

Strategic Action Programme  
for the International  
Waters of the Pacific Small  
Island Developing States

## **First Regional Task Force Meeting**

**26–27 March, 2001**

**Apia, Samoa**

---

**Meeting Report 2001/01**

### **Participating Countries in the International Waters Programme**

Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.



## Table of Contents

Summary Record of Discussion .....	1
Opening .....	1
Vice Chair .....	1
Apologies .....	1
Procedural Issues .....	1
Adoption of Agenda .....	1
Overview of IWP Objectives .....	1
Terms of Reference for the Regional Task Force .....	2
Inception Report .....	2
Current Status – Coastal Component .....	3
Current Status – Oceanic Component .....	3
Proposal for Building Sustainability .....	4
Mechanisms for Securing Economic Input .....	4
Budget .....	5
Terms of Reference for National Coordinators .....	5
Review of Country Submissions to the Formulation Phase of the IWP .....	6
Draft Framework Communications Strategy .....	6
2001 Work Plan .....	7
Supplementary Activities .....	7
Other Business .....	8
Next Meeting .....	8
Adoption of Summary Record of Discussion .....	8
Close of Meeting .....	8
<b>Annex I: Participants' List</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<i>Organisations</i> .....	<i>10</i>
<i>Partner Agencies</i> .....	<i>11</i>
<i>Observers</i> .....	<i>12</i>
<b>Annex II: Welcome Address</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex III: Introductory Address</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex IV: Opening Remarks</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Annex V: Agenda</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Annex VI: Programme Technical Advisory Group Terms of Reference</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<i>Introduction</i> .....	<i>20</i>
<i>Objective of the Programme</i> .....	<i>20</i>
<i>The Programme Technical Advisory Group (PTAG)</i> .....	<i>20</i>
<i>Secretariat</i> .....	<i>20</i>
<i>Composition</i> .....	<i>21</i>
<i>Committees, Sub-Committees and Subsidiary Bodies</i> .....	<i>21</i>
<i>Role of the Programme Technical Advisory Group</i> .....	<i>21</i>
<i>Frequency and Timing of Programme Technical Advisory Group Meetings</i> .....	<i>21</i>
<i>Chair and Vice Chair</i> .....	<i>21</i>
<i>Funding</i> .....	<i>22</i>
<i>Reports</i> .....	<i>22</i>
<i>Amendments</i> .....	<i>22</i>
<b>Annex VII: Closing Statement</b> .....	<b>23</b>



## Summary Record of Discussion

1. Representatives from Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tonga, and Tuvalu participated in the First Regional Task Force for the Strategic Action Programme for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States. Representatives from the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the South Pacific Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, the South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC), the University of the South Pacific (USP), Guam, the Canada-South Pacific Ocean Development Program (C-SPODP), The Asian Development Bank (ADB), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Pacific Islands Association of Non Government Organisations (PIANGO), the World Conservation Union (IUCN), the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), the AusAID Samoa Fisheries Project, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) also participated in the Task Force. A list of participants is attached as Annex I.

## Opening

2. Reverend Utufua Naseri led the opening of the First Regional Task Force with a prayer.
3. As a result of the overseas absence of Mr Tamari'i Tutangata, Director of SPREP, Ms Neva Wendt, Officer-in-Charge, delivered a Welcome Address. On behalf of the SPREP Secretariat and meeting participants, Ms Wendt requested her condolences be passed to the family and friends of Felix Punjuboe, and the Director and staff of FFA, on the sudden passing of Felix on 24 March in Apia. She noted that Felix had been a loyal servant to the region for more than 10 years and that his death was a major loss. Ms Wendt's address is attached as Annex II.
4. The Resident Representative of the UNDP, Apia Office, Mr Serge Ducasse responded with his Introductory Remarks. These are attached as Annex III.
5. Ms Wendt then introduced the Honourable Tagaloa Tuala Tagaloa, Minister for Lands, Surveys and Environment for Samoa to deliver his Opening Remarks. The Minister's Remarks are attached as Annex IV.
6. On behalf of Task Force participants, Ms I'o Tuakeu Lindsay from the Cook Islands, thanked the Minister for his Opening Remarks.
7. Ms Wendt then formally invited the Minister to assume the Chair.

## Vice Chair

8. The Task Force unanimously elected Ms I'o Tuakeu Lindsay as Vice Chair.

## Apologies

9. Apologies were received from the Government of Vanuatu and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

## Procedural Issues

10. The Secretariat circulated a draft logo for the International Waters Programme (IWP). Participants were asked to provide written comments on the draft prior to the end of the meeting.

## Adoption of Agenda

11. The Task Force adopted the agenda which is attached as Annex V.

## Overview of IWP Objectives

12. Referring to the Project Document and the Inception Report, the Project Manager provided an overview of the International Waters Programme (IWP). The overview commenced with an outline of the scope of international waters and its relevance to the Pacific islands region. The Project Manager summarised the goal, objectives and principal activity areas envisaged for the Programme as presented in the Project Document. He noted that the Programme has two components, a coastal component and an oceanic component with the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) based at SPREP responsible for implementation of the coastal component while the oceanic component is implemented through the SPC and FFA. Finally, the Project Manager summarised the principal anticipated outputs of the Programme as presented in the Project Document.

13. The Task Force noted the overview.

## Terms of Reference for the Regional Task Force

14. The Project Manager introduced Working Paper 1 that provided an outline for issues to be considered in respect of the conduct of meetings of the Regional Task Force. He noted that draft Terms of Reference appended to the paper were based on the Rules of Procedure for meetings convened by SPREP and FFA, including the Terms of Reference for the Technical Management Advisory Group established to support the South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme (SPBCP).

15. A small group convened separately to review the draft Terms of Reference. This included a proposal to change the name of the Task Force to a Programme Technical Advisory Group (PTAG) and the transfer of administrative and financial issues to the Tripartite Review. The recommendations of the small group were presented to the meeting and, after discussion, were adopted by the Task Force (Annex VI).

16. Until such time as the PTAG elects to review them, the Terms of Reference adopted by the First Meeting will apply to all future meetings of the PTAG.

## Inception Report

17. In introducing Working Paper 2, the Inception Report, the Project Manager noted that critical supporting work normally associated with the formulation phase for Programmes like the International Waters Programme appeared to have received little attention. The Project Manager explained that the formulation phase had been relatively short with countries given six weeks to aggregate information relevant to the Programme and formulate national priorities that could be addressed under the Programme. In order to comply with this timeframe, countries had relied on existing documentation, such as National Environmental Management Strategies, to prepare their submissions.

18. He advised that there was little evidence that critical baseline information had been adequately assimilated into the formulation phase for the Programme, that little attention had been paid to lessons that had been learned from related programmes previously implemented in the region and that issues, such as indicators of success, as well as a thorough treatment of partnership responsibilities, and monitoring and evaluation strategies had received insufficient attention. As a result, the PCU will now have to expend considerable effort undertaking this type of background work to improve the prospects for efficient implementation of the pilot projects.

19. In addition, the Project Manager advised the Task Force that major components of the Project Document were difficult to interpret. He noted that the relationship between the activities described at Part D, Immediate Objectives, Outputs and Activities, the UNDP Input Budget (Table 1), the UNDP Output Budget (Table 3) and the Logical Framework (Annex 1) was not clear with the result that it was not possible to confidently identify financial resources described in the Project Document with the activities and outputs envisaged under the Programme. In association with UNDP, SPC and FFA, these issues had been reviewed so as to provide more clarity in relation to the activities, and budgetary resources to support them, under the Programme. It was also noted that, as a result of the delayed implementation of the Programme, it was unlikely that expenditure forecasts would be achieved.

20. The Project Manager concluded by noting that despite the difficulties associated with implementation of the Programme, the commencement was occurring at a beneficial time for the region. He noted that, for the oceanic component, the IWP was now providing critical support to the participating governments in their sensitive negotiations that will lead to the establishment of new arrangements for the management and conservation of oceanic fish stocks in the western central Pacific. He also noted that, for the coastal component, valuable lessons had been generated by several significant community-based initiatives that should provide a sound basis for the design and implementation of pilot projects in the participating countries.

