on organisation of Consultative Meetings and to chair these meetings.

Attachment A to ANNEX 5 (Continued)

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

1. To improve communication among practising environmental scientists and between them and policy makers in the countries of the SPREP Region.
2. To provide a focus for data collection and utilisation, and a mechanism whereby the technical and scientific results of activities, supported by the SPREP Research and Monitoring Network, can be better co-ordinated on a regional basis.
3. To provide a focus for collection and utilisation and a mechanism whereby the results of activities, supported by the SPREP meeting, can be co-ordinated on a regional basis.
4. To improve channels of communications between the practising scientists in the region, particularly those involved in:
 - (a) the SPREP Research and Monitoring Network (RMN) and
 - (b) the SPREP Environmental Education, Training and Information Network (ETIN) and the SPREP Co-ordinating Group.
5. To ensure that technical and scientific data resulting from non-SPREP-funded activities in environmental research in the region are integrated into SPREP activities, and properly used in development planning within the region.
6. To ensure a co-ordinated and integrated approach to external Agency involvement in environmental and resource research and training in the SPREP Region.
7. To support the defined objectives of RMN and ETIN as defined in item 29 of the report of the Second SPREP Consultative Meeting, and the objectives of the SPREP Action Plan.
8. To ensure that the results of activities undertaken by RMN are adequately incorporated into the activities of ETIN.

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Paper submitted to the
SECOND MEETING OF THE SPREP STEERING COMMITTEE
(Port Vila, Vanuatu, 13-14 September 1989)

**WHAT FUTURE FOR THE
SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**
(Secretariat Note)

Purpose of Paper

To present a Secretariat viewpoint on the future directions for SPREP for consideration by the Committee and, if deemed necessary, the Intergovernmental Meeting on the SPREP Action Plan.

1. INTRODUCTION:

- 1.1 The Conference on the Human Environment in the South Pacific (Rarotonga, Cook Islands 8-11 March 1982) formally adopted the Action Plan for Managing the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region (the SPREP Action Plan) and approved the establishment of the SPREP Secretariat to -
- a) serve as a referral centre providing information, identifying experts and institutions to aid participating states, and otherwise assist in solving specific environmental problems;

- b) facilitate information exchange and co-operation among those experts and institutions; and,
 - c) use regional expertise and services where possible.
- 1.2 During the discussion on institutional and financial arrangements, the Conference also decided that the Governments, through meetings every two years of the South Pacific Forum and the South Pacific Conference, should make policy decisions concerning all substantive and financial matters related to the Action Plan. Further, the Conference decided that the SPC, as the host organisation for the SPREP Secretariat, should be responsible to the participating governments and administrations for the overall technical coordination and continuous supervision of the implementation of the Action Plan; this function to be carried out under the guidance of the Coordinating Group consisting of representatives of UNEP, ESCAP, SPC and SPEC (now the Forum Secretariat).
- 1.3 The idea behind the production of this paper is to stimulate discussion and some serious consideration about what lies ahead for the Programme (SPREP) and how it could be strengthened (if it should be strengthened at all) to effectively carry out its diverse and expanding mandate.
- 1.4 The text is arranged in a series of sections which are designed to form a complete overview of the objectives, structure, and operation of the SPREP. The sections are:
- The Mission and Approach of SPREP
 - The Structure of SPREP
 - The Functions and Organisation of the SPREP
 - The Image and Outreach of the SPREP.

- 1.5 No amount of written analysis or organisational review can by itself transform a body like SPREP with its region-wide membership and millions of people affected by its action. An organisational framework is a means to an end - the accomplishment of a mission. But a clear definition of our objectives and approach, efficient organisation and good communications can greatly facilitate our work. Because the SPREP Secretariat has very few permanent staff and operates with resources that are tiny in proportion to the scale of the need and demand from its member governments, it is in continual danger of fragmentation and incohesion, let alone being ineffective. It is hoped that the proposals in this paper will help the member governments, the Steering Committee, the Intergovernmental meetings, the regional and international organisations in support of SPREP, and the Secretariat to work together as a team in the promulgation of the environment message for the benefit of the governments and peoples of the South Pacific region.

