



Pacific Regional Workshop

LAND DEGRADATION in the PACIFIC

UNCCD National Action Programmes

&

UNDP-GEF

Sustainable Land Management Portfolio Approach

22-26 August, 2005, Suva, Fiji

WORKSHOP REPORT

A: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1:0 Introduction

The workshop was planned and implemented collaboratively by SPREP, UNDP-GEF, UNDP Country offices located in Suva, Apia and Port Moresby, and the UNCCD Secretariat in Bonn, Germany. Matt McIntyre was sub-contracted by SPREP and engaged as consultant/resource person to the workshop.

SPREP was engaged to organize and facilitate the workshop under two separate but closely related contracts with UNDP and UNDP-GEF. The Government of Fiji approved the hosting of the workshop in Suva, assisted with organizing the venue and presented the welcoming and closing address through Mr Inoke Ratukalou, the Director of Lands and Planning of the Ministry of Agriculture of the Government of Fiji. Opening statements were also presented by Amena on behalf of the SPREP Director, Mr Richard Dictus (UNDP Resident Representative in Fiji), Hans Eschweiler (UNDP-GEF) and Yoko Hagiwara (UNCCD)

The two initiatives supported by the workshop are:

i) UNDP-GEF Medium Sized Project (MSP) on Sustainable Land Management (SLM)

14 SPREP Member Countries that are parties to the UNCCD have been given the opportunity to develop MSP proposals seeking funding of up to USD 500,000 each for the development and implementation of Sustainable Land Management projects. Funding for this initiative has been made possible under a new GEF innovative approach to funding termed as the **Portfolio Project Approach**, which is a Portfolio of GEF OP 15 projects for Sustainable Land Management, under the Strategic Priority of Targeted Capacity Building. Eligible countries include LDCs and/or SIDS s whom have not yet finalized their National Action Plans (NAPs) and are eligible for GEF funding. This includes a total of 47 countries in Africa, Asia, Pacific and Caribbean. The initiative has a reserve of USD \$29M of GEF funding and expects matching co-financing from countries at a ratio of 1:1.

ii) Support for Pacific Island Countries to develop and complete their National Action Plans (NAPs)

Countries that are Parties to the UNCCD are required to develop and present their NAPs to the Secretariat. NAP's are intended for Parties to assess and report on the status of land degradation and present strategies for addressing them. Of the 14 SPREP Members that are Parties to the UNCCD, the status of NAP development and presentation is as follows:

- 2 countries have completed their NAPs. (Palau and Niue).
- 4 countries have received funding to complete their NAPs and are at various stages of developing them (Fiji, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea and Tonga).

- 8 countries have yet to receive funding to develop their NAPs (Samoa, Cook Islands, RMI, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Vanuatu, Nauru and FSM).

In a recently signed MOU with the UNDP (Samoa Country Office), SPREP has undertaken to deliver the following outputs with funding support from the UNDP Pacific Sub-Regional Centre, Governance in the Pacific Project:

- Assist 8 countries develop and complete their NAPs.
- Strengthen collaboration and coordination amongst CROP and other agencies to support countries with UNCCD work in the Pacific.
- Support collaboration amongst countries through regional and sub-regional workshops.

2:0 Workshop participants

- Representatives from all SPREP Members that are parties to the UNCCD, except Nauru, attended the workshop. (See Annex 7 for participants list). Officers from respective Environment Departments led most of the country teams with some including Finance and Agriculture officers.
- Forum Secretariat (Coral Pasisi and Dr Padma Lal).

2:1 Observers

- Representatives from the Maldives and Timor Leste and from the UNFCCC.

2:2 Resource Persons and Presenters

- SPREP Amena Yauvoli, Frank Wickham, Saunoa Mata'u (Workshop Secretariat)
- UNDP GEF Hans Eschweiler, Andrea Volentras
- UNDP Easter Galuvao, Meapelo Maiai (Apia Office), Alvin Shandra, Jan McDonald (Suva/Honiara Office, Tony Torea (Port Moresby Office)
- UNCCD Ms Yoko Hagiwara (UNCCD Secretariat)
- SOPAC Dr Netatua Prescott, Litea Biukoto
- Consultant Matt McIntyre.

3:0 Objectives of the Workshop

The workshop had four main objectives:

- To introduce the Sustainable Land Management Medium Size Project to countries, explain the GEF Portfolio Approach and requirements for developing PDFAs and Medium Sized Project (MSP) proposals.
- To identify and agree on technical back-stopping services to be provided to countries to design and implement the SLM MSP.

- iii) To assist countries have an understanding of the UNCCD process for developing NAPs and obtain feedbacks on status of NAP work in each country.
- iv) To introduce the SPREP-UNDP MOU and Work Plan for supporting countries develop and complete their NAPs.
- v) To begin planning for PICs participation in the up-coming UNCCD COP7 meeting in Nairobi, Kenya in October (17-19) this year.
- vi) To introduce to countries the UNCCD Sub-Regional Action Plans (SRAP) and determine their positions relating to the development of the Pacific SRAP.

4:0 Approach

The workshop approach included presentations followed by working group sessions and re-convening of plenary for working groups to provide feedbacks. Most of the working group sessions involved groups going through the GEF requirements for MSPs under the new Portfolio Approach and to discuss the planning and development of NAPs. On the SLM proposal the Mauritius MSP proposal was used in the working group sessions and provided an excellent opportunity for countries to see how such a proposal is developed. Towards the end of the week, more time was made available for one-to-one sessions with resource persons assisting country representatives with development of PDFA proposals and MSP Proposals. Some discussions revolved around the GEF requirements for determination of baselines, incremental costs and co-financing.

5:0 Workshop Outputs

- i) Participants understanding the GEF Portfolio Approach to Medium Sized Projects for Sustainable Land Management including how to use the GEF Template for MSP proposals, GEF requirements for co-financing, and what is meant by 'baseline actions' and 'incremental costs'.
- ii) Participants understanding the UNCCD process for developing National Action Plans and the resources (finance and expertise) available to assist with their developments.
- iii) Participants identifying measures to take on board in the preparation for the up-coming UNCCD COP7 in Nairobi later this year.
- iv) Countries recognizing the need for developing UNCCD Sub-Regional Action Plans and identifying this as a follow-up action following the completion of NAPs.
- v) Participants recognising the role of UNDP-GEF Regional Support Unit (Apia, Samoa), UNDP Country Offices, and SPREP in providing backstopping and technical services to PICs under the SLM MSP, NAP development and general UNCCD and land degradation work.

Substantial meeting materials were made available to participants both in e-version and in hard copy upon arrival.

Materials presented and additional reference material made available during the course of the week were aggregated based on the agenda and copied to CD for all participants by the end of the week. Countries called for one-on-one discussions with resource people by the end of the week, and given the high intensity of the information and work, it was agreed to finish the meeting by lunchtime on Friday so as to accommodate this request.

B: RECORD OF DISCUSSIONS

Attachment 1 contains a full account of presentations, key discussion points and Working Group results. The meeting conclusions are covered here in this report.

WHERE TO FROM HERE:

Based on the discussions and conclusions from various sessions the following actions represent key outcomes and recommendations from the Workshop.