21. In relation to the oceanic component, the representative from FFA agreed that delayed implementation had been beneficial to the region. He highlighted the critical support that had been provided through the Programme to participating governments during the final negotiating sessions of the Multilateral High Level Conference in 2000 and noted that the Programme continued to provide strategic support to the participating countries as arrangements for a new tuna commission are negotiated.

22. In respect of the coastal component, the representative from WWF noted that opportunities existed for the activities of the IWP to be linked to National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) that are being implemented in participating countries. He also noted potential collaborative opportunities for the Programme with both WWF's 3-year training programme focused on biodiversity valuation and its green economic programme.

23. Supporting a view expressed by the representative from Samoa that it welcomed the implementation of the Programme, the representative from Cook Islands also noted that the Cook Island's NEMS required updating. She cited

this as an example of where greater effort was required to promote prospects for integrating the results of initiatives such as the International Waters Programme into national policy.

24. The Task Force noted the Inception Report.

## **Current Status – Coastal Component**

25. The Project Manager introduced Working Paper 3 that summarised activities relating to the coastal component of the International Waters Programme. He reported on administrative and logistical issues associated with the establishment of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) at SPREP, the administrative arrangements in place for other partner organisations involved in the Programme, initiatives to raise awareness of the International Waters Programme – within the SPREP Secretariat and throughout the region, and progress designing strategies and identifying the foundation work required to support national components of the Programme and the implementation of the pilot projects.

26. The representative from the ADB expressed concern that four focal areas to be addressed under the coastal component had the capacity to involve several government departments, not just those associated with the environment or marine resources management. He noted that lessons learned pointed to using one implementing agency and now considerable effort would be required to ensure that all relevant government agencies collaborated in pilot project implementation. He also queried the arrangements for the selection of pilot project focal areas once the number of projects identified in the Project Document to address each area is fully subscribed.

27. The Project Manager responded that while the Project Document envisaged each pilot project would address one focal area, there were also possibilities for designing pilot projects that would address two focal areas or more. However, he also noted that the GEF had provided funding based on the fact that the pilot projects would address a range of priority concerns and that understanding should be honoured to the extent possible.

28. The representatives of Fiji and Federated States of Micronesia expressed support for integrating pilot project focal areas if feasible.

29. The representative from SOPAC highlighted SOPAC's capacity and willingness to assist with the implementation of the pilot projects. He noted that technological developments in the area of coastal mapping (swathe mapping and satellite mapping) should be able to provide valuable spatial information at pilot project sites.

30. The representative from UNDP noted that the implementation of the pilot projects is already a complicated issue. He acknowledged that while some pilot projects may be designed to address more than one focal area, such an initiative would create additional complexities. He also noted that pilot projects do not necessarily have to be developed from scratch – there are possibilities for designing pilot projects so they complement existing programmes for mutual benefit.

31. The Task Force noted the report for the coastal component.

## **Current Status – Oceanic Component**

32. The Coordinator of the Oceanic Fisheries Programme at SPC provided an overview of activities associated with the SPC component of the IWP. He noted the western central Pacific supported a tuna fishery of global significance and that, through the IWP, increased attention was being applied to ecosystem-wide issues associated with that fishery. This included improved scientific advice concerning the target fish stocks and by-catch species. He noted that the SPC-implemented component of the IWP has the potential to provide valuable scientific support to participating countries during the negotiations that will lead to the establishment of the new conservation and management commission. He concluded that the three positions for IWP-supported staff at SPC had been recruited, and good progress had been made with the implementation of the project; national coordinators, who would take a lead role in national fisheries monitoring programmes in participating countries, were however yet to be recruited.

33. In response to a question from the representative from ADB concerning shark by-catch in oceanic fisheries, the SPC representative advised that many countries are starting activities that address the FAO International Plan of Action on Sharks. There is an existing baseline of by-catch information in the region and IWP fishery-monitoring activities will build on that, to the benefit of member countries.

34. The Fisheries Management Adviser at FFA provided a summary of activities for the FFA component of the International Waters Programme. He noted that the IWP is supporting three streams of work with one level of impact at the global level:

- At the regional level, IWP resources are focused on ensuring effective Pacific island participation in the process of establishing a new regional tuna management regime;
- At the national level, IWP resources are focused on institutional strengthening, particularly

through the preparation of national tuna management plans, with work under way in Vanuatu, Cook Islands and Tuvalu and planned for Niue, Kiribati and Fiji. This work depends on collaboration between the IWP and other regional programmes promoting tuna management and conservation such as that supported by C-SPODP; and

- At the level of the Secretariat, the IWP is also supporting significant restructuring within the FFA secretariat so that the secretariat could be more responsive to the needs of participating countries once new oceanic fisheries conservation and management arrangements are formalised. He concluded that the target outputs and timing for the implementation of the oceanic component were excellent.

35. The Task Force noted the reports from SPC and FFA concerning the oceanic component of the IWP.

## **Proposal for Building Sustainability**

36. The Project Manager introduced Working Paper 5 relating to the key issue of the sustainability of Programme initiatives. He noted that there are many examples of programmes in the region where significant advances in meeting design objectives are achieved while resources are available to support implementation. However, once those resources are withdrawn, many programmes collapse.

37. As elaborated in Working Paper 5, the PCU proposed one relatively minor activity in an attempt to improve prospects for the sustainability of initiatives associated with the International Waters Programme. The proposal involved providing financial resources from pilot project budgets to support post-graduate tertiary study on issues directly related to each pilot project. In this way, countries would be building capacity and local skills in issues directly related to environment and resource management while at the same time contributing to the implementation of each pilot project and assisting it to achieve its objectives. Any skills acquired should then be available to countries and the region well beyond the completion of the International Waters Programme.

38. The representative from USP reported that a similar programme had been supported at USP by C-SPODP but that was drawing to a close. An indication of the appropriateness of the programme was demonstrated in the fact that 26 scholarships had been awarded under the programme and that a recent advertisement for six scholarships had resulted in 32 applications.

39. Following an intervention from the representative from Papua New Guinea in which she noted that the Programme provided for attachments and fellowships for the oceanic component, but not the coastal component, the representative from the IUCN stated that, while she supported the concept, she queried arrangements to incorporate capacity building and sustainability into the design of the Programme as a whole. In respect of this she referred to a recent report drafted by the TNC that addressed this issue.

40. The representatives from TNC and WWF noted that, in addition to tertiary training, training in support capacity building can be addressed to all components of a community, ranging from school leavers to village elders. In addition, WWF drew the attention of the Task Force to a Community Development Conservation Course that is proving effective.

41. The representatives of Samoa and Fiji noted that local environments are changing rapidly and that there is a need to build capacity within communities to assist with developing appropriate responses to these changes. The representative from Samoa expressed concern that not all graduates remain in the region at the completion of their studies and so there will be instances where any investment by the Programme in capacity building is lost to the region. The representative from USP noted that this was a common problem to many areas of training.

42. The Task Force agreed that capacity building and sustainability were critical issues that should be addressed in pilot project design. While tertiary studies were one option to assist in addressing this issue, there were many other training needs that also required attention.

43. The Task Force recommended that full consideration of capacity building and sustainability issues should be reviewed and promoted in discussions with participating countries during planning for implementation of pilot projects. The Task Force further recognised that the coastal component of the IWP does not provide specifically for capacity building, as the oceanic component does, and that this element should be accommodated in the design of the pilot projects.

44. The Task Force accepted that mechanisms for promoting sustainability, including the provision of tertiary training opportunities, should be taken up with participating countries during the design of pilot projects. The PCU undertook to keep regional and national tertiary institutions briefed on developments in relation to this initiative.

## **Mechanisms for Securing Economic Input**

45. The Project Manager briefed the meeting on mechanisms to access professional input to address economic issues associated with the IWP. He explained that the Project Document had provided for a Resource Economist to be



recruited to the PCU. However, on the basis of lessons learned from other related projects, and following detailed discussion within the SPREP Secretariat, it was decided to re-designate that post to support a Community Communications Specialist. This was done on the basis that effective communications is critical to the success of programmes such as International Waters and that it was considered economic input to the IWP could be secured through consultancy arrangements on an ad hoc basis.