2. THE MISSION AND APPROACH OF THE SPREP

The Central Mission

- 2.1 The mission of SPREP is defined in the SPREP Action Plan as: "helping the countries of the South Pacific to maintain and improve their shared environment and to enhance their capacity to provide a present and future resource base to support the needs and maintain the quality of life of the people."
- 2.2 This definition makes it clear that human needs stand at the centre of SPREP's concerns. The SPREP mission is to ensure the future for South Pacific island people, in a stable balance with the natural systems of the biosphere on which that future depends. The goal is to preserve and manage natural resources "in a way that is conducive to the peace, progress and prosperity of island people".

2.3 This message is consistent with that articulated in the World Conservation Strategy, produced by IUCN, UNEP and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) in 1980. It will be expounded further in the development of a World Conservation Strategy for the 1990's (now in progress) and it would be desirable that SPREP's mission should continue to be consistent with the sentiments of this global strategy.

2.4 The central mission of SPREP can be summed up in a single sentence:

"The mission of SPREP, is to help the peoples and governments of the South Pacific to apply their insights, skills and resources so as to develop and sustain the harmony which should characterise humanity's relationship with other components of the environment".

The Approach

2.5 The above mission, if it is to be realised, demands four things:

- a) that the SPREP is authoritative. This means that it must gather knowledge and distill clear insight and compelling guidance. Its science has to be first class, although the scientific and technical prescriptions it develops have to be relevant to the needs of communities interacting with the environment in the real world and applicable by them to enhance their future. If the SPREP's primary task is to provide an intellectual base for conservation and sustainable development, that intellectual product has to be expressed through practical tools and methods.
- b) that the SPREP is outward looking. SPREP can only achieve its objectives by working with and through others. It has to be a catalyst and a facilitator, for example helping Government departments and agencies concerned with the environment to convince political leaders and Ministries of Finance and Development that sound conservation practices mean sound economic development. The "conservation movement" has to face outwards and convince the rest of the world that its message is sound.

- c) that SPREP communicates. SPREP can achieve the results it seeks by drawing on the expertise of national, regional and international experts and institutions and promulgating its conclusions to those who can and will use them. "Outreach" is crucial. If the SPREP's conclusions do not reach users in a convincing and applicable form they will get nowhere, labour will have been lost, and the credibility of the Programme will be diminished.
- d) that SPREP works in partnership with other international bodies (such as the UN agencies, IUCN, WWF, ADB, the World Bank etc), and with non-governmental organisations including the churches, women's organisations and youth clubs. SPREP must have direct access to these NGO's as all have something to contribute to its mission. It is part of the task of SPREP to justify its existence by working in harmony with others and assisting their missions as if they were its own.

Specific Objectives

- 2.6 The SPREP Action Plan was intended to provide a framework for environmentally sound planning and management, suited to the needs and conditions of the countries and people in the region and to enhance their own environmental capabilities. Its more specific objectives include:
- (i) further assessment of the state of the environment in the region including the impacts of man's activities on land, fresh water, lagoons, reefs and ocean, the effects of these on the quality of man's environment, and the human conditions which have led to their impacts.
 - (ii) the development of management methods suited to the environment of the region which will maintain or enhance environmental quality while utilising resources on a sustainable basis.

- (iii) the improvement of national legislation and the development of regional agreements to provide for responsible and effective management of the environment.
- (iv) the strengthening of national and regional capabilities, institutional arrangements and financial support which will enable the Action Plan to be put into effect efficiently and economically.

2.7 As the work of the SPREP has evolved, other forms of action have also proved valuable. The list above could, accordingly, be extended, for example by adding:

- (v) demonstrating sound practices for conservation and sustainable development through carefully chosen cooperative field projects.
- (vi) cooperating with governments, non-governmental organisations, international organisations, aid agencies and others in programmes of mutual interest at international, national, regional and local level (e.g. global programmes on climatic change and sea level rise).
- (vii) promoting the sustainable use of natural resources, as the basis for a durable relationship between humanity and nature, drawing on traditional knowledge and practices wherever such knowledge and practices are considered beneficial.
- (viii) provide training opportunities for local people in the environment sciences and encourage public participation in discussions and decisions on issues relating to the environment.