1) Production of National Action Programmes

Action Area	Action required	By Whom - when
1. GOVPAC - UNDP Core resources to support NAP production for 8 PICs yet to receive funds and 14 PICs with regional actions and other technical backstopping. NAP Production	1.1 SPREP to Circulate information to PICs with draft Work Plan for discussion	SPREP - Sept
	1.2 Draft MOU models to be developed to enable PICs to lever resources	SPREP - Sept / Oct
	1.3 Consideration for re-allocation of resources based on PIC feedback	SPREP/UNDP Apia
2. Guides to assist with NAP production	2.1 UNDP GSU contract for NAP-SLM process links to include NAP production issue eg timeline	UNDP GEF GSU consultancy - early September
3 Completion of NAPs to assist with UNCCD implementation, SRAP and pending review of the Convention	3.1 Timely completion of NAPs tied to SLM design and inception	Pacific SIDS - early 2006 UNCCD Support - ongoing

2) SLM MSP for Sustainable Land Management

Action Area	Action required	By Whom - when
1. Completion and submission of PDF A's	1.1 Use of the PDF A template to complete and submit the PDF A	Pacific SIDS yet to complete - asap
2. Commence SLM project design and consultations	2.1 SLM Projects to be completed by early 2006	Pacific SIDS - March 2006
	2.2 Guides on LFM to be circulated	Completed
	2.3 Examples of SLM MSPs to be circulated eg Mauritius	Completed
	2.4 Provide technical support to Pacific SIDS to complete MSPs	UNDP CO's - ongoing
	2.5 Provision of awareness information/materials	UNDP GEF GSU

3) COP 7 Preparations

Action Area	Action required	By Whom - when
1. Prepare country presentations for COP 7	<p>1.1 Pacific SIDS to review outcomes of COP6 plus CRIC 3 to report on specific issues to be raised at COP 7</p> <p>1.2 Key issues to be conveyed to SPREP and UNCCD for comment</p> <p>1.3 Support to SPREP to attend COP 7 be given from GOVPAC resources - regional support</p>	<p>Pacific SIDS - early Oct</p> <p>Pacific SIDS - Early Oct</p> <p>UNDP</p>
2. Regional briefing package to be generated and circulated	<p>2.1 Country key points to be conveyed to SPREP for inclusion in the regional brief</p> <p>2.2 Matter of NAP deadline to be included</p> <p>2.3 Matter of GM resource support to be canvassed</p> <p>2.4 Representation of Pacific SIDS in key UNCCD for a to be covered</p> <p>2.5 Nomination of SPREP to continue as the UNCCD FP prior to fully consideration by all regional stakeholders</p>	<p>Pacific SIDS - end of Sept</p> <p>SPREP</p> <p>SPREP</p> <p>SPREP</p> <p>SPREP - agreed by PICs</p>

4) Regional Coordination and Cooperation

Action Area	Action required	By Whom - when
1. Regional Coordination	<p>1.1 Confirm timing of the next regional meeting to assist with SRAP agreement and update in NAP/SLM preparations</p> <p>1.2 Identify timeframes of up and coming UNCCD commitments eg COP, CCD Review etc</p> <p>1.3 Confirm information on resources to be availed for Reporting to CCD review 2006</p>	<p>SPREP with PICs - post COP 7 after COP discussions</p> <p>UNCCD Secretariat - October</p> <p>UNCCD Secretariat - October</p>
2. Regional Collaboration	<p>2.1 Discussions/Liaisons among regional partners on coordination and collaboration mechanisms</p> <p>2.2 Commence consideration of options to improve Regional - National networking and information exchange (component of GOVPAC - NAP support)</p> <p>2.3 Confirmation of the resources available to support SPREP backstopping MSP design and implementation</p>	<p>SPREP to initiate - but involve GSU and UNCCD Secretariat</p> <p>SPREP - ongoing</p> <p>UNDP - GEF GSU to confirm longer term arrangements as agreed in supporting Portfolio Approach 2004</p>

5) Guidance in linking NAP generation and SLM MSP Project Design and Implementation

Action Area	Action required	By Whom - when
1. Guides to be provided	1.1 Completion of guides to link processes of NAP generation and MSP design by early Sept 1.2 Guides to include processes from PDF A design to Implementation of MSP and NAP 1.3 Guides to be released prior to COP 7.	GSU consultant to consider inclusion in guides - early Sept

6) Supporting Information

- All information available on NAP production and MSP design has been supplied on the Meeting CD or in the original Meeting Materials folder.

**REGIONAL WORKSHOP ON LAND DEGRADATION: SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT AND
NATIONAL ACTION PROGRAMMES FOR UNCCD
22-26 AUGUST, 2005. TANOA PLAZA HOTEL, SUVA, FIJI**

RECORD OF DISCUSSIONS:

Workshop Objectives: Overview and expected follow up.

Session 1: Introductions and Country Presentations

To begin the first session countries were asked to introduce themselves and give brief statements or presentations with regards to sustainable land management and the UNCCD.

[Other than where indicated most countries spoke to powerpoint presentations]

1. KIRIBATI: Kautoa Tonganibeia; Environment Inspector (MLED)-*see powerpoint under Day 1*
2. TONGA: Tupe Semani Verbal Presentation
 - Ratified UNCCD December 1998
 - Lack statistical data to ascertain status quo of land degradation throughout Tonga
 - 4.5 percent of forest remains in Tonga
 - Major cause is agriculture; move from subsistence agriculture to cash cropping.
 - Mechanical farming practices.
 - Cash crop such as squash uses immense amounts of fertilizers
 - Short term lease arrangement for land lease allows for short term realization of benefits at the expense of long term sustainability of r soil fertility.
 - Urbanisation is also a major cause ???
3. NIUE: Ernest Nemaia
 - 2003: Niue submitted their Country Report to UNCCD. Niue has completed its NAP and in the midst of submitting to the UNCCD Secretariat. A special presentation will be given tomorrow
4. COOK ISLANDS: Timoti Tangiruaine
 - Lack of statistics
 - Lack of coordination among government agencies
 - Lack of industrial standards and operation guidelines; improve self regulation among industries and private sector agents
 - Lack of expertise to manage underground water.
 - Causes: Agriculture via the use of pesticides and inappropriate disposal of livestock waste i.e piggery farming.
 - Cyclones - coastal and infrastructure damages
5. SAMOA: Soialo David Fong
 - Human Causes: Outdated/poor pastoral farming practices i.e slash and burn
 - Excavation, sandmining, coastal erosion
 - Natural Cause: Climatic conditions via El Nino La Nina; impacts on topography, dry areas (northwestern parts of Upolu and Savaii)
 - NAP progress: ISSUES
 - Sustainable forest management
 - Water Catchment Areas
 - Agri Practices
 - Dryland Management
6. FSM: Joe Konno
 - Causes: Landslides (Chuuk caused 20 deaths)
 - Pollution
 - Landuse Planning
 - Loss of Upland forestry

7. MARSHALL ISLANDS: Debra Barker
 - Causes: Lack of capacity and knowledge transfer to integrate SLM and other thematic areas into the planning policy and management systems.
 - Lack of appropriate linkages between national and regional issues.

8. SOLOMON ISLANDS: Nesta Leguvaka & Ellen Iramu
 - Economy drivers/sectors: Predominantly forestry, fisheries and mining.
 - Causes: Land clearance for forestry
 - Increase population has lead to shorter fallow periods (previously 10 years and now 3-6 months).
 - Slash and burn
 - Impacts: Loss of biodiversity; Poor water quality; Diminishing food security
 - 1st National Communication finalized in 2002.

9. VANUATU: Ernest Bani (verbal presentation)
 - Causes: Beef Industry resulting in high land clearance for grassland for cattle grazing. The current Govt supports this.
 - Population increase will put pressure on land resources.
 - Natural Disasters.
 - Limited human resource capacity to manage resources sustainably.
 - PAA - Priority Action Agenda outlines the priority areas that government will focus on in a 3 year period. Mainstreaming of SLM will have to be articulated into the PAA framework.

10. PALAU: Mike Aulero
 - Specializes in mapping of degraded areas vis-à-vis soil fertility. Presented on behalf of Government.

11. MALDIVES: Ahmed Ali Manik & Ahmed Nilam Mohamed
 - Joined UNCCD in Oct 3 2002
 - Cause: Climate Change and sea level rise
 - Population increase
 - Beach erosion
 - Natural disasters i.e tsunamis
 - UNCCD fits under the Climate Change Strategy alongside the NBSAP.

12. PNG: Stanley Oa
 - Cause: Land ownership (70 percent of lands are communally owned; 30 percent owned by govt and industry)
 - NAP process includes a STC; already 3 workshops have taken place for the NAP.
 - Currently recruiting a consultant for MSP production.

13. TIMOR LESTE: Luis Godinho (verbal presentation)
 - ratified UNCCD in 2003.
 - 75 percent of upland communities are engaged in agriculture productivity
 - Soil erosion programme in TL - more efforts needed

DISCUSSIONS:

Timeline: Linking the process of SLM and NAP development.