46. The Project Manager advised that it was proving difficult to locate a source of sustained input on economic issues for the IWP in a cost effective manner. He advised that as each pilot project will require economic assessment and appraisal at various stages of implementation he was exploring possibilities for additional external assistance to support the re-establishment of a position of a Natural Resource Economist within the IWP. He advised the Task Force that considerable efficiency gains could be achieved if economic expertise required to support pilot project activities could be established within the PCU as opposed to contracting consultants to undertake the work required.

47. The representative from UNDP added that the post for the Resource Economist had been advertised internationally for recruitment early during programme implementation and that the terms and conditions offered were insufficient to attract applicants with the desired attributes.

48. The representative from Samoa agreed that it was essential to incorporate economic considerations in the design of pilot projects. The representative from ADB supported this view noting that monitoring and evaluation strategies, including current descriptions for what the Programme will achieve, need to be either refined or developed.

49. The Task Force encouraged the PCU to continue exploring options for securing on-going economic advisory services for pilot projects.

## **Budget**

50. The Project Manager provided a summary of the Budget to supplement details presented at Appendix 8 of the Inception Report (Working Paper 2). He advised that considerable effort involving SPC, FFA, UNDP and the PCU had been expended in September and October 2000 to revise the UNDP Input Budget presented in the Project Document. This was required so that the financial allocation expected for the oceanic component could be satisfied and so that relationships between the activities for the IWP and the Input Budget and Output Budget (Table 3 of the Project Document) could be related. He noted that several issues remained outstanding and that they would be resolved with FFA and UNDP during this meeting.

51. Expenditure figures for each of the components of the IWP were presented. They indicate that, as of the end of 2000, SPC's drawdown of funds amounted to 10 per cent of budget, FFA's amounted to 16 per cent and the PCU's amounted to 1.7 percent of budget. The Project Manager noted that FFA's expenditure was primarily concerned with supporting participating country representation in international and regional meetings. He also noted that PCU expenditure would increase once pilot project implementation commenced.

52. The Task Force noted the Budget.

## **Terms of Reference for National Coordinators**

53. Following a presentation by the Project Manager, the Task Force discussed the Terms of Reference for National Coordinators. The Project Manager noted that while the Terms of Reference will be the subject of discussion between the PCU and individual governments to be negotiated during in-country visits there is some value in developing a regional template that could be applied to the appointment of National Coordinators. It was noted that the National Coordinator is not only expected to serve as manager for pilot project activities within each of the participating countries but he or she will also be expected to serve as an ambassador for the International Waters Programme in general. In this respect, while it was not envisaged that the National Coordinator would have an active role in the implementation of national elements of the oceanic programme, he or she could provide useful backup support for that component if required.

54. In response to a query from the representative from Cook Islands, the Project Manager advised that the approximate annual budget to support National Coordinators was US\$20,000.

55. After lengthy discussion concerning attributes for National Coordinators it was agreed that rather than stipulating post-graduate qualifications for applicants for the post, minimum qualifications should be identified. It was noted that, ideally, individuals appointed to this position should have a full range of skills including diplomatic skills and established networks at senior levels in the public service while at the same time to be an efficient project manager with considerable community liaison skills. The Task Force recognised that people with this range of skills are rare and that some compromises would have to be made prior to recruitment. This is an issue that the PCU would take up during initial consultations to establish pilot projects in each of the participating countries.

## **Review of Country Submissions to the Formulation Phase of the IWP**

56. The Community Assessment and Participation Specialist introduced Working Paper 8 that provided a summary of the process for soliciting participating country input to the formulation of the Programme in 1997. She noted that country submissions were requested in a prescribed format that was designed to identify priority environmental concerns and the major problems associated with each concern. Using existing information, such as the National Environmental Management Strategies, countries were given approximately six weeks to prepare their input. To facilitate broad consultation, National Coordinators were nominated and National and Regional Task Forces were established to support this process.

57. In their submissions, countries generally noted that the time allocation had been a significant constraint in being able to adequately address all issues required for effective country input. As a result, submissions varied significantly in terms of their quality and content and their adherence to the suggested guidelines. Nevertheless, the majority of submissions listed sewage-related liquid and solid microbial pollution, habitat destruction and loss (mangroves, beaches and coral reefs) and over-exploitation (of various species) as their primary concerns.

58. The meeting was invited to consider the proposal that with the assistance of the Project Coordinating Unit, countries review their current priorities in terms of national environmental concerns and problems in the four focal areas the IWP will address, through extensive community consultation, facilitated by the National Coordinators and National Task Forces. Information generated could then be used by the countries to assist in the selection of pilot projects.

59. The representatives from Niue, Federated States of Micronesia and Fiji welcomed the opportunity to review their priority concerns within the four focal areas as identified in 1997. The representative from Palau also noted that, as Palau had not been eligible to participate in the formulation process in 1997, planning for implementation of the pilot project in Palau would need to start from scratch.

60. In addition to reiterating the potential to develop a close association with the NBSAP process, the representative from WWF noted that the information generated during the formulation of the country pilot projects could be valuable for related programmes that may be implemented by other agencies. He encouraged the development of mechanisms so that this type of information could be shared and, in order to avoid duplication and make best use of limited resources, to develop the pilot project formulation process in collaboration with established programmes. The representative from Kiribati, where established mechanisms for the Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme (PICCAP), could be a useful vehicle for the pilot project formulation process supported this view.

61. The representative from SOPAC requested information in relation to the relationship between the consultancies currently being implemented by the PCU, to provide a synopsis of information relating to IWP-related activities in the region, particularly in relation to technical information for the four focal areas, and the proposed national process to formulate each country's pilot project.

62. The Project Manager responded that it was intended to complete the consultancies before the end of May 2001 and that the reports generated would then be used to assist countries select their pilot projects and design the process for their implementation.

63. The Project Manager further advised that approximately 65 per cent of the budget for pilot projects was reserved for direct application at pilot project sites, additional funds were available to support in-country consultative processes and that four per cent of the pilot project budget had been reserved to address issues applicable to all participating countries, such as the consultancies currently being arranged. He advised that the PCU had already expended considerable effort to establish collaborative linkages with all CROP agencies with an active interest in pilot project focal areas and that this commitment would continue.

64. It was noted that the funds to support regional activities such as these would be drawn from the budget for the pilot projects, the results of which would be shared among all participating governments.

65. The representative from the Forum Secretariat also noted that coordination mechanisms among CROP agencies will also be discussed through the Marine Sector Working Group with which the Regional Task Force is expected to maintain a linkage.

## **Draft Framework Communications Strategy**

66. The Community Communications Specialist from the PCU presented a draft Framework Communications Strategy for the International Waters Programme. She advised that despite the relatively large number of related programmes that have been implemented in the Pacific, and in other ocean regions over the last decade, there are few precedents that provide useful working examples of dedicated communications strategies developed in support of those programmes.

67. She noted that the development of a Communications Strategy for the IWP is particularly challenging: the Programme covers an enormous geographical area accommodating different cultures and political influences, it has

many potential partners and covers a complex range of technical issues ranging from high seas fisheries issues to the conservation and management of resources on the coast and in coastal watersheds.

68. The representative of Samoa noted that communications was required to reach in two directions – one on a regional and international scale and the other, of relatively higher importance, to communities at pilot project sites.

69. The representative from USP noted that this was an extremely complex subject and that the resources available to the PCU were insufficient to effectively address all components of the Draft Framework Communications Strategy. The Project Manager responded that it was not intended that the PCU take full responsibility for all components of the Framework Communications Strategy but that numerous partnerships would need to be established, particularly at the national level, to support communications, awareness-raising and education activities under the IWP. It was noted that the budget assigned to supporting communications issues at the national level would be the subject for discussion with national counterparts during the formulation of each pilot project.

70. The Task Force noted the draft Framework Communications Strategy. It encouraged the PCU to continue to develop the Framework and report back to stakeholders as it is refined.