2.8 Even such a list is not exhaustive, and while it may be prudent to amend the Action Plan to reflect the full span of the SPREP's activities, what is really crucial is that it provides the flexibility essential to the continuing evolution of the SPREP's mission.

General Characteristics of the SPREP's Approach

- 2.9 However its detailed tasks are formulated, the SPREP must remain first and foremost, a professional body with scientific credibility. It is this that gives it political and operational stature. It should stake out its position as the provider of the knowledge, standards and practices that will achieve conservation. But it should be remembered that SPREP cannot survive in dignified intellectual isolation; it has to develop its concepts and prescriptions in response to the perceived needs of the region it serves - and this perception must be guided by its region-wide membership, by its Steering Committee and Intergovernmental Meetings, by the scientific community, staff and consultants who are actively involved in the implementation of conservation plans.
- 2.10 The SPREP needs to give much more serious thought to the ways in which its "output" is communicated. The two main vehicles for communication - the preparation and promulgation of reports, handbooks and guidelines and the conduct of field operations which apply this knowledge and demonstrate the benefits it can bring to human communities - remain valid. But the precise form of the product needs to be shaped as a conscious response to user requirements which have been ascertained by inquiry. As a result of a conscious attempt to cut costs, reports resulting from field missions and scientific studies have been dispatched to recipient governments by mail and there has been very little follow-up on whether or not such reports have generated action at the government level. The SPREP must influence such action and this can be effectively achieved through the personal presentation of reports and discussions with government officials.
- 2.11 Field projects are of immense value in establishing that the SPREP is able to bring its concepts down to earth. It is right that this side of the SPREP's work has expanded over the last three years, but the field programme needs a clear rationale. They should:

- a) involve work of high quality, advancing standards of environmental management;
- b) respond to the needs of recipient governments;
- c) be capable of evaluation, so that lessons can be learned and concepts advanced;
- d) be of broader relevance than the specific locality in which they take place, so that the demonstration can be seen to be worth copying elsewhere;
- e) be properly integrated within the SPREP's overall programme, and reflect its guiding priorities.

The development of the SPREP's Work Programmes

- 2.12 The evaluation of the SPREP in 1985 revealed as a major weakness the lack of government involvement in the identification of priority areas for the Programme. This was promptly rectified when in 1986, the First Intergovernmental Meeting on the SPREP Action Plan was convened to adopt a work programme for SPREP for the 1987-88 biennium. The second IGM was held in 1988 to adopt the 1989-90 work programme.
- 2.13 While these meetings have enabled the Programme to be guided by its membership, there remains the need to influence thinking and interest in activities that provide solutions which are of broad application, and are therefore sought after and applied more generally.
- 2.14 The broadening of the SPREP's activities in recent years has brought some criticism that the Programme is trying to do more things than its resources can sustain, and that quality and credibility could suffer in consequence. The number of project proposals considered by the 1988 IGM more than doubled that considered by the IGM in 1986, and this trend is expected to continue as "new" environmental issues are unveiled and as governments, NGO's and the public become more involved in environmental conservation matters.

- 2.15 The work programme of SPREP naturally and rightly develops in response to the priorities set by its membership, the scientific community and staff and to the requests from donor agencies wishing to work with SPREP in implementing tasks important to them. These influences will continue. The status and effectiveness of the SPREP depends on its ability to attract resources in an increasingly competitive world. Staff numbers have risen to their present level because of this marketing of a service to the membership, partner organisations and aid agencies. This however has been minimal compared to the demand for the Secretariats' services. The dues paid by the membership (on a voluntary basis) is inadequate to meet the cost of running the Secretariat today. Work programme activities demand other resources - those raised by the Secretariat from extra-budgetary sources, and those whose donors will generally specify what they wish to support. Hence, the freedom of the membership to determine the SPREP work programmes could be lost, however, if we are sincere in our wish to work in partnership with the international community, this is no cause for regret. But something has to be done to prevent the work programme becoming the product solely of other people's shopping list.
- 2.16 It is essential that there is a single, integrated work programme for SPREP. The membership must be involved, as now, in its overall strategic thrust. The membership however must be represented at the highest level possible thus sparing the Programme and the Secretariat the additional cost of communication to seek government endorsement to proposals submitted by technical officials. Definitive annual work programmes based on biennial programmes approved by the membership should remain the responsibility of the Secretariat; these should be formulated well in advance of the beginning of each year, since they will be the basis for budgeting and manpower allocation and should therefore be as firm as possible.