Samoa: Following up Hans Eschweiler comments on the extension deadline for producing the NAP document. Request clarification from Yoko and Matt with regard to this extension. [Response referred to a recent letter to UNCCD Focal points from the UNCCD Secretariat.....copy included in the meeting Folder]

UNDP GEF-Hans Eschweiler: Deadline to be clarified by coming presentations. Congratulated Tonga for their draft MSP project document and look forward to receiving the final document. 8 PICs out of 14 have completed their PDF As. Requested CKI, Nauru, Tuvalu, Marshall Islands to clarify their status quo of their PDF A production.

Cook Islands (Tanya) clarified that they have deliberately delayed the PDF A prodoc due to public discontent about government accession to MEAs and with little ground-level actions. The UNCCD actions will need to be articulated with the NESAF framework.

Marshall Islands: have completed their draft and will finalize with UNDP Fiji, following the Mauritius meeting for BPOA.

FSM (Joe): Also facing the dilemma of preparing numerous national action plans but little action happening at the local level. Public discontent with national/federal government on limited actions for grassroot communities for them to realize real benefits for UNCCD, UNFCCC, UNCBD, Stockholm Convention etc. There should be better coordination among UN agencies and thematic secretariats.

UNCCD (Yoko): Extension of NAP deadline must not be delayed too much; the next review period of UNCCD in 2006 will assess the progress of countries producing their NAPs and it will reflect well for PICs to prepare a draft or final document by then.

Day 1 PM SESSION 2: Introduction to NAPs
Yoko Hagiwara - see powerpoint ppt on CD

Annex proposed change in COP 6 to mention Pacific more specifically, however the Chairman didn't want to take up issue in the final session. COP7 could be used to get the Pacific more specifically mentioned for Implementation ambitions

SESSION 3: Introduction to the Portfolio Approach
Hans Eschweiler , UNDP GSU
[Hans presentation was done as a brief ppt to explain the Portfolio Approach. See the CD]

SESSION 4 & 5 on linkages of policy platforms (national and regional) were combined and Working Group Session 1 was brought forward (Session 6) to relieve participants from lecture mode and to consider presentations in mapping their own ideas on linking actions at the policy and project levels.

The Groups considered matters as shown at ANNEX 1

END OF DAY 1

DAY 2

Session 6 Working Group Session 1 : Report-back
[Note that Group work based on Paper presentations have been included below as photographs; LCD presentations are included in the CD]

Group 1: Presenter: Tanya Temata
Group 2: Presenter: Ernest Neemaia (LCD Presentation)
Group 3: Presenter: Tony Turea
Group 4: Presenter: Debra Barker

DISCUSSIONS:

Most groups followed a similar pattern in focusing on relationship between causes of land degradation (the problems), what the current baselines were (what you're doing about the problems); the needs (what still has to be done to address the problem); and the project rationale (what gaps the project will focus on).

There were a number of queries on how to describe activities that form part of the baseline when you intend to use them as part of the MSP for co-financing (e.g. future components of the MSP). Related to this there was some guidance sought on defining a "capacity building activity"? Examples of what this could include, eg. Pilot projects? A number of questions centred on co-financing, and despite this being a matter to be covered later in the workshop, it did get participants to focus early on what are the challenges of putting together a GEF proposal.

With regard to the stakeholder involvement plan: it was noted that a plan for stakeholder involvement will vary for each planned outcome/output/activity. Village-level capacity dev't may be best delivered by a local NGO in partnership with the village fono, while national mainstreaming into plans and actions would require govt as the key stakeholder. It was also important to focus on planning for long-term sustainability of stakeholder involvement beyond the life of the project, rather than just during project design and inception.

Some participants commented that while this session looked at planning synergies, as delegates representing their countries they could not act or advise outside the established Planning frameworks in respective countries, and any action to meld MSP and NAP development would need to be in the context of those planning frameworks. There was a feeling among other planning partners in-country that too many 'deadlines' were set by others, and these need to be reconciled with in-country planning processes. It was noted by all participants that there were inherent problems with setting deadlines, namely what happens to those who can't/don't meet them.

There was general agreement of the utility of tying NAP and MSP generation as parallel processes, but also that the stepwise production that may be chosen by some would also need to be respected. Whichever way the 'timeline' for production of NAPs was an issue that needed some guidance. Participants agreed that we cannot let the 'deadline' run on endlessly, however there are problems with setting deadlines without understanding the circumstances of each country or planning process. The need to commence UNCCD review reports by (mid?) 2006 sets a parameter. Developing a roadmap of steps to develop a NAP/MSP with component timelines would be a useful guide, and would provide a overall timeframe by which countries could commit to completion.

SESSION 7: Production of National Action Plan
Presenter: Yoko Hagiwara
Facilitator: Hans Eschweiler

A letter was sent by the Secretariat to countries on the relief to the initial deadline of December 2005 (Annex in workshop folder)

COP 7 could be used to offer a reasonable deadline or conversely could be set to set a new deadline.

GEF is not the only financial mechanism of the UNCCD, there is the Global Mechanism (GM), which acts as a global support mechanism. While it was stated that Countries who ratified the UNCCD early received funding through the Global Mechanism, this was not always the case in the Pacific. Countries who ratified the convention later either received deferred payments or have not received any.

Timor Leste, Cook Islands, Kiribati, Vanuatu, Maldives, Samoa, Tonga, Marshal Islands, have not received funding yet to prepare their NAP. The UNCCD Secretariat have been following up funding for NAP but in the meantime, and were aware that for PICs the UNDP had been successful in leveraging some of its core funding linked with SLM to assist in the elaboration of NAPs.

SAMOA (Soialo): Samoa had requested funding in COP 6. Were they to expect that money will be coming from the Global Mechanism?

Yoko: Unfortunately, the new GSU agenda does not take into account funding for NAP [GM admitted at CRIC 3 that finances were very short and intended activities were very much affected.

VANUATU (Ernest): Vanuatu also submitted their request in COP 6. Should countries apply again? Yoko: The workshop could perhaps recommend for countries to take this up in COP 7. The UNCCD Secretariat could facilitate a statement for COP 7. Review of financial arrangements can be taken up in COP 7.

There was some discussion of the failure of Pacific SIDS to successfully bid for representation/chairship of any technical committees including TPN 1,2,3,4,5,6 meetings. Completion of a number of NAPs by linking with the MSP projects could place the Pacific in better stead to argue for better representation.

SAMOA (Mark): What are the national and local benefits of a subregional Action Programme (SRAP) with regard to preparing or implementing NAPs.

Yoko: SRAPs - Countries may adopt a sub-regional document which reflects the similar issues shared by all PICs rather than that argued through individual NAPs. Another benefit is the opportunity that subregional framework can link with other subregional frameworks i.e Carribean, for SIDS wide argument.

TONGA (Tupe):When/how do countries qualify in “commencing NAP” as requested in the letters from the Secretariat to countries. Yoko: this has yet to be determined formally but it was suggested that having a Minister formally recognize the need for a NAP and the setting up and meeting of a working group or steering committee - may suffice. The important thing too is to demonstrate that a possible completion date had been considered.

SAMOA (Mark): If the national focal point has a corporate plan which states clearly that activities have been mobilize towards initiating the NAP process - would this suffice? Yoko (unofficial response): It depends on interpretation of countries.

Hans Eschweiler: Recognized Yoko’s offer to review countries individual NAPs and provide her presentations in the Workshop CD.

FSM (Joe): Request CDs covering all workshop materials before they leave island. (SPREP) This was the intent as explained in the invitation papers

SESSION 8: Country Experiences in producing an NAP

PALAU: (Mike Aurelio)

Country presentation: Ratified UNCCD in 1999.

Causes of LD:

- ‘Compact Road’
- Drought
- Sea level rise
- Watershed degradation
- Invasive species
- Uncontrolled burning
- Land land use planning

Priority Program Activities:

- Providing enabling conditions
- Promoting agroforestry
- Rehabilitation of degraded land
- Land degradatikon inventory and monitoring
- Improve water conservation

NIUE: (Ernest Nemaia)

Country presentation: Ratified UNCCD in 1999.