## **2001 Work Plan**

71. The Project Manager presented the draft Work Plan presented at Appendix 8 of the Inception Report. He noted that this work plan was a broad conceptual plan. Although regional activities for the PCU have been identified for 2001, in terms of initiating in-country activities, the actual work plans for each of the 14 participating countries is a matter that would be developed individually with each of the countries during in-country consultations. He advised that a detailed electronic version of the PCU work plan was available for the review of the meeting. Additionally, representatives from SPC and FFA were present to discuss aspects of their respective work plans for the oceanic component of the Programme.

72. The meeting noted the Work Plan presented and encouraged the PCU, in collaboration with participating countries and other partners to move quickly on programme implementation, particularly in respect to the coastal component.

## **Supplementary activities**

### **TRAIN:SEA COAST**

73. The Co-Manager of the TRAIN: SEA COAST (TSC) Unit at USP introduced Working Paper 11. He advised that USP now had significant capacity to deliver TSC-related programmes, a global network of tested courses, developed through the UN Division of Ocean Affairs and the Law of the Sea, that could be adapted for regional application. He noted that, although not formally affiliated with the IWP, the TSC process envisaged close collaboration with international waters programmes that are operational in the same region in which the course will be delivered.

74. In relation to this, the Co-Manager reported that USP, SPREP/PCU, FAO, SPC and FFA were exploring the possibility of developing the first course, tentatively scheduled for delivery in March 2002, that would focus on the FAO's Code of Conduct and its Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries.

75. Existing arrangements provide for the delivery of two courses under the TSC programme. The Co-Manager reported that, as it is intended to address the oceanic component of the IWP through the first course, it has been suggested that the second course should address coastal issues. It was likely that the second course would be delivered in 2003.

76. The representatives of FFA and SPC supported efforts to improve regional understanding of the Code of Conduct noting that this would address a regional need. They noted that resources for the oceanic component within the Programme are fully committed and so supplementary support would be required for their involvement.

77. The Task Force endorsed the proposal to develop the first TSC with a focus on the Code of Conduct.

### **Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA)**

78. The Project Manager for the International Waters Programme briefed the Task Force on attempts to affiliate the Programme with the GIWA initiative – a programme supported by the GEF, implemented by the United Nations Environment Programme and executed through the University of Kalmar in Sweden. He advised that the objective of GIWA is to develop a strategic framework for identifying priorities in relation to threats through an assessment of environmental conditions affecting international waters in relation to: freshwater shortage, water pollution, habitat and biological community modification, fisheries and global change.

79. Following comments by the representative from USP relating to the complexity of the GIWA process, the

Project Manager noted that there are many initiatives currently underway that it could be beneficial to collaborate with GIWA. This included the Rio+10 processes and the Third Global Environment Outlook (GEO3). He also noted that indicative funding for the South Pacific component of the GIWA process was insufficient to provide for detailed consultations with countries and that SPREP would prefer for countries to be directly involved in the process.

80. The Project Manager undertook to keep the Task Force informed of developments in relation to the South Pacific component of GIWA.

## **Other Business**

81. The representative from the WWF asked the representatives from UNDP to explain the relationship between the pilot projects and the potential for countries to target additional GEF funds to support international waters-related activities following the completion of the pilot projects. The representative from UNDP agreed that there may be competition for limited GEF funding and that, depending on the success or otherwise of the international waters pilot projects, it was each country's responsibility to identify priority areas for potential funding assistance under the GEF.

## **Next Meeting**

82. The venue and date for the second meeting of the PTAG will be determined by the Project Coordination Unit in consultation with all major stakeholders. The Task Force agreed that it should meet at least once annually with the result that the next meeting will be convened before April 2002. Prospective participants will be advised of the Task Force Meeting at least six weeks in advance of the proposed meeting dates.

## **Adoption of Summary Record of Discussion**

83. The First Regional Task Force adopted this Summary Record of Discussion.

## **Close of Meeting**

84. Ms Neva Wendt presented a closing statement attached as Annex VII.

85. The Project Manager joined Ms Wendt in thanking the Hon. Tagaloa Tuala Tagaloa, Minister for Lands, Surveys and Environment for the time that he had dedicated to the Task Force. In addition, he extended his appreciation to SPREP administrative personnel, particularly Ms Rosanna Galuvao, the PCU secretary, who had provided professional logistical support to the meeting.

86. The representative from UNDP, on behalf of Mr Serge Ducasse, UNDP's Resident Representative, also thanked the Minister for his excellent chairmanship. He expressed the view that the meeting had been highly successful in raising general awareness of the IWP.

## Annex I: Participants' List

---

### International Waters - Partner Countries

---

#### **Cook Islands**

Ms I'o Tuakeu Lindsay  
Special Advisor  
International Environment Advisory Unit  
PO Box 371  
Rarotonga, Cook Islands  
Ph: (682) 21 256  
Fax: (682) 22 256  
Email: iotuakeu@environment.org.ck  
resources@enviroment.org.ck

Mr Joshua Mitchell  
Director  
Policy and Fisheries Management  
Ministry of Marine Resources (MMR)  
PO Box 85  
Rarotonga, Cook Islands  
Ph: (682) 28 721  
Fax: (682) 29 721  
Email: rar@mmr.gov.ck

#### **Palau**

Ms Mina Rhee  
Assistant Attorney General  
Attorney General's Office  
PO Box 1365  
Koror, Palau 1365  
Ph: (680) 488 2481  
Fax: (680) 488 3329  
Email: agoffice@palaunet.com

#### **Federated States of Micronesia**

Mr Okean Ehmes  
Project Manager, NBSAP  
Department of Economic Affairs  
Ph: (691) 320 2620  
Fax: (691) 320 5854  
Email: fsmrd@mail.fm

#### **Fiji**

Mr Luke Qiritabu  
Legal Officer  
Department of Environment  
PO Box 2131  
Ph: (679) 311 699  
Fax: (679) 312 879  
Email: Iqiritabu@govnet.fj

Mr Maciu Lagibalavu  
Director of Fisheries  
Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forests  
Private Mail Bag  
Raiwaqa, Fiji  
Ph: (679) 361 184  
Fax: (679) 361 122

#### **Papua New Guinea**

Ms Kay Kalim  
Assistant Director  
Water Resources Management  
Office of Environment and Conservation  
PO Box 6601  
Boroko, PNG  
Ph: (675) 325 0198  
Fax: (675) 325 0182  
Email: anggig@daltron.com.pg

#### **Samoa**

Hon. Tagaloa Tuala Tagaloa  
Minister of Lands, Surveys and Environment  
Department of Lands, Surveys and Environment  
Apia, Samoa  
Ph: (685) 23 723

Tu'uu Dr Ieti Taulealo  
Director  
Department of Lands, Surveys and Environment  
Apia, Samoa  
Ph: (685) 22 481

Mr Faumuina V. S. Pati Liu  
Assistant Director of Environment  
Department of Lands, Surveys and Environment  
Apia, Samoa  
Ph: (685) 23 723

#### **Tonga**

Mr Asipeli Palaki  
Marine Conservation Officer  
C/o: Department of Environment  
Ph: (676) 25 050  
Fax: (676) 25 051  
Email: apepacs@kalianet.to

#### **Tuvalu**

Mr Malaki Tihala  
Deputy Director of Fisheries  
Ministry of Natural Resources,  
Energy and Environment  
Private Mail Bag  
Funafuti, Tuvalu  
Ph: (688) 20 742  
Fax: (688) 20 346  
Email: mtihala@hotmail.com  
mnre@tuvalu.tv

**Kiribati**

Ms Nenenteiti Teariki  
Biodiversity and Conservation Officer  
Environment and Conservation Division  
C/o PO Box 234  
Bikenibeu, Tarawa  
Republic of Kiribati  
Ph: (686) 28 593  
Fax: (686) 28 334  
Email: conservation.mesd2@tskl.net.ki  
bsap.mesd2@tskl.net.ki

**Niue**

Mr Brendon Pasisi  
Fisheries Advisor  
Department of Agriculture,  
Forestry and Fisheries  
PO Box 74  
Niue Island  
Ph: (683) 4302  
Fax: (683) 4079  
Email: fisheries@mail.gov.nu