- 2.17 In developing future work programmes, it is suggested that the following central questions should be asked:
- a) What is the need? (likely to be answered by the member seeking the SPREP's services or from the regional or international level);
 - b) What is the present situation? (likely to be answered from the national, regional or international level or from the scientific community);
 - c) What can and should be achieved? (should demand intellectual analysis from the field of conservation science and awareness of local circumstances);
 - d) What are the projected consequences in term of subsequent and related events? (as (c) above);
 - e) What will it cost - and where are the resources coming from?

3. THE STRUCTURE OF THE SPREP

- 3.1 The SPREP has been from the beginning a "membership Programme", it brings together governments and administrations, government agencies, regional and international organisations. The South Pacific Conference and the Forum are its highest decision-making bodies determining policy and financial matters. The IGM determine the work programme priorities with the Steering Committee acting in this capacity in the interim period between IGMs. The Coordinator is the head of the Programme appointed by the SPC Secretary-General in accordance with SPC rules and regulations. As the executive head, he is, by necessity, particularly responsible for the establishment of operational priorities, for financial management and for the development and effective implementation of the policy of the Programme. The three programme officers are the strength of the Secretariat, they are the planners and implementors of field programmes. They provide and deliver the service for which the Programme was established, and upon which its future existence will be judged.

- 3.2 But whilst the Secretariat had performed admirably with the minimum of resources over the past several years, it is now clearly in danger of becoming ineffective as the demands for its services continue to increase. There is therefore an essential need to expand the Secretariat staff if its reputation as the provider of knowledge relevant to the needs of the membership is to be sustained.
- 3.3 A decision to expand the Secretariat would inevitably lead to a number of important considerations:
- 3.3.1 Funding requirements: As earlier stated in this paper, membership dues are at present inadequate to meet the operational cost of the Secretariat. At the very minimum, two additional professional staff, one specialising on waste management (including pesticide and other hazardous substances) and the other on environmental impact assessment, should be added to the present posts in the Secretariat within the next two years. Funding assistance for these positions might be possible from donor agencies or from increased country contributions.
- 3.3.2 Location of the Secretariat: An increase to the present level of staff at the Secretariat would definitely create space problems at SPC headquarters. It would be desirable therefore that the possibility of relocating the Programme be looked at in conjunction with any decision to increase staff numbers. It will also be important to bear in mind that a decision to relocate the Programme from Noumea would probably result in additional expenses to the Programme in terms of rental costs which are at present being met by the SPC as an in-kind contribution to SPREP.
- 3.3.3 Status of SPREP: Linked but not necessarily dependent on a decision to relocate the SPREP away from SPC is the inevitable question of what would then be the status of the Programme operating in isolation and without the support services normally provided by SPC? This matter is discussed in further detail in the latter sections of this paper and is not therefore elaborated on here.

The Decision-making Process

- 3.4 Although the South Pacific Conference and Forum are the ultimate legislature for SPREP, they exert minimal managerial influence except for the discussion and approval of contemporary policy and environmental issues to which the Programme should address itself. This is unfortunate as environmental issues often transcend national boundaries and requires a concerted regional effort to address these issues. The effectiveness of such efforts could be best assured by debate and action at the highest level possible.
- 3.5 The above situation should be rectified when the SPREP Convention enters into force. Then, the Meeting of the Parties should become the ultimate sovereign body and legislature of the SPREP with the following managerial functions:
- a) appoint the head of the Programme;
 - b) elect the members of the Steering Committee;
 - c) agree on the objectives to be pursued in the following biennium, guided by the definition of the SPREP's mission and within available resources;
 - d) approve the programme and budget for that period;
 - e) determine membership dues;
 - f) appoint the auditors for the following biennium.