- NAP development drew on a number of like or related policy and project initiatives
- Key manifestations resulting in LD include disc ploughing; deforestation; expanding agriculture influenced by mechanized farming practices; land tenure and fragile soils
- Key thematic areas:
 - Sustainable management of land clearance
 - Soil diagnostics
 - Soil rehabilitation
 - Sustainable cropping management practices
 - Agroforestry
 - Forestry
 - Waste water and water resource management
 - Capacity building
 - Governance
- Implementation of the NAP will be initiated through a pilot project with an emphasis on sustainable agricultural development.

UNDP's PACGOV Regional Project - Providing assistance to Pacific SIDS through supporting NAP production and elaboration.

Presentation: (Easter Galuvao)

UNDP support to Land Degradation via Governance in the Pacific Project. Refer to powerpoint presentation

SAMOA (Mark): What is the procedure for accessing the funds.

UNDP (Easter): This will be guided by the MOU signed between UNDP and SPREP.

SAMOA (Sooialo) Has there been any allocation made to countries and how much are countries entitled to?

SPREP (Frank): Countries allocations will be consistent. The MOU nominates USD64,000 to be allocated to PICs who have yet to receive NAP support funds.

VANUATU (Ernest): Need to know the process for accessing the funds.

SPREP (Frank): Discussion of the MOU can take place within working groups. USD 8,000 will be made available to certain countries to support the preparation of their NAPs. Other funds available through PACGOV and the MOU between SPREP and UNDP are for regional facilitation and backstopping, networking etc. Where savings are envisaged further dispersal direct to PICs will be the intent.

UNDP (Garry)GOVPAC project identifies with environmental governance issues that needs to be capture in country's NAPs.

FSM (Joe): Are there other funding opportunities besides the GOVPAC project funds

Countries can apply in other focal areas (human rights, parliamentary support, etc) of the GOVPAC for funds to assist actions that correspond or assist with the NAP. This is based on countries' context and issues relating to the focal areas of the GOVPAC project.

NIUE (Ernest): Is this fund available to countries which have already prepared their NAPs?

FIJI (Inoke): We need to provide higher standard of NAPs before submission; this could be the window of opportunity for including those countries that have already prepared their NAPs.

UNDP (Garry): The GOVPAC project is trying to assist 8 countries to prepare their NAPs however, it is important to note quality assurance is imperative.

SESSION 8: Working Group Session 2: Status and possible scheduling of NAPs

Groups considered a number of matters regarding the status and possible timing of completion of NAPs, including resources and needs to complete NAPs (see ANNEX 2).

[Note that Group work based on Paper presentations have been included below as photographs; LCD presentations are included in the CD]

Much of the feedback centred on clarification of the resources available from the GOVPAC project and the timing of leveraging of such resources. SPREP advised that as the MOU between UNDP and

SPREP had only recently been concluded the first action shall be the formal referral of the details by Circular seeking feedback on the specifics of allocation and support to PICS - which is usual procedure. While the allocation of specific amounts had been determined by UNDP Fiji, they were consistent with the calling by PICS for actions in the Roadmap produced at COP6. With the receipt of feedback from PICS there was optimism that UNDP would accept flexible allocation to respect the specific needs of the country.

Fast-tracking access to funds for NAP production (8 PICS) was agreed as being urgent. Other discussions revealed some misconception on whether the NAP can be completed as part of MSP or whether it is a 'precondition' to commencing the MSP. The inability of GEF funds for use to complete the NAP, versus the MSP being able to 'elaborate' the NAP- seemed to be the source of confusion.

SESSION 10 - Pacific Sub-region Action Programme (Pacific SRAP)
Presentation - Yoko Hagikawa [ppt included on CD]

Discussions:

Fiji: Expressed strong support for the development of SRAP, following agreement in Apia 2001, as a means to demonstrate a common position in COP negotiations. However this should only be developed once countries finish their NAPs. While the inception shouldn't be totally sequential to completing all NAPs, the SRAP shouldn't divert attention from preparation of NAPs. There was continued support and designation of SPREP as sub-regional focal point. Discussion on this and how other CROP and regional organisations and stakeholders can be involved should occur formally, and determined as part of SRAP development. Yoko Hagiwara suggested that delegates could discuss this with capitals and agree at COP7.

Overall it was generally agreed that NAPs were the priority but countries would discuss the devt of the SRAP during and after COP7.

Session 11 - Case Study - Land Degradation, the experience from Fiji

Presentation - Inoke Ratukalou
[ppt available on CD]

Key needs:

- Matching land use, land capability with crop type and management
- Enhancement and integrating legislation, determining what to provide as incentives and what to police
- Improve resourcing to the sector and planning sectors
- Infrastructure support.
- Improved knowledge: on-site and off-site status and implications of LD
- Addressing competing charters

Participants sought clarification on the issue of expiration of leasehold farmlands and the influence of this on sustainable land management. There was a question of whether the leaseholds were on govt or native land. Over 90% were on native land, and as leases were approaching expiration date there was limited interest in sustainable land management, but a tendency to over-exploit the land for short term gains.

In terms of mechanisms trialled with the renewal of leases, with the aim to overcome problems of rural-urban drift?, cash incentives have been offered for renewal or resettlement. So far, take up of expired leases has been subject to some political interference. Most landowners are actually happy to extend/renew leases with original tenants.

UNFCCC: Could you provide example of low-cost technologies for SLM? Fiji: The use of vitiva vertiva grass - assisted with expansion of sugar cane. The supply of A-frames and equipment to help establish contour banking and farming - were another example of low cost alternatives.

PNG: What approaches have been taken to work with local farmers? This has been a big problem in PNG - especially subsistence farmers. Fiji: this is a hard issue especially with regard to sugar cane farmers, as the nature of the business, the leasehold situation etc provide little incentive to invest in conservation. The only option has been to mobilise resource owners to be stewards in their own area.

END OF DAY 2

DAY 3 AMENDED AGENDA (Re-shuffle of Sessions 12-15, prior session numbers shown in brackets)

(SESSION 14): The LDC/SIDS Portfolio Project - Overview

Hans Eschweiler

A quick overview of the SLM Portfolio project was provided [ppt provided on CD]

(SESSION 12): The UNDP Project Management Cycle/Requirements

Ms Easter Galuvao

UNDP presented briefly on their project management requirements, highlighting the expectations of GEF proposals with regard to this.

(SESSION 13) UNDP GEF MSP Submission requirements & processes

Andrea Volentras

UNDP GEF presented briefly the submission requirements for the MSP, explaining the administrative procedures of UNDP and UNDP GEF. It was explained that in the work of the next two days much reference would be given to the Mauritius MSP being the only Portfolio project approved to date. The sessions and working group sessions would proceed by key sections of the MSP template. There was some explanation of the Annexes to the MSP template.

SESSION 15 Overview of the MSP process and ingredients

Andrea Volentras

The above session was immediately followed by a complete presentation of the MSP Template components and expectations in completing the project document. The completed Mauritius proposal was used as a reference point on occasion. Annotated additions to the MSP template to assist participants were also referred (copy on CD).

There was some initial discussion on the difficulties with co-financing - however it was explained that further information will be addressed in later presentations.

SESSION 16a: Introduction to Section 1(Elaboration of Narrative), Part I (Situation analysis) and Part II (Project Strategy) of the MSP Template for the SLM Portfolio Project

Andrea Volentras

After the overview this session went back to the first components of the Template to look at the sections in detail, using the annotated additions to the template and the Mauritius proposal as key references.

SESSION 16 b: Working Group Session 3:

Working Groups were asked to consider Section 1 Part 1 & 2 of the Template

ANNEX 3 contains the notes for consideration for the Groups to address. They were also asked to seek comments on matters presented on the Portfolio approach.

SESSION 16 c: Working Group Session 3 presentations

Most presentations and much of the discussions centred again on baselines and co-financing - despite this to be targeted in subsequent sessions. The peculiarities of defining co-financing were questioned: whether existing projects could be included; what if outcomes of completed project were relevant; how to tie co-financing; when does co-financing have to be confirmed etc.

There was some question and explanation of the benefit of the Portfolio approach versus separate MSPs. The institutional difficulties of numerous focal points in-country was raised, as an internal and external issue, ie no-one knows who all the FPs are, or when they are changed.

Some explanation of the co-financing situation with NAPs was requested, with regard to use of other GEF funds counting as co-financing.

Along with these useful queries most groups identified either useful information sources to establish the Situation analysis and the Baselines.