---

**Organisations**

---

**Asian Development Bank (ADB)**

Mr Thomas Gloerfelt-Tarp  
Natural Resources Adviser  
Office of Pacific Operations  
6 ADB Avenue  
0401 Mandaluyong City  
Metro Manila, Philippines  
Ph: (632) 632 5546/6112  
Fax: (636) 632 2442  
Email: tgartp@mail.AsianDevBank.org

**The Nature Conservancy (TNC)**

Dr Andrew Smith  
Director  
Pacific Division, Coastal Marine Program and Palau Country  
Program Manager  
PO Box 1738  
Koror, Palau 96940  
Ph: (680) 488 2017  
Fax: (680) 488 4550  
Email: asmith\_tnc@csi.com

**International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN)**

Ms Sue Miller  
IUCN Project Manager  
Aleipata and Safata Marine  
Protected Area Project  
C/o: Division of Environment and Conservation, Department  
of Lands, Surveys and Environment  
Private Mail Bag  
Apia, Samoa  
Ph: (685) 23 800/70402  
Fax: (685) 25 856  
Email: sue.miller@samoampa.com

**The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**

Mr Masanami Izumi  
Fishery Officer  
FAO Sub-Regional Office for the Pacific Islands  
Private Mail Bag  
Apia, Samoa  
Ph: (685) 22 127  
Fax: (685) 22 126  
Email: Masanami.izumi@fao.org

**South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC)**

Private Mail Bag, GPO  
Mead Road,  
Suva, Fiji  
Tel: (679) 381 139/381 377  
Fax: (679) 370 040/384 461

Dr Russell Howorth  
Programme Manager  
SOPAC  
Email: Russell@sopac.org

Mr Marc Overmars  
Associate Expert for Hydrogeology  
SOPAC  
Email: marc@sopac.org.fj  
<http://www.sopac.org.fj>

**World Wide Fund For Nature (WWF-South Pacific Program)**

Mr Cedric Schuster  
Conservation Policy Officer  
WWF-South Pacific Program  
Private Mail Bag  
G.P.O Suva  
Fiji Islands  
Ph: (679) 315 533  
Fax: (679) 315 410  
Email: schuster@wwfpacific.org.fj

**Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat**

Mr John Low  
Resources Adviser  
Development and Economic Policy Division  
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat  
Private Mail Bag  
Suva, Fiji  
Ph: (679) 300 192  
Fax: (679) 305 573  
Email: johnl@forumsec.org.fj

**Canada-South Pacific Ocean Development Program (C-SPOD II)**

Dr Kenneth Mackay  
Field Program Coordinator  
Development and Economic Policy Division  
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat  
Private Mail Bag,  
Suva, Fiji  
Ph: (679) 312 600  
Fax: (679) 312 696  
Email: KennethM@forumsec.org.fj

**Samoa AusAID Fisheries Project**

Dr Michael King  
Project Manager  
AusAID Fisheries Project Phase II  
PO Box 244  
Apia, Samoa  
Ph: (685) 21 097  
Email: mking@samoa.ws

Peter Watt  
Commercial Fisheries Adviser

Kelvin Passfield  
Fisheries Adviser

**Pacific Islands Association of Non-Government Organisations (PIANGO)**

Mr Clark Peteru  
O le Siosiomaga Society  
PO Box 3372  
Apia, Samoa  
Ph: (685) 21 748  
Email: peteru@samoa.ws  
ngo\_siosiomaga@samoa.ws

**Resource Personnel**

Mr Peter Hunnam  
259 Lambert Road  
Indooroopilly  
Brisbane, Queensland 4068  
Australia  
Ph: (617) 3371 6475  
Email: hunnam@bigpond.com

Mr Robert Gillett  
Gillett, Preston and Associates, Inc.  
PO Box 3344  
Lami, Fiji  
Ph: (679) 362 855  
Fax: (679) 361 035  
Email: gillett@is.com.fj

---

**Partner Agencies**

---

**Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA)**

PO Box 629  
Honiara, Solomon Islands  
Ph: (677) 21 124  
Fax: (677) 23 318

Mr Les Clark  
Fisheries Management Adviser  
Email: Les.clark@ffa.int

Dr Barry Pollock  
Deputy Director  
Email: BarryP@ffa.int

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

Mr Tom Twining-Ward  
Environment Advisor/Head Environment Section  
Private Mail Bag  
Matautu-Uta  
Samoa  
Ph: (685) 23 670/71/72  
Fax: (685) 23 555  
Email: tom.twining-ward@undp.org

Dr Jenny Bryant-Tokalau  
GEF Technical Advisor and Head, GEF Unit  
UNDP Private Mail Bag  
Suva, Fiji  
Ph: (679) 312 500  
Fax: (679) 301 718  
Email: jenny.bryant@undp.org  
Website: www.gefpacific.org

**Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC)**

B.P. D5  
98848 Noumea Cedex  
New Caledonia  
Ph: (687) 262 000  
Fax: (687) 263 818

Dr Antony Lewis  
Oceanic Fisheries Coordinator  
Email: TonyL@spc.int

Dr Tim Adams  
Director, Marine Resources Division  
Email: TimA@spc.int

**University of the South Pacific (USP)**

Prof. Robin South  
Director  
Marine Studies Program  
University of the South Pacific  
PO Box 1168  
Suva, Fiji  
Ph: (679) 21 2051  
Fax: (679) 301 490  
Email: South\_R@usp.ac.fj

---

## South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)

---

### SPREP SECRETARIAT

PO Box 240

Apia,

Samoa

Ph: (685) 21 929

Fax: (685) 20 231

Ms Neva Wendt

Officer-In-Charge

Email: NevaW@sprep.org.ws

Mr Andrew Wright

Project Manager, International Waters

Email: dreww@sprep.org.ws

Dr Natasha Stacey

Community Assessment and Participation Specialist

Email: NatashaS@sprep.org.ws

Ms Michelle Lam

Community Communications Specialist

Email: MichelleL@sprep.org.ws

Ms Rosanna Galuvao

Divisional Assistant, International Waters

Email: RosannaG@sprep.org.ws

Ms Mary Power

Coastal Management Officer

Email: MaryP@sprep.org.ws

Mr Joe Reti

Project Manager

South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme

Email: JoeR@sprep.org.ws

Mr Wayne King

Project Manager

Pacific Islands Climate Change Assistance Programme

Email: WayneK@sprep.org.ws

Ms Saunoa Mata'u

Conference/Travel Officer

Email: SaunoaM@sprep.org.ws

Mr Sam Sesega

Action Strategy Coordinator (Nature Conservation)

Email: SamS@sprep.org.ws

Mr Andrea Volentras

Legal Officer

Email: AndreaV@sprep.org.ws

---

### Observers

---

Mr Denny Cruz

Administrator's Special Assistant

Chemical/Environmental Engineer

Guam Environment Protection Agency

PO Box 22439 GMF

Barrigada, Guam 96921

Ph: (671) 475 1665

Fax: (671) 477 9402

Email: cruz.denny@epa.gov

Ms Anna Tiraa

Consultant

PO Box 244

Apia,

Samoa

Ph: (685) 20 772



## **Annex II: Welcome Address**

**Ms Neva Wendt  
Officer-In-Charge  
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)**

Reverend Utufua Naseri from the Congregational Christian Church of Samoa,  
The Honorable Tagaloa Tuala Sale Tagaloa, Minister for Lands, Surveys and the Environment in Samoa,  
Mr Serge Ducasse, Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme in Samoa,  
Distinguished representatives of countries participating in the Strategic Action Programme for International Waters for the Pacific Region,  
Officials from our sister regional CROP agencies,  
Officials from other regional and international intergovernmental and non-government organisations,  
Observers and staff of the SPREP secretariat, including the staff of the Project Coordination Unit for the International Waters Programme,

Welcome to the first meeting of the Regional Task Force to oversee the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States.

Before proceeding, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Director and staff of the SPREP secretariat, and all participants in this Task Force, it is an honour for me to extend our congratulations to the Honourable Minister on his re-election at the recent Samoan national elections held here three weeks ago. Further, we are particularly pleased that he remains responsible for the Environment portfolio in the new Government.