The above functions for the Meeting of the Parties will be additional to those set out under Article 22 of the SPREP Convention.

- 3.6 Under the above arrangements, the IGM's and the Meetings of the Parties to the SPREP Convention will be rolled into one, and this integration would mean that the Meetings of the Parties will be a business and technical meeting although the business component should be streamlined as much as possible. Discussion of the work programme should be strategic and devoted to ensuring that the mission of the SPREP is duly reflected in it. The important thing is that the membership gives clear guidance to the Programme on the priorities to be addressed and that this guidance is unambiguously reflected in the agreed biennial programme and budget. The programme and budget discussion should aim to demonstrate to the membership what the SPREP will do with the resources it can realistically expect (and especially the core funds they provide in the form of dues), satisfy them that they will get value for money, and enlist their aid in essential fundraising.

The Steering Committee

- 3.7 The Steering Committee should direct the affairs of the Programme between meetings of the Parties from which it derives its authority. The terms of reference for the Committee were approved at its first meeting in March 1989 but there might be a need for these to be formally adopted by the IGM (and the Meeting of the Parties when the Convention has entered into force). The selection of sub-regional representatives will probably require further attention.
- 3.8 The Committee is by necessity, a small body. It is deliberately structured to provide a balanced sub-regional representation. To work effectively:
- a) it must recognise that it works within the context of policies defined by the IGM or Meeting of the Parties;
 - b) papers must focus on the policy decisions to be taken;
 - c) sub-regional representatives must attend;
 - d) representatives must be briefed both by the Secretariat and by the members they represent;
 - e) there must be effective machinery to ensure continuity between Committee meetings, assuming that the latter normally remain annual events;
 - f) it should be worthwhile for members to attend because really significant decisions are taken at Committee meetings about the work programme.

- 3.9 It is suggested that papers to Committee meetings should not normally exceed three pages in length with supporting details relegated to an appendix. The main paper should clearly define the issue and the options for action. As to the kinds of issue to be addressed, the Committee should:
- a) monitor progress with the work programme adopted by the IGM/Parties;
 - b) consider major issues of policy;
 - c) consider long-term issues including the relationship between SPREP and other bodies, the funding of the Programme and its strategic development.
- 3.10 The Committee should not become too involved with details of management, which are the responsibilities of the Head of the Programme. It is however, appropriate for the Committee from time to time to review in depth some part of the operation of the SPREP. This can be done by having a presentation at a committee meeting by the Head of the Programme or by a Secretariat staff on a specific area requested by the Committee.
- 3.11 Finally, the membership needs to be informed about what the Committee is doing. The vehicle for communicating this information is clear - the meeting reports and the SPREP Newsletter. Summaries of the minutes of Committee meetings should appear in the SPREP Newsletter with major decisions highlighted. By this channel members should also be invited to write to their sub-regional representatives and to the Secretariat with points they wish to lay before the Committee: in this way the integration of the membership in the Programme affairs can be enhanced.

4. THE FUNCTIONS AND ORGANISATION OF THE SPREP SECRETARIAT

- 4.1 The management structure of the SPREP must be geared to its tasks - without redundancy or distorted proportions, the systems must also be able to evolve flexibility to meet new needs.