Some discussion was had on the status of regional projects or regionally supported projects such as DSAP (EU); Food Security (FAO); WB; SOPAC etc. The message was clear that such projects could offer great advantage for co-financing for MSPs.

[Group Work has been included on the CD or incorporated as photographs below]

SESSION 17 a: Introduction to the Financial Plan

Andrea Volentras

This session explained briefly the financial planning components of PART 2. The elements include the Incremental cost assessment and the Project Budget. Again the annotated additions to the template and the Mauritius proposal were used as key references.

SESSION 17 b: Working Group Session 4:

Working Groups were asked to consider a scenario for establishing incremental costs and project budget. The recommended cost benchmarks Table of the Template (pg 8) and table of detailed description of co-financing were used by most groups to undertake a pilot project finance plan (see ANNEX 4).

SESSION 17 c: Group Presentations

Working group presentations are included on the CD or as photographs below.

Discussions and group outcomes varied. Some groups saw the need to develop a real life scenario in terms of a problem analysis to indicate some possible outcomes/outputs to then undertake costing and co-financing scenarios. As a result many initially discussed components of a possible Log-Frame: what was a goal versus outcome; versus output etc. So this was in itself a useful outcome of the session. Along with the usual difficulties of addressing finance plan/project budgeting it enable participants to appreciate the connectivity between project rationales/objectives and project finance.

The questions posed were significant and also revealed that completing a MSP [or any project design for that matter was not purely a sequential thing, that iterative development is required:-

- Do we start to develop the Goal statement first or the output statements? A: there is no simple answer. Sometimes problem analysis will help in identifying possible goals; sometimes iterative development of a project will see goals amended during design; sometimes prior related work may have established goals
- How many outcome and output statements? A: Usually up to 3 outputs per Outcome; Numbers of Outcomes usually dependent on the size of the project - but 3-5 is quite usual in MSPs.
- Is there a GEF guide/rule for writing objective statements, indicators and assumptions? See LFA document in resource folder (CD)
- Can the outcome be revised and changed part way through the project? A: Not generally but outputs and activities may
- Explain use of "base-line" in the Indicator column of the Mauritius Log Frame. A: different template at that time (November 2004)
- How long is the "Long term goal". A: Usually strategic policy planning these days targets a 15-20 year timeframe.
- What happens when outcomes in the PDFAs are already established? A: There are synergies with the PDFAs template and the components advocated in the MSP Template.

- What are the PDF A minimum requirements. A: see the PDF A template in the Meeting Materials (CD).
- What activities qualify as baseline activities and what qualifies as cofinancing? A: Baseline simply is what you are currently doing; the increment being the activities needed to meet the outputs of the project to achieve the outcomes and global benefits.....however the scenario below should be noted.
- A scenario- if the Government is investing in GIS/Database development already - what activities can be said to directly relate to a MSP output? - and if they can be linked, can the funds be seen as cofinancing? A: If current investments as 'baseline' are critical to achieving the GEF objectives (see pg 7 of the Template) as indicated in the Log Frame - they can be counted as co-financing (in-kind or parallel cash funding). You do need to show however how the GEF funds will build on these baseline actions

END OF DAY 3

SESSION 18: Part III (Management Arrangements) and Part IV (Monitoring and Evaluation)
Andrea Volentras

A brief introduction to Section I Parts III and IV were given again with reference to the annotated Template and Mauritius MSP example. It was explained that these parts were where there was a mix of country specific implementation and institutional arrangements and that of UNDP - which were often standard Management entries. The standard inputs from UNDP perspective often related to the legal arrangements / agreements.

With regard to M & E - reference was made to the use of the LFM (baselines and targets) and the UNDP GEF and UNDP 'administrative' requirements for M&E. A specific Toolkit on M& E for the Portfolio project will be released in September.

SESSION 18 b & c: Working Group Session 6: Management and M&E
[Working Group outputs are available on CD, or included below as photographs]

ANNEX 5 includes the notes for Working Groups to consider the Management and M&E components of the MSP project design. The purpose was to provide some questions to tease out some of the options that may be available for PICs as well as for them to get to understand the standard requirements of UNDP GEF/UNDP.

Discussions ranged from statements of understanding to questions of the rigidity/flexibility of UNDP 'legal' requirements; the timing and number of audits required; who pays for auditing/reviews etc. Some interesting scenarios were posed such as ...'what happens if a co-financier pulls out after prior commitment'? How do countries deal with tying co-financiers separate auditing processes. There were also questions on whether multiple EAs (in-country) could be established. Practice has shown that this can occur, however for the purposes of wise management some party within Govt would have to take ultimate responsibility. There can be other cooperating agencies - ie national agencies participating in the implementation of the project.

While it was stated that MSPs because of the Portfolio approach may not need a MTR, PICs were clear that their own country processes may required annual audits.

Technical Assistance required from other agencies should be included in the section on Management Arrangements and costs included in Budget. E.g Assistance from SPREP, SPC, FAO etc.

The final evaluation conducted at end of Project will include documentation of lessons learnt, however there was questions surrounding this: timing after closure of project; who pays; who completes; there need to be lessons learnt during implementation as well.

There was also question about including other other agencies M&E approaches with the UNDP requirements.

Generally it was accepted that further information may be required with regard to the Management and M&E standard requirements (UNDP), that of GEF and country specific management, monitoring and review processes.

SESSION 19: Introduction to Section II - Strategic Results Framework
Andrea Volentras

Section II was briefly explained using again the annotated MSP Template and the Mauritius MSP as an example. It was indicated to participants the availability of a Reader on LFA and Matrices available on the CD.

SESSION 19 b and c: Working Group Session 6 - Strategic Results Framework

ANNEX 6 provided some questions for the groups to consider. There is often much confusion and writing styles that differentiate components of LFM, tempered somewhat by various models used by various Donors. A number of groups centred on defining the cascading from Goals, objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities. Some groups took on to develop a scenario from a problem tree approach to gain an understanding of the levels.

[Working Group outputs are available on CD, or included below as photographs]

Discussions:

A consistent question was 'where do you start'...at setting goals and objectives..or defining activities and working upwards. There is no correct way, however most guides are process orientated and will advocate the initial determination of goal and objective statements from 'situation analysis' or problem tree analysis..which in turn will provide identification of components for outcomes and likely activities. Again it is important to note that it is an iterative process and early prospects may be sifted as the project design develops. As packaged MSP linked to the global project design to some extent the Goal and Objective has been set (Global Prodoc)

Some again questioned the number of Outcomes. A: There needs to be a minimum of 4 to address the components advocated in the Global Portfolio project design. The number of outputs to an Outcome is usually 2 or 3.

For some there was concern that the advocacy in the MSP Template and the PDFa template differed. The PDFa template indicated prospect Outcomes and Outputs that MAY come out of MSP project design. This may require additional explanatory notes.

Additional queries were heard with regard to guidance on goals..etc and assumptions. Again the LFA Reader available on the CD was referred. Phraseology was peculiar to donors sometimes!!

In principle the project Outcomes cannot be changed mid-project, and it is doubtful for Outputs other than in extenuating circumstances and review processes are triggered to manage the change. Activities can be changes as a matter of rule.

Participants noted the difference between the LFM of the MSP Template and that used by Mauritius in terms of documenting baseline and targets (note additional columns in the MSP Template for this Portfolio project compared to usual MSP design templates). This was because the template used by Mauritius was based on the older model before the last GEF Council Meeting.

There was some discussion on the extent of 'capacity building' activities under the project with some interest on whether some capital investments could be made? A: If capacity building actions include training or awareness building pilots that require Hardware - then as long as it is substantiated in text, objectives, outcomes and outputs then it should obtain support.

SESSION 20: Introduction to Section III Additional Information
Andrea Volentras

This session briefly described the nature of additional information that needs to be included in the proposal. It was explained that these were the minimum requirements and additional supporting information that gives weight to the proposal is often welcomed.

The additional information includes vetting by relevant FPs, co-financing letters (committed, confirmed, expression of interest, under negotiation - at time of submission)

SESSION 20 b & c: Working Group Session 7 - Additional Information

Annex 7 contains notes for working groups to consider aspects of the 'additional information' required for MSP project.