SPREP has had the pleasure of working with Tuala for almost five years that he has served as Samoa's Minister of Lands, Surveys and the Environment. During that time we have built a strong and productive working relationship that has been of enormous assistance, not only in terms of SPREP's work programme in Samoa, but also in terms of SPREP's regional and international initiatives. We look forward to continuing to develop this relationship during your forthcoming term.

The RTF's responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme will be a demanding one. This Programme, which admittedly took a large number of people from numerous backgrounds considerable time and effort to formulate, is the first regional programme that directly links activities of several CROP agencies, across 14 member countries, over an extended time frame.

In many respects, this is an important experiment. For the first time we have a regional programme that provides a formal framework for regional agencies and 14 island countries to work collaboratively on the implementation of activities in which they have a shared interest. We all know that SPC, FFA, SPREP, Forum Secretariat, USP and SOPAC have cooperated in various ways in the past but cooperation has not occurred under a long term formal arrangement as is provided for under the IWP.

Over the next three years - in relation to the oceanic programme, and five years - in relation to the coastal components, SPREP looks forward to fully participating in processes that may lead to new ways for Pacific organisations to work together for broad regional benefit. Please be assured that, for our part, SPREP will do what it can to assist this process.

In relation to the 14 participating countries. We would not be surprised if there were many questions in relation to the delay in getting this Programme implemented. In early 1996, when the formulation process commenced, we could have all been quite justified in thinking that by now, almost midway through 2001, the Programme would have been close to completion. Even at that time, we could not have guessed it would take the best part of the following two years to develop the IWP to the point where the Heads of Governments of the South Pacific Forum could endorse the Programme. It was only after receiving that endorsement at the Heads of Government meeting in Rarotonga in late 1997 that we had the mandate for a formal submission to the GEF Secretariat. And here we are, half way through 2001, and implementation has just started!

All I can say is that a Programme as complex as the one you will oversee, involving 14 countries, two major international institutions, at least five regional organisations, and with the potential to engage numerous other local, provincial, national, regional and international organisations, institutions and community interest groups, takes a considerable amount of effort, and compromise, to finalise.

We all hope that, now the establishment phase is behind us, we can proceed to implement a Programme that effectively and efficiently provides valuable support to our shared resource management and conservation efforts. As you are aware, the Programme will pay particular attention to the regional tuna resource and to the sustainable use of

coastal and terrestrial resources by island communities. New and existing partnerships will have to be developed and strengthened if there is to be any chance of meeting the ambitious objectives of the Programme in terms of successfully implementing sustainable resource management and conservation practices so that mounting threats to our fragile ecosystems are reduced.

This Task Force will play a significant role in the success, or otherwise, of the IWP. Although we may all use this first meeting to find our way a little, the Regional Task Force does have the potential to develop, not only as the group providing administrative oversight for the Programme, but also as an important forum for discussion of technical issues that the IWP will address during its implementation.

Principally, because implementation of the technical programme, in terms of both the oceanic and coastal components, is still relatively new, this first meeting has been kept reasonably short - and discussion confined to broad administrative and logistical issues. It is hoped that future meetings will be a little different and that, as envisaged in the Project Document, we will be able to evolve this Task Force into a group that provides sound technical advice for the consideration of policy makers as they plan their national and regional economic development initiatives.

To FFA and SPC I know we have a common understanding that this is a shared Programme that requires a significant level of collaboration in order for implementation to be successful. While we are all under pressure to deliver on demanding work programme expectations - which can occasionally narrow our focus - I hope that as implementation proceeds we can find effective ways to exchange information and ideas that contribute to the efficient and effective implementation of the SAP.

For the oceanic component of the Programme, it is not too early to start thinking about where the IWP is heading. How can we build on the results of our oceanic work under the IWP to continue to involve the GEF in activities of Pacific island countries in their endeavours to secure better long-term and sustainable benefits from the responsible use of their oceanic fisheries resources?

To USP and SOPAC. Collaborative arrangements are already firmly in place with USP – as you will learn when we get to the agenda item relating to the TRAIN:SEA COAST initiative. Although nothing formal is in place with SOPAC at this point in time, there will be significant opportunities for close collaboration in relation to the design and implementation of the freshwater and waste pilot projects. We look forward to working closely with SOPAC as we develop those initiatives with the 14 participating countries.

To Mr Serge Ducasse and his staff, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the support that has been provided to the Project Coordination Unit in the implementation of this Programme to date.

We at SPREP believe that, despite the delayed start, the Programme is laying a solid foundation for its future work. This does require a large amount of logistical and administrative work. Without the support of the UNDP office in Apia we would not have been able to achieve what we have in the seven months that the Programme has effectively been operational and we look forward to continuing to work closely with you for mutual benefit during the remainder of the Programme.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your attention. It is now my pleasure to call on the Resident Representative for the United Nations Development Programme, Mr Serge Ducasse to deliver his introductory remarks.

## **Annex III: Introductory Address**

**Mr Serge Ducasse  
Resident Representative  
United Nations Development Programme - Apia**

Honourable Minister for Lands, Surveys and Environment in Samoa, Tuala Sale Tagaloa Kerslake,

Ms Neva Wendt, Officer-In-Charge, South Pacific Regional Environment Programme,

Distinguished representatives of countries participating in the Strategic Action Programme for International Waters for the Pacific Region,

Officials from regional CROP organisations,

Officials from other regional and international intergovernmental and non-government organisations,

Observers,

Ladies and Gentlemen.

I feel very pleased and honoured to address you on behalf of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), at this first meeting of the Regional Task Force (RTF) to oversee the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States.

Let me first congratulate the Honourable Minister for his second term as Minister for Lands, Surveys and the Environment and assure him that UNDP is looking forward to continuing the very close working relationship established and consolidated over the past four years.

The importance of this first RTF meeting cannot be emphasised enough, and I am particularly pleased to see such an impressive number of distinguished participants gathered here in Apia to attend it. What you - as Task Force members - will oversee for the next five years, is one of most significant and ambitious projects ever undertaken in the area of environment and natural resource management in the Pacific; both in terms of scope, funding and cooperation.

I think enough has been said already by Neva about the delays this project has encountered over the years, and I am not going to dwell on the subject. Instead, I would like to thank all the involved partners for your patience and understanding and congratulate you for finally taking the South Pacific IWP into the implementation phase.

I am optimistic by nature, and by profession, but what I see is unfortunately not very encouraging. All around us, life support systems are under severe stress. If one takes a look at global environmental problems in the past and extrapolates them into the 21st century, the outlook by any measure is alarming. Despite some progress, our earth still faces a wide variety of threats: We have experienced 15 of the warmest years of this century in the last two decades. Projections of sea-level rise over the next several decades point to economic havoc for coastal areas. Deforestation of watersheds has increased people's vulnerability to floods and droughts, and one could go on.

These trends are not new, but they are getting worse because of inaction. We heard about them in Stockholm in 1972, as well as in Rio in 1992. Today, the international community as a whole needs to look at ways to re-energize the pursuit of sustainable development and protection of our global commons, including our trans-boundary water systems.

Experience tells us that no technological, investment, or demonstration project in itself will be sustainable without the necessary policy, institutional, and legal reforms. The challenge in dealing with the complex nexus of global environment, development, and water resources is to reform policies, build institutions, increase capacity, and bring environmental considerations into the mainstream of economic and community decision-making.

More than ever before, domestic policies and actions must go hand in hand with international policies and relations among states. Effectively addressing the linked considerations of land-use, water use, ecosystems, and poverty reduction in a more comprehensive framework may help facilitate the transition to a new development paradigm that will allow improvement in welfare and living standards without destroying the water-related ecosystems that sustain our life on earth.

The South Pacific IWP provides all the involved partners with the unique opportunity to take a comprehensive approach in overcoming the sectoral and organisational fragmentation that is often at the root of many cross-border as well as national water problems. Developing integrated solutions depend on an effective diagnosis of the linkages among land and water activities and the involvement of specialists in identifying urgent priorities. This approach also fosters dialogue among stakeholders and communities so that regional organisations, governments, the private sector, and the public can work together to produce collective benefits for all that exceed the sum total of their individual expectations.