- 4.2 SPREP staff are engaged in the following activities:
- a) central administration
 - b) external relations and membership service
 - c) communication, training and promotion
 - d) implementation of scientific and technical programmes, including direct professional services
 - e) technical information service
 - f) fundraising.
- 4.3 The first two of these fields of activity demand administrative skills, and in parts of the first one, specialist financial abilities are also essential. The third area demands skills of presentation and communication. The fourth groups the scientific, economic and technical activities which are the main justification for the existence of the SPREP. It is closely linked to the fifth - the collection and evaluation of information. The sixth area demands skills of presentation, publicising the achievements of the SPREP in a fashion that sustains confidence and support.
- 4.4 The SPREP has one, integrated, work programme, drawing upon the membership, the Secretariat, the scientific community and consultants engaged on particular projects to fulfill the SPREP's mission. The programme encompasses activities that are primarily conceptual, drawing together evaluations of scientific knowledge, others that are directed to the production of specific products in the shape of guidelines, data, publication or advice, and yet others that demonstrate the applicability of the Programme's ideas and prescriptions on the ground in partnership with governments and other organisation and with local communities.
- 4.5 The current SPREP work programme contains six long-term regional programmes each containing numerous specific projects. These are implemented in a number of ways including utilisation of the Secretariat staff, sub-contracts to regional institutions, outside consultants and by national experts. However they are carried out, the supervisory role of the Secretariat Staff is always necessary but with the present level of staff, this is proving to be very difficult and cumbersome and is straining the efficiency of the Programme as a whole.

- 4.6 However, the Secretariat must continue to develop long-term regional projects based on the priorities set by the membership, the scientific community and consultants and in dialogue with other organisations, aid agencies or other donors wishing to collaborate with the Programme. Every project would need unambiguous management and however they emerge, are required to follow an operational procedure for approval as projects in the concept stage, their development as thought-through plans, discussion with potential funding agencies and then implementation to completion and final report. Each project needs a defined project manager within the Secretariat who is responsible for seeing that the project develops in accordance with agreed procedures, runs on time, stays within budget and delivers results. He/she will also be responsible for seeing that the project is done in a professionally sound way, and that where necessary, supplementary external scientific or technical advice is obtained.
- 4.7 The present Secretariat is much too small and inadequately funded to cope with the present increasing demands from the membership. This situation will deteriorate if the present number of staff and level of support does not improve in the next year or so. Previous attempts by the Secretariat to set up the Programme on a secured financial basis have been unsuccessful. It has been suggested that this is partly due to the fact that SPREP is merely a Programme and not a regional organisation.
- 4.8 If independence for SPREP means its self-reliance in terms of finance, staff and administrative resources, then this option must be pursued as soon as possible. The SPREP Convention (when it enters into force) provides a legal basis for this course of action and it would not be unrealistic therefore to see a fully-fledged independent Regional Environment Programme in place shortly after the convention enters into force.
- 4.9 As an independent regional organisation, the SPREP should have its own Director (or equivalent) appointed by the Meeting of the Parties on the advice of the Steering Committee for terms not less than three years subject to renewals. The structure below the Director level could take the form of those applied by other regional organisations. e.g. FFA, and CCOP/SOPAC.

- 4.10 One of the current strengths of SPREP is that it brings together all Governments and Administrations of the South Pacific region and it is strongly recommended that whatever form it takes in future, this truly regional membership should be maintained. A number of loose ends exist in the SPREP Convention. These would obviously have to be addressed if the present membership is to be ensured. The most controversial issues are likely to be agreement on the voting rights and financial contribution of non-signatories to the Convention.
- 4.11 An independent SPREP would need strong horizontal links between its various components. These could be provided for by:
- a) operational rules and procedures;
 - b) internal committees and/or steering groups.
- 4.12 The operational rules and procedures could include:
- a) the Financial Rules, which ensure that budgets and expenditures are constantly monitored by the Administration and that project supervisors work within set limits of delegation and account for the expenditure they incur;
 - b) rules for the development of projects and programme components;
 - c) the Staff Rules which lay down consistent operational practices and conditions of service;
 - d) an integrated publications policy.
- 4.13 A coordinated internal committee under the Director composed of the Deputy Director, the Finance manager and a Director of Administration could be concerned with managerial matters such as the consistency and efficiency of operation of the rules and procedures described in paragraph 4.12, or the policies to be adopted in terms of staff location, pay, and assessment procedures.