[Working Group outputs are available on CD, or included below as photographs]

Discussions:

This session enable participants to recall other queries regarding co-financing, support and substantiation - and this was reflected in a number of questions posed to Plenary.

In terms of whether all government resources for a certain programme/project could be aggregated and substantiated as co-financing (in-kind) - this would very much depend on the circumstances of the case. It would have to be demonstrated that it made up a component of the baseline that was essential to meet the objectives of the GEF proposal. Co-financing for one project being accounted as co-financing for another in essence was not a good practice, however if the project proposal proper reported on multiple projects and alignment of outcomes/outputs there was a possibility if those components assisted with meeting the overall objectives of the GEF project.

In terms of endorsement where do you start if NCSA, UNCCD and other enabling actions (GEF/ MEA) have yet to be officiated/incepted. It would require the endorsement of the relevant political FP.

The level of certainty in co-finance letters was raised. While the template recognized that upon submission the 'status' could still be under negotiation, it was best if they could be confirmed asap, to ensure quick and smooth inception. If prospect co-financiers pull out in the last instance this is a matter that may entail project re-design and another reason not to let 'confirmed' co-financing' hanging. The co-financing letter would need to be generated by the co-financing partner, however standard text could be proffered for consideration.

It was agreed that if the knowledge base of the FP and team was suffice the actions of consultants should be limited to components of project design.

Participants also agreed that further information on co-financing and the precision of documentation would be useful.

END OF DAY 4

DAY 5

SESSION 21 (revised session 27) Preparing for COP 7

Yoko Hagiwara

The UNCCD Secretariat presented on the upcoming COP 7, October, in Nairobi, Kenya. The COP presented a good opportunity for Pacific SIDS as reflected in past sessions:

- Possible discussion on 'new' deadline for NAP production
- Financial support from GM and UNCCD Secretariat
- Representation of Pacific SIDS in key UNCCD for a
- SPREP role as a UNCCD focal point pending further consideration as part of SRAP
- 2006 Year of Deserts and Desertification.

SESSION 22 (revised session 29) Regional Projects and Coordination

SOPAC - Dr Neta Prescott

It has been noted that the successful implementation of the UNCCD and the SLM approach, in the Pacific sub-region will require the collaboration of a number of policy and technical partners in the region. There is benefit in having a greater understanding of current regional projects or country projects supported by regional stakeholders - to consider possible co-financing. In addition the Pacific SIDS called for better coordination in the 'Roadmap' generated at COP6.

In terms of regional coordination the plan is to use the revitalized Land Resources Working Group to provide a hub for regional partner involvement, and pending this actions in the region will use the Sustainable Development Working Group. The philosophy has been to ensure the minimal resources to date available from international sources gets to the country level with minimal bureaucracy and transaction cost. A diagram depicting the model for prior actions for country reporting and that forwarded to UNDP GEF was shown. The penultimate arrangements with coordination mechanisms and regional partnering is best brought to a head during the

generation of the draft SRAP, with much liaison between country reps and regional partners. COP 7 could be used to stimulate some of this debate.

This session also was used to present on a very useful regional project managed by SOPAC which has much connection with SLM.

Dr Neta Prescott's/SOPAC's ppt is available on the CD

SESSION 23 (New) - Guides for tying NAP and SLM project design and implementation

Matt McIntyre

The Global Support Unit UNDP-GEF has engaged a consultant to produce guides on means to tie NAP and SLM MSP development, consistent with the recent communication from the UNCCD Secretariat to members.

The presentation briefly described the background to this guide and the elements that would be included in the draft guides – to include processes from PDFA submission, to MSP design, NAP generation and implementation. It would be an international guide for LDC/SIDS; would be graphic orientated; pitched at multiple audiences and limited in size for simplicity.

It is to be completed by early September however would need to be reviewed by a number of international partners – with the aim for release prior to the COP 7.

SESSION 24: CLOSING STATEMENTS, Close of the Meeting

To cater for the need for some one-on-one meetings with countries on PDFA's, NAP and MSP generation it was decided to call the meeting closed prior to lunch on the final day. This would also enable CDs to be produced and made available to PICs before some who had early departures.

Closing Statements were heard from the Observers and a representative of participants.

Mr Frank Wickham summarized key findings of the week and follow-up actions. [See Section on 'Where to from here' pp 2 above.]

Fiji (Inoke) gave the closing speech indicating that this regional meeting had been a long time coming, that the SLM had reinvigorated momentum and the renewed interest of the UNCCD places Pacific SIDS in good stead to use the coming COP 7 wisely. The key message was for us all to work together as equal partners, assisting each other in NAP development, commencing the SRAP but in particular in our preparations for COP7.

END OF REPORT

ANNEX 1: Working Group Session 1, pm day 1 - Notes for Groups

Pacific Regional Workshop on the UNCCD National Action Programmes and UNDP GEF's Sustainable Land Management Portfolio Approach.

NOTES FOR WORKING GROUP FACILITATORS

Day 1, Session 6 : Time allocation: 1 hr

.....

Purpose: To have participants discuss 1, 2 and 3 below and develop up to 5 main points under each item for discussion during plenary session:

- 1) Links between NAPs, SLM Project and other national and regional environmental and agricultural initiatives and programs in terms of:
 - Common or complementary objectives
 - Common institutional aspects
 - Coordination opportunities
 - Opportunities for co-financing
 - Relationship between NAP and SLM.

Note: Linkages, relationships could be presented in a diagrammatic form or with use of bullet-points.

- 2) Past, current and/or potential challenges for addressing NAPs and SLM Project in countries.
- 3) Particular needs, issues or concerns that the workshop can be used to address.

Process:

- a) Identify reporter and presenter
- b) Introduce session purpose and expected outputs.
- c) Facilitate brainstorming & discussions on the above matters.
- d) 5 minute presentation on the main points during plenary session using flipcharts or power point presentation.

ANNEX 2: Working Group Session 2, Day 2 - Notes for Groups

Regional Workshop on the UNCCD National Action Programmes and UNDP GEF's Sustainable Land Management Portfolio Approach.

WORKING GROUP NOTES

Day 2, Session 8 Time allocation: 1 hr

.....

Purpose:

- To discuss status of NAPs , possible scheduling of NAP production, resources and needs to complete NAPs or related activities.

1: Status:

Completed	Palau , Niue
Under preparation with funding support	Fiji, PNG, Tuvalu, Solomon Is.
Under preparation, using own resources	Samoa,
Initial preparations underway	Cook Is, Kiribati, RMI, FSM, Nauru, Tonga, Vanuatu

- Countries to elaborate on status of NAP preparation, development and plans for implementation.

2: Possible scheduling for NAP Production

- Discuss process presented by Yoko and timing

3. Needs and Resources

- Funding opportunities
- Back-stopping/technical support

ANNEX 3: Working Group Session 3, Day 3 - Notes for Groups

NOTES FOR GROUPS

Section I, Part 1 & 2 of the MSP Template

PART 1
Key Questions
What are existing policy/legal/technical documents could you draw on to address the above issues?
What institutions/groups of people would you need to involve to collect the data and information to do the MSP?
What circumstances particular to your country would you like to incorporate into the MSP?
Parameters to consider
Environmental context
Socio-economic context
Policy, Institutional and Legal Context
Causes of Land Degradation
PART 2.
Baseline Cause of Action
What are existing policy/legal/technical documents could you draw on to address the above issues?
What institutions/groups of people would you need to involve to collect the data and information to do the MSP?
What circumstances particular to your country would you like to incorporate into the MSP?
Parameters for Consideration
Capacity and Mainstreaming needs for SLM
Project Rationale and Objective
Expected Project Outcomes and Outputs
Global and Local Benefits
Linkages to IA activities and programmes
Stakeholder Involvement Plan

ANNEX 4: Working Group Session 4, Day 3 - Notes for Groups

FINANCIAL PLAN (SESSION 17)

Objectives of the session:

By the end of this session delegates should:

- Be familiar with preparing the Financial Plan
- Understand the various components of the plan and what they can be used for
- Understand the various options/sources for co-financing

Tasks:

- 1 Carry out a streamlined incremental costs assessment (as per instructions in the template)
- 2 Complete the tables on the next page (as per instructions in the MSP template)