I would like to assure you that UNDP remains fully committed to maintaining its support to your efforts in International Waters related issues. The South Pacific IWP is only one of many International Waters projects that have been approved globally since 1992, representing almost half a billion dollars from GEF funding. When the project was approved by UNDP and the GEF, it was very much seen as providing the framework for a number of additional sub-regional and national projects in the Pacific. UNDP - as the main GEF implementing agency - stands ready not only to assist in the implementation of the South Pacific IWP, but also to assist the South Pacific Island countries with the development of new projects in the area of International Waters, as well as under the other GEF Operational Programmes.

Before concluding, I would like to acknowledge the close and friendly working relationship between UNDP and SPREP, which will continue to benefit the environment in the Pacific island countries. This partnership, which we have built over the years, is stronger than ever and has been further enhanced by the development and early implementation of the South Pacific IWP. I would particularly like to thank our Project Manager Mr. Andrew Wright and his team, for the hard and dedicated work they have carried out since coming on board. I trust all of you can appreciate that it was never going to be an easy task to satisfy the priorities of all the stakeholders involved in the project. The commitment and dedication shown by Drew has, however, already laid the sound foundation for an efficient and effective implementation of the South Pacific IWP, and it is our duty to support these efforts for the ultimate benefit of the people we serve.

Ladies and Gentlemen, there is an Asian proverb saying that: "In every drop of water, there is a grain of gold." We are only beginning to understand the truth of that statement, and it is my hope that the project we are now about to fully embark upon, will make us realise the importance of our common water resources and engage us in a process of cooperation and collaboration that will provide an example for future interventions.

I wish you the very best for a successful and rewarding Regional Task Force meeting.

Thank you and Soifua.

## **Annex IV: Opening Remarks**

### **The Honourable Tagaloa Tuala Tagaloa Minister, Lands, Surveys and the Environment Samoa**

Reverend Utufua Naseri from the Congregational Christian Church of Samoa,  
Ms Neva Wendt, Officer-In-Charge, South Pacific Regional Environment based here in Samoa,  
Mr Serge Ducasse, Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme in Samoa,  
Distinguished representatives of countries participating in the Strategic Action Programme for International Waters in the Pacific Region,  
Officials from regional CROP organisations,  
Officials from other regional and international intergovernmental and non-government organisations and interest groups,  
Observers and staff of the SPREP secretariat and the International Waters Programme,

For all visitors, welcome to Samoa - to this, the first meeting of the Regional Task Force to oversee the implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States.

Before proceeding, thank you very much, Ms Wendt, for the warm welcome and for the useful background to the Strategic Action Programme. I too am looking forward to the next five years in office.

To you Mr Ducasse, thank you also for your informative overview. We share your hope that, in very many ways, this Programme will chart new waters for this region.

Apart from my role as Chair of this Meeting, which, at the invitation of the Director of SPREP, Mr Tamari'i Tutangata, I was honoured to accept, I also have the privilege of delivering the Opening Remarks. I think the Secretariat has probably used this as a ploy to get me to brief myself on the Programme as they would have been well aware that for the last two months I haven't had much chance to dedicate myself to terribly much more than local politics. I am honoured to have been re-elected by my constituents and will do my best during the next five years to serve their interests here in Samoa, and as the opportunity arises, the interests of our brothers and sisters in the other island countries that share this region. I am particularly pleased at having been asked by our Prime Minister to continue to oversee the Ministry for Lands, Surveys and the Environment.

Now the election is behind us, I have had a chance to familiarise myself with documentation relating to this important regional Programme. It is indeed a broad ranging Programme that appears to offer enormous opportunities for significant collaboration among our various regional organisations while at the same time providing a valuable mechanism for directly involving us, the member countries, in practical aspects of their work. In fact, for the coastal component, each country is directly involved through the implementation of community-based pilot projects that will be gradually instigated over the next 12 to 18 months.

This new Programme for International Waters, funded by the Global Environment Facility, implemented by the United Nations Development Programme and executed by SPREP, in partnership with other CROP agencies, is a fine example of a regional vehicle that can assist us, as a group of small island States, address important issues and shared concerns relating to the management and conservation of our natural resources.

You were right Ms Wendt. We have had to employ a great deal of patience as the development of this Programme has progressed. But despite the frustrations at the amount of time that it has taken to get this Programme off the ground, now it is here, we couldn't have hoped for it to arrive at a better time. God does work in mysterious ways!

For example, if implementation had commenced in 1998 we would not have had access to the high quality information that has been generated over the last seven years by the South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme – another major regional initiative involving the GEF, UNDP and SPREP. The information generated by that Programme can now be used to assist with the implementation of the International Waters Programme. It will help in identifying issues that can be used to facilitate implementation and avoid pitfalls that could otherwise have jeopardised programme implementation.

Other related programmes have generated equally valuable information. These include the Biodiversity Conservation Network's activities in the late 1990s. In addition, other organisations, such as The Nature Conservancy, IUCN and the World Wildlife Fund, have a firmer base in the region now, compared with 1998, and thus offer us improved opportunities to develop partnerships in the implementation of International Waters initiatives. Additional partnership opportunities are offered through the many non-government community groups that are also becoming more firmly established regionally and nationally. They also offer valuable potential vehicles to progress International Waters initiatives.

And in relation to oceanic fisheries, 2001 is perhaps the most opportune time for the International Waters Programme to become operational. Through that, the Pacific Small Island States are now well placed to build on the outcomes of the Multilateral High Level Conference (MHLC), which concluded late last year, and secure a strong position in new arrangements for the management and conservation of the regional fish stocks.

The challenges that the new Convention negotiated under the MHLC process presents for the region means that Pacific island countries will need to call on all the resources they can to secure long-term sustainable benefits from the valuable regional tuna resource.

I look forward to the next two days of discussion. I will run a relatively informal meeting and, while officials from the participating countries will receive priority, anyone who has something constructive to suggest will be encouraged to provide their views.

I take note of Ms Wendt's warning that this first meeting may not be as exciting as future meetings in terms of its technical content. Nevertheless, I note that there is quite a bit on the agenda that will keep us busy over the next day and a half. While the technical content may be lacking I am sure you will agree that, come Wednesday, we will all be much better informed on the International Waters Programme, particularly in respect of how we can participate fully in its effective implementation, whether that be at the national or regional level.

With that, ladies and gentlemen, I extend a very warm welcome to you all to Samoa.

Let's get down to work.

## Annex V: Agenda

- a) Opening
- b) Welcome Address [Ms Neva Wendt, Officer-In-Charge, SPREP]
- c) Introductory Remarks [Mr Serge Ducasse, Resident Representative, UNDP, Apia]
- d) Opening Remarks [Hon. Tagaloa Tuala Tagaloa, Minister for Lands, Surveys and Environment, Samoa and Chairperson of the RTF.]
- e) Apologies
- f) Procedural Issues
- g) Adoption of Agenda
  - 1. Overview of IWP Objectives
  - 2. Terms of Reference for the RTF
  - 3. Inception Report
  - 4. Current status - Coastal Component
  - 5. Current status - Oceanic Component
  - 6. Proposal for Building Sustainability
  - 7. Mechanism for Securing Economic Input to Pilot Project Activities
  - 8. Budget
  - 9. Terms of Reference for National Coordinators
  - 10. Review of Country Submissions to the Formulation Phase of the IWP
  - 11. Draft Communications Strategy
  - 12. 2001 draft Work Plan
  - 13. Supplementary activities:
    - a. TRAIN SEA COAST
    - b. GIWA
  - 14. Other Business
- h) Next Meeting
- i) Adoption of Summary Record of Discussion
- j) Close of Meeting.

## Annex VI: Programme Technical Advisory Group Terms of Reference

### Introduction

The Strategic Action Programme for International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States (IWP) is a five-year programme that commenced 16th February 2000. The IWP is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and executed by the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). The IWP has both oceanic and coastal components.

The oceanic component, executed through the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), is to address issues associated with the conservation and management of the South Pacific regional tuna resource.

Overall responsibility for guiding the management and administration of the IWP, including the approval of the Annual Work Programme and Budget is vested in the TriPartite Review meeting between the Implementing Agency (UNDP), Executing Agency (SPREP) and the participating countries.