- 4.14 A Scientific and Technical Programmes Group, also under the Director could bring together the programme supervisors and would be the forum for Secretariat discussion of programme needs, experiences, successes and failures. It could also develop project proposals based on the priorities set by the Meeting of the Parties or the Steering Committee for inclusion in the work programme, and agree on a publications policy and procedures for the SPREP.
- 4.15 A Fundraising Committee also under the Director composing the Deputy Director and the Finance Manager could ensure a coherent, integrated approach to the pursuit of new resources.

5. THE IMAGE AND OUTREACH OF THE SPREP

- 5.1 At present the SPREP is not well-known within the world of conservation, governments, aid agencies and the scientific community. There are reasons for this:
- a) identity and status. As it is housed by the SPC, the SPREP is often considered a Programme of the SPC.
 - b) lack of resources. Communications, publicity and fundraising have not been high budget priorities, hence, there is no specialist employed in this area.
 - c) uncertainty about target audiences. The Programme has produced some excellent publications for the scientific world however these are not always relevant to the needs of management, policy makers, industry or the public.
- 5.2 The SPREP must grapple with these deficiencies. Communications, publications, promotion and fundraising activities need to be integrated and to have a single set of objectives:
- a) to ensure that the membership knows about the activities of the Programme and the opportunities for participation in them;

- b) to ensure that international organisations, politicians, industry, and other potential backers know about the SPREP's work and how it may serve their needs;
- c) to ensure publications are produced to a consistent standard, in a recognisable house format, at lowest practicable cost, and professionally marketed and distributed so as to bring the best obtainable return and to reach the widest possible audiences;
- d) to provide press briefings and to hold public seminars on issues and activities arising out of the work of SPREP;
- e) to prepare material for specific properly coordinated, fundraising activities.

5.3 The SPREP produces a quarterly Newsletter and this can and should play a central part in:

- a) informing the membership about the activities of the SPREP;
- b) soliciting membership input on their activities and concerns;
- c) presenting the SPREP to prospective supporters;
- d) presenting the SPREP's work to partner organisations in conservation.

5.4 Fundraising is an imperative for the SPREP. Like any organisation, the SPREP finds it far harder to obtain support for its essential core of management and administration than for programme and project activities. The approach to fundraising must be properly coordinated and follow a proper study of the interests of potential donors. No approach should be made to an agency or other source of support in the name of the SPREP unless it has first been sanctioned by the Fundraising Group, which will want to satisfy itself that the bid is well-formulated. Records should be kept of all approaches, of the reason for success or failure, and of guidance that may facilitate success on a future occasion.

- 5.5 Joint approaches to aid agencies, in partnership with other environmental organisations, are likely to be profitable: the evidence that the environment movement is "getting its act together" is itself likely to predispose to a more favourable response than separate un-coordinated approaches will receive. The SPREP has benefited from its partnership with its founding organisations (UNEP, ESCAP, Forum Secretariat and SPC). It has developed joint projects with the EWC and IUCN and has recently been accepted as a working partner of the Centre for Our Common Future. The strengths of all these organisations should help reinforce each other, and this is a model that is likely to be worth adopting with other organisations in future.

6. WHAT FUTURE FOR SPREP

- 6.1 Much has already been said about the mission, the structure, the functions and organisation and the image and outreach of SPREP. These discussions should inevitably lead to an important and critical consideration of a future identity and status for SPREP.
- 6.2 This paper has suggested an expansion of the SPREP Secretariat if it is to remain relevant and responsive to the needs of its membership ie. the Governments and Administrations of the South Pacific region, government agencies, the scientific community, regional and international organisations working in partnership with SPREP and the donor agencies. But an expanded Secretariat will require additional space to accommodate it and more importantly, increased financial contributions from the membership to support its operation. The paper argues that this logistical support can be best assured if the SPREP were to be restructured as an independent organisation or, if another regional organisation is not acceptable, an agency of the same status as the Forum Fisheries Agency or CCOP/SOPAC.

- 6.3 An independent SPREP Secretariat should have the following professional and administrative staff:
- A Director (or equivalent)
 - A Deputy Director
 - At least five (5) professional staff
 - A Finance Manager
 - An Administrative Officer
 - A Publications Officer
- 6.4 It is highly desirable that the SPREP should continue to have access to the South Pacific Forum and the South Pacific Conference. However the Meeting of the Parties should be the ultimate sovereign body and legislature when the SPREP Convention enters into force. The Steering Committee should continue to guide the Programme during the interim period between the meetings of the Parties.

7. RECOMMENDATION FOR ACTION

- 7.1 It is recommended that the Committee review and discuss this paper and if deemed appropriate:
- a) approve it for consideration by the next IGM on the SPREP Action Plan;
 - b) identify priority action to be taken to address the deficiencies outlined in the paper;
 - c) comment on the appropriateness of the mission and approach for SPREP, its structure and functions as proposed in the paper as the basis for pursuing independence and self-reliance for the Programme.

DISCUSSION PAPER ON THE FUTURE FOR SPREP

Introduction

The purpose of this discussion paper is to highlight some key questions that the Steering Committee suggests member countries consider before the Intergovernmental Meeting in September and be prepared to address them at that time.

Background

The desire to improve the administration and development of the SPREP programme and the anticipated implementation of the SPREP Convention led the SPREP Secretariat and the Steering Committee to give detailed consideration to the future of the SPREP programme and what action might be necessary to make the SPREP programme a more effective instrument of member countries' needs. An initial paper prepared by the Secretariat (Steering Committee 2/WP.7) was considered at the Second Meeting of the Steering Committee in Port Vila, Vanuatu, on 13-14 September 1989 and a supplemental paper (Steering Committee 3/WP.6) with addendums (WP.6.Add.1, WP.6.Add.2) was discussed at the Third Meeting of the Steering Committee in Noumea on 30-31 March 1990. At this latter meeting the Steering Committee agreed that the policy issues should be addressed by the Second Intergovernmental Meeting which is to be held in Noumea in September and that these issues should be clearly identified in the following memorandum to the Secretariat's papers (attached).

KEY QUESTIONS

1. *What should be the mission and essential approach of SPREP? (section 2 WP.7)*
2. *Should SPREP become an independent agency and what should be the nature of such independence? (section 2.4-3.6 of WP.6 and section 4 of WP.7)*
3. *To whom should SPREP be accountable and what should be the relationship between SPREP and the South Pacific Forum and between SPREP and the South Pacific Commission? (section 3 of WP.6)*
4. *Should SPREP become a member of the South Pacific Organisations Coordinating Committee (SPOCC)? (Section 3.7 of WP.6)*
5. *What is to be the relationship between SPREP and ASPEI? (Section 4 of WP.6)*
6. *What are the structural and staffing needs of SPREP to handle the current expansion of demands and support of the SPREP Secretariat and the future role of the SPREP Secretariat? (section 3 of WP.7 and section 5 of WP.6)*
7. *Where should SPREP be located?*
8. *Once the SPREP Convention is signed should the Parties to the Convention comprise the sovereign body having authority over the activities of SPREP?*
9. *Given the responsibilities of SPC and the Forum Secretariat, (and their different membership) should there not be a reporting responsibility to these two bodies and if so how should this be defined?*
10. *Is there a need to initiate a study of budgetary considerations, cost effectiveness and programme efficiency on practicable options for the future of SPREP? (section 2.4 WP.6)*

ANNEX 7 (Continued)

Comment:

While the work undertaken to date by the Secretariat has helped identify key issues there may be a need to further develop the costs and benefits of practical options in a manner that gives member countries an independent appraisal of these options. If an independent appraisal is to be undertaken what should the terms of reference of this work be and how should the costs of doing it be met?

If this exercise is to be undertaken should it best be specified at the Intergovernmental Meeting and undertaken in time for consideration at the first meeting of parties to the SPREP Convention? This approach would help anticipate the matters the Convention requires be considered once it comes into force.

Members of SPREP are invited by the Steering Committee to give consideration to the above questions and the fundamental issues discussed in the two working papers attached. They are encouraged to consult on these matters so that there can be constructive progress at the next Intergovernmental Meeting on these issues.