Example of Financial plan (Session 17)

Cost benchmarks (in 1,000 US dollars)

Component	GEF	Co-finance		Total
		Govt Co-finance	Other co-finance	
Capacity Development for SLM	300	200	200 (50 Aus, 150 EU)	
Completion of NAP	0	5	12 (10 EU, 3AusAID)	
Mainstreaming	100	45	88 (38 Aus, 50 EU)	
Medium Term Investment Plan and its Resource Mobilization	100	50	99 (10 Aus, 89 EU)	
TOTAL MSP	500	300	400	1,200

Table 1. Detailed description of estimated co-financing sources

Co-financing Sources				
Name of Co-financier (source)	Classification*	Type*	Amount (US\$)	Status*
AusAID	Donor		100	
EU	Donor		300	
GoSOI	Donor		300	
Sub-Total Co-financing			700	

Explanation for deviations from criteria and norms (if applicable):

ANNEX 5: Working Group Session 5, Day 4 - Notes for Groups

PART III: MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

Project Implementation Process

- Do the countries in your group fall under UNDP National Execution Procedures (NEX) or UNDP Direct Execution Procedures (DEX)?
- Who is the implementation agency in the management arrangements?
- Who is the executing agency in the management arrangements?
- Can there be more than one executing agency?
- Who manages the contracts with local service providers?
- How might a country receive high level guidance and oversight and technical oversight for this project?
- How often will the project be audited?
- Should technical assistance from other agencies (national/regional/international) be included in this section? Who might they be?
- What types of revisions is the UNDP Resident Representative authorized to make to the MSP Project Document?
- Who owns any intellectual rights generated under the project

PART IV: MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

- What provisions should the monitoring and evaluation plan provide for?
- Who provides the monitoring and evaluation plan?
- On what basis will the projects Monitoring and Evaluation system be assessed?
- When will the external mid-term review be performed?
- What is the focus of this review?
- When is the final evaluation of the project conducted?

Type of M&E activity	Lead responsible party in bold	Budget	Time frame
Inception Report	Project Implementation Team	None	At the beginning of project implementation
APR/PIR	The Government, UNDP Country Office, Executing Agency, Project Team, UNDP/GEF Task Manager ¹	None	Every year, at latest by June of that year
Tripartite meeting and report (TPR)	The Government, UNDP Country Office, Executing Agency, Project Team, UNDP/GEF Task Manager	None	Every year, upon receipt of APR
Mid-term External Evaluation	Project team, UNDP/GEF headquarters, UNDP/GEF Task Manager, UNDP Country Office, Executing Agency	average \$30,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final External Evaluation	Project team, UNDP/GEF headquarters, UNDP/GEF Task Manager, UNDP Country Office, Executing Agency	average \$40,000	At the end of project implementation, Ex-post: about two years following project completion
Terminal Report	UNDP Country Office, UNDP/GEF Task Manager, Project Team	None	At least one month before the end of the project
Audit	Executing Agency , UNDP Country Office, Project Team	Average \$1000 per year;	Yearly
Visits to field sites	UNDP Country Office, Executing Agency	Average \$2,000 per year;	Yearly
Lessons learnt	UNDP-GEF, GEFSEC, Project Team, Executing Agency	Average \$4,000 per year;	Yearly
TOTAL COST			

ANNEX 6: Working Group Session 7, Day 4 - Notes for Groups

SECTION III: ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Part I. GEF Operational Focal Point Letter

- What is the recommended process for obtaining country endorsement ?

Part II. Co-Financing Letters

- Should all co-financing letters indicate that funds are confirmed?
- Who writes the co-financing letters?
- What would you expect your consultant to do when seeking these co-financing letters?

Part III Detailed Information

- What information would you include here?

Annex 7: List of Participants:

	<p>Pacific Regional Workshop on UNCCD Land Degradation - National Action Plans and UNDP-GEF Sustainable Land Management Approach</p>		
---	---	---	---

22-26 August, 2005 - Suva, Fiji

Participants List

COOK ISLANDS

Ms Tania Temata
Manager, Environment International Division
National Environment Service
PO Box 371
Rarotonga
Cook Islands
Telephone: +682 21 256
Fax: +682 22 256
Email: resources@environment.org.ck
tania@environment.org.ck

Mr. Timoti Tangiruaine
IT/GIS Officer
Ministry of Works and Physical Planning
Rarotonga
Cook Islands
Telephone: +682 20 034
Fax: +682 21 134
Email: t.tangiruaine@mow.gov.ck

Ms Heimata Louisa Karika
NCSA Project coordinator
National Environment Service
PO Box 371
Rarotonga
Cook Islands
Telephone: +682 21 256
Fax: +682 22 256
Email: louisa@enviornment.org.ck

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

Mr. Joseph M. Konno
Environmental Conventions Advisor
Chuck State Government
PO Box 559
Weno, Chuuk State
Federated States of Micronesia 96942
Telephone: +691 330 4158
Fax: +691 330 2233
Email: cpiccap@mail.fm

Mr. Abraham K. Simpson
Executive Director
Kosrae Island Resource Management Authority
(KIRMA)
PO Box 480
Tofol, Kosrae
Federated States of Micronesia
Telephone: +691 370 2076
Fax: +691 370 2867
Email: simpson@mail.fm

FIJI

Mr. Inoke Ratukalou
Director
Land Resources Planning and Development
PO Box 5442
Raiwaga, Suva
Fiji
Telephone: +679 338 4900
Fax: +679 338 4058
Email:

Mr. Atish Prasad
Acting Principal Research Officer, Land Use Planning
Department of Land Resources Planning &
Development
PO Box 5442
Raiwaga, Suva
Fiji
Telephone: +679 338 4900
Fax: +679 338 4058
Email: aprasad006@govnet.gov.fj

KIRIBATI

Mr. Kautoa Tonganibeia
Environmental Inspector
Environment and Conservation Division
Ministry of Environment, Lands & Agriculture Development
PO Box 234
Bikenibeu, Tarawa
Kiribati
Telephone: +686 28 000 / 28 507
Fax: +686 28 334
Email: kautoa.ecd@melad.gov.ki

Ms Rota Tetaake
Agricultural Officer
Department of Agriculture
PO Box 267
Tarawa
Kiribati
Telephone: +686 28 005
Fax: +686 28 121
Email: toatetaake@yahoo.co.uk

MALDIVES

Mr. Ahmed Ali Manik
Senior Environment Analyst
Ministry of Environment, Energy and Water
Huravee Building
Ameeru Ahmed Magu
Male, Maldives
Telephone: +960 332 4861
Fax: +960 332 2286
Email: ahmed.ali@environment.gov.mv

Mr. Ahmed Nilam Mohamed
Legal Officer
Ministry of Environment, Energy and Water
Huravee Building
Ameeru Ahmed Magu
Male, Maldives
Telephone: +960 332 4861
Fax: +960 332 2286
Email: nilam.Mohamed@environment.gov.mv

MARSHALL ISLANDS

Ms Deborah Barker
Majuro
Marshall Islands
Telephone: +695 625
Fax: 695 625
Email: oeppc@ntamar.net

NIUE

Hon. Bill Vakaafi Motufoou
Ministry for DAFF
Government of Niue
Alofi
Niue Islands
Telephone: +683 4200
Fax: +683 4206
Email: bva@niue.nu

Mr. Ernest Nemaia
Trade Officer
Government of Niue
PO Box 90504
Auckland
New Zealand
Telephone: +649 302 2204
Fax: +649 302 0096
Email: eknemaia@hotmail.com

PALAU

Mr. Michael Aulerio
National GIS Analyst Assistant
Palau Automated Land and Resources Information
Systems (PALARIS) / National GIS
Office of PALARIS
Ministry of Resources and Development
Government of the Republic of Palau 9640
Telephone: +680 488 6654
Fax: +680 488 3380
Email: mikeaulerio@hotmail.com
palaris@palaunet.com

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Mr. Robert Norombe
Acting Deputy Secretary
Department of Environment & Conservation
Port Moresby
Papua New Guinea
Telephone: +675 325 0180
Fax: +675 325 0182
Email: odir@daltron.com.pg