The Project Coordination Unit (PCU) at SPREP, which is responsible for administrative arrangements for the Programme as a whole and serves as the point of contact between Programme partners and UNDP, will also oversee the coastal component. The coastal component will involve the establishment of 14 pilot projects, one in each of the 14 participating countries<sup>1</sup>, and is designed to address community issues associated with waste reduction, sustainable coastal fisheries, marine protected areas and freshwater, particularly potable drinking water.

Coordinators to be appointed in each of the participating countries will facilitate national implementation of the pilot projects. A National Task Force will be established to oversee the implementation of the IWP in each participating country. There is also potential to involve other CROP agencies, non-government organisations and other interest groups in activities related to the coastal component.

### Objective of the Programme

The broad objective of the IWP is:

*To achieve global benefits by developing and implementing measures to conserve, sustainably manage, and restore coastal and oceanic resources in the Pacific Region.*

The IWP identifies four high priority areas for immediate intervention:

- Improved waste management
- Better water quality
- Sustainable fisheries
- Effective marine protected areas

Targeted action within these activity areas is proposed in five categories:

- Management
- Capacity building
- Awareness/education
- Research/information for decision-making
- Investment

Institutional strengthening is included under management and capacity building.

### The Programme Technical Advisory Group (PTAG)

During formulation of the IWP, SPREP established a Regional Task Force that was responsible for overseeing national input to the drafting process.

SPREP has established a Program Technical Advisory Group (PTAG) for the life of the IWP, as an advisory group supporting the PCU. The composition and functions of the PTAG are outlined in these Terms of Reference, which are based on and supersede the specifications for a Regional Task Force provided in Section 5, of Annex 6 Terms of Reference to the Project Document.

### Secretariat

The Programme Coordination Unit will serve as the Secretariat to the Technical Advisory Group.



## **Composition**

The Programme Technical Advisory Group will comprise individuals with technical expertise and involvement in IWP-related issues in the Pacific islands region. The composition of the PTAG will be determined by the main stakeholders in the IWP, as follows:

- (a) one nominee each from UNDP and SPREP;
- (b) four nominees by participating country Governments, determined at the Tripartite Review meeting;
- (c) one nominee from each of the CROP agencies actively involved in the IWP;
- (d) two nominees from NGOs determined by the PCU in consultation with PIANGO and the Pacific Islands Round Table; and
- (e) two nominees from the private sector determined by the PCU in consultation with relevant industry associations.

Consideration will be given to nominees being able to provide continuity of participation in PTAG for the life of the Programme.

The Project Manager, in consultation with the SPREP Secretariat, UNDP and other CROP agencies directly involved with implementation of components of the IWP may invite advisers, resource personnel or observers to meetings of the Regional Task Force. Advisers and observers may address the meeting and participate in its discussions, with the consent of the Chair. Invitations for advisers, resource personnel or observers to participate in meetings of the Regional Task Force must be renewed between one meeting of the Regional Task Force and the next.

## **Committees, Sub-committees and Subsidiary Bodies**

The Programme Technical Advisory Group may convene such Committees, Sub-committees or Subsidiary Bodies as may be required for the effective transaction of business and as funds allow, during or between meetings, either of representatives or of experts or resource personnel to consider issues of a specialised nature and to report back to the Regional Task Force.

Unless otherwise decided, the Programme Technical Advisory Group shall determine the terms of reference for each Committee, Sub-committee or Subsidiary Body and shall also appoint a convener of each such group.

## **Role of the Programme Technical Advisory Group**

The Programme Technical Advisory Group is the principal advisory body monitoring International Waters issues and providing technical, strategic and policy advice on implementation of the IWP.

The PTAG will report and make recommendations directly to the Director of SPREP, for forwarding to the Programme Coordination Unit, UNDP and the TriPartite review meetings.

The functions of the Programme Technical Advisory Group shall include:

- To monitor progress with IWP implementation, review technical issues arising, provide technical, strategic and policy advice and make recommendations to the PCU, SPREP, UNDP and periodically to the TriPartite and Mid-term reviews of the Programme, aimed at strengthening implementation of the Programme.
- To provide liaison and technical links between the IWP and other relevant programmes and organisations at national, regional and international levels, including government agencies, regional institutions and non-government organisations, community groups and the private sector.
- To monitor progress concerning the adoption of policy advice emanating from the IWP into other regional and national programmes.

## **Frequency and Timing of Programme Technical Advisory Group Meetings**

The Programme Technical Advisory Group will meet annually or as required. Face-to-face meetings will be supplemented by e-communications. Regular PTAG discussions or meetings will be scheduled around the middle of the calendar year, in order to contribute usefully to the annual cycle of programme performance review, planning and budgeting.

Invitations to attend meetings of the Programme Technical Advisory Group will be dispatched by the Project Manager six (6) weeks in advance of the planned meeting.

Where possible the meetings of the Programme Technical Advisory Group will be synchronised with meetings of the CROP agencies' Marine Sector Working Group. To reduce meeting costs, efforts will be made to coordinate meetings of the Programme Technical Advisory Group with other regional meetings.

## **Chair and Vice Chair**

SPREP, in consultation with UNDP, shall invite an eminent person from the region to Chair the Programme Technical Advisory Group.

The Project Coordination Unit will make all necessary arrangements to support the Chair's participation in meetings of the PTAG. At each meeting, the PTAG may elect a Vice Chair. The Chair and the Vice Chair may exercise speaking rights of his/her delegation in the absence of another representative of the same delegation at meetings of the PTAG.

The Chair shall declare the meetings of the Programme Technical Advisory Group open and closed, promote discussions on Programme-related issues, accord the right to speak and announce consensus and decisions. In the absence of the Chair from the meeting, the Vice Chair shall assume the duties of the Chair.

If the Chair should resign or otherwise become unable to participate in meetings of the PTAG, SPREP, in consultation with UNDP, shall arrange for the appointment of a suitable replacement.

### **Funding**

Priority for the allocation of funding to support meetings of the PTAG will be assigned to the country nominees.

If technical or logistical issues on the agenda of Programme Technical Advisory Group meetings justify the participation of advisers or resource personnel funding may be applied to support their involvement in Programme Technical Advisory Group meetings.

Representatives from CROP agencies, the GEF and GEF-implementing agencies will be self-funded.

### **Reports**

A Summary Record of Discussion shall be adopted by each meeting of the Programme Technical Advisory Group prior to the close of the meeting and submitted to the Director of SPREP. The Project Coordination Unit will circulate a final version of the Summary Record, complete with attachments detailing the agenda of the meeting, meeting participants and other matters considered by the meeting, within four (4) weeks of the conclusion of each meeting. Copies of the reports will be provided to the TriPartite Review meeting.

### **Amendments**

These terms may be amended by the PTAG and submitted to the Executing Agency, SPREP, and Implementing Agency, UNDP, for approval.

## **Annex VII: Closing Statement**

**Ms Neva Wendt  
Officer-In-Charge  
South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)**

Honourable Minister of Lands, Surveys and Environment, Hon. Tagaloa Tuala Tagaloa,  
The Resident Representative of the United Nations Development Programme, Mr Serge Ducasse,  
Distinguished Delegates,  
Representatives of CROP Agencies and other Regional/Institutional Partners,  
Ladies and Gentlemen

Thank you all for your efforts over the past two days. I understand it had been a most productive meeting and that you have achieved a significant amount of work.

I am aware of the excellent preparatory work that the Programme Coordination Unit (Drew, Natasha, Michelle and Rosanna) have put into ensuring that this was a successful meeting. I believe this augurs well for continued successful implementation of the project leading to achievement, we hope of impressive outcomes and results.

To our Member Country Participants, thank you for your guidance which will ensure that the outcomes of the International Waters Programme are in accord with your respective national needs.

To our CROP Partners, thank you for your input, for your involvement and support in this first formalised regional agency “experiment”. We see this type of regional collaboration as an important way forward signaling the potential for similar regional endeavours.

To our other international and regional partners (both Intergovernmental and non-governmental), thank you. We look forward to your continued involvement and support.

Lastly, thank you Honourable Minister, and your co-chair, the distinguished delegate of the Cook Islands for your Chairing skills. We have especially appreciated your making time to be present here, despite your other demanding commitments.

Thank you