Mr. Stanley Oa
Acting Senior Soil Scientist
Department of Agriculture and Livestock
PO Box 1863
Boroko
Papua New Guinea
Telephone: +675 320 2959
Fax: +675 321 1046
Email: odir@daltron.com.pg

SAMOA

Mr. Sooialo David Fong
Assistant Chief Executive Officer
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment
PO Box 2286
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: +685 21 904
Fax: +685 23 692
Email: laloaoa1@hotmail.com

Ms Natasha Siaosi
Senior Land Development Officer
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment
Private Bag
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: +685 22 486
Fax: +685 23 176
Email: Natasha.siaosi@mnre.gov.ws

Mr. Lae Siliva
Senior Research Officer
Ministry of Finance
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: +685 34 325
Fax: +685
Email: lae.siliva@mof.gov.ws

Mr. Mark Bonin
Consultant
Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment
PO Box 3039
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: +685 21 860
Fax: +685
Email: bonin@lesamoa.net

SOLOMON ISLANDS

Ms Nesta Lolley Leguvaka
National Project Coordinator
National Capacity Self-Assessment Project
Department of Forestry
Environment & Conservation
Ministry of Natural Resources
PO Box G24
Honiara
Solomon Islands
Telephone: +677 28 611
Fax: +677 24 460
Email: nesta_lolley@hotmail.com

Ms Ellen Iramu
Senior Research Officer
Department of Agriculture & Livestock
PO Box G13
Honiara
Solomon Islands
Telephone: +677 22 162
Fax: +677 28 116
Email: iramue@solomon.com.sb

TIMOR-LESTE

Mr. Luis Godinho
Director of Reforestation and Land Degradation
Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and Focal
Point of UNCCD
Fomento Building
Rua D. Aleixo Corte Real
Dili
Timor-Leste
Telephone: +670 333 9033

Mr. Mario Ximenes
Division of Environment
Multilateral Environment Agreement Coordinator
Secretariat of State of Environmental Coordination
Physical Development and Territorial Management
Fomento Building
Rua D. Aleixo Corte Real
Dili
Timor-Leste
Telephone: +670 333 9119

Fax: +670 332 5121
Email:

Fax:
Email:

TONGA

Ms Tupe Samani
Conservation Officer
Department of Environment
PO Box 917
Nuku'alofa
Tonga
Telephone: +676 25 050
Fax: +676 25 051
Email: tupe_samani@hotmail.com

TUVALU

Mr. Enati Evi
Acting Director
Department of Environment
Vaiaku, Funafuti
Tuvalu
Telephone: +688 20 815
Fax: +688 20 113
Email: enviro@tuvalu.tv

Mr. Poni Faavae
NAPA Coordinator
Tuvalu Government
Office of Prime Minister
Vaiaku, Funafuti
Tuvalu
Telephone: +688 20 171
Fax: +688 20 162
Email: napa@tuvalu.tv

VANUATU

Mr. Ernest Bani
Head, Vanuatu Environment Unit
Government of Vanuatu
Administration Management of the Vanuatu Environment
Unit
Official Focal Point for UNCCD, UNCBD, GEF
PMB 9063
Port Vila, Vanuatu
Telephone: +678 25 302
Fax: +678 23 565
Email: environ@vanuatu.com.vu

Mr. Francois Wabak
Horticulture Officer
Department of Agriculture & Rural Development
PMB 040
Port Vila
Vanuatu
Telephone: +678 22 432
Fax: +678 25 265
Email:

PACIFIC ISLAND FORUM SECRETARIAT (PIFS)

Ms Coral Siale Pasisi
Environmental Resources Officer
Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS)
Private Bag
Suva, Fiji
Telephone: +679 331 2600
Fax: +679 331 2696
Email: coralp@forumsec.org.fj

Ms Padma Lal
Sustainable Development Adviser
Pacific Island Forum Secretariat (PIFS)
Private Bag
Suva, Fiji
Telephone: +679 331 2600
Fax: +679 331 2696
Email: padmal@forumsec.org.fj

SECRETARIAT OF THE PACIFIC COMMUNITY (SPC)

Mr. Aleki Sisifa
Director
Land Resources Division
Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)
Private Mail Bag
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: +679 330 0472
Fax: +679 330 5212
Email: alekis@spc.int

Mr. Sairusi Sevu Bulai
Forests & Trees Adviser
Land Resources Division
Secretariat of the Pacific Community
Private Mail Bag
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: +679 330 0472
Fax: +679 330 5212
Email: sairusib@spc.int

Mr. Rainer Johannes Blank
Adviser for Land Management
SPC/GIZ Pacific-German Regional Forestry Project
PO Box 14041
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: +679 33-5 983
Fax: +679 3315 446
Email: rainderB@spc.int

**SOUTH PACIFIC APPLIED GEOSCIENCE COMMISSION
(SOPAC)**

Dr. Netatua Prescott
Sustainable Policy Adviser
SOPAC
Private Mail Bag
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: +679 338 1377
Fax: +679 337 0040
Email: netatuap@sopac.org

UNCCD SECRETARIAT

Mrs Yoko Hagiwara
Programme Officer, Asia Unit / 99
UNCCD Secretariat
Haus Carstanjen
Martin-Luther-King-Strasse 8
53175, Bonn
Germany
Telephone: +49 228 815 2829
Email: +49 228 815 2898
Email: yhagiwara@unccd.int

UNFCCC SECRETARIAT

Mr. Moussa M. DIAKHITÉ
Programme Officer, UNFCCC Secretariat
LDC/Adaptation Sub-programme
Sustainable Development Programme
Martin-Luther-King-Strasse 8
D-53175, Bonn
Germany
Telephone: +49 228 815 1332
Fax: +49 228 815 1999
Email: mdiakhite@unfccc.int

UNDP (Apia)

Mr. Easter Galuvao
Assistant Resident Representative
(Environment and Energy Programme)
Private Mail Bag
UNDP
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: +685 23 670 / 671
Fax: +685 23 555
Email: easter.galuvao@undp.org

Mr. Meapelo Mai'ai
Environment Programme Officer
Private Mail Bag
UNDP
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: +685 23 670 / 671
Fax: +685 23 555
Email: meapelo.mai'ai@undp.org

Mr. Andrea Volentras
UNDP
Private Mail Bag
Apia
Samoa
Telephone: +685 23 670 / 671
Fax: +685 23 555
Email: andrea.volentras@undp.org

UNDP (PNG)

Mr. Tony Feu'u Torea
National Programme Officer
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
UN House, Level 14
Deloitte Tower Building
PO Box 1041
Port Moresby
Papua New Guinea
Telephone: +675 321 2899
Fax: +675 321 1224
Email: tony.torea@undp.org

UNDP (Solomon Islands Sub-Office)

Ms Jan Mcdonald
Environment Program Manager
UNDP-Solomon Islands Sub-Office
PO Box 1954
Honiara
Solomon Islands
Telephone: +677 27 446
Fax: +677
Email: jan.mcdonald@undp.org.sb

UNDP (South Africa)

Mr. Hans Eschweiler
Project Coordinator SLM Portfolio Project
Global Support Unit
UNDP
Pretoria
South Africa
Telephone: +27-12 354 8128
Fax: +27-12-354 8111
Email: hans.eschweiler@undp.org

UNDP (Suva)

Mr. Garry Wiseman
Pacific Regional Centre
UNDP
Suva
Fiji
Telephone:
Fax:
Email:

Ms Asenaca Ravuvu
UNDP
Suva
Fiji
Telephone:
Fax:
Email:

Mr. Alvin Chandra
Environment/GEF/Energy Associate
UNDP
Suva
Fiji
Telephone: +679 331 2500
Fax: +679
Email: alvin.chandra@undp.org

FACILITATOR

Mr. Matthew McIntyre
Consultant

SPREP Secretariat
PO Box 240
Apia, Samoa

Telephone: +685 21 929
Fax: +685 20 231 / 22 186
Website: www.sprep.org.ws

Mr. Amena Yauvoli
Sustainable Development Policy Adviser

Email: amenay@sprep.org

Mr. Frank Wickham
Human Resource Development / Training Officer

Email: frankw@sprep.org

Ms Saunoa Mata'u
Programme Assistant

Email: saunoam@sprep.org

5 November 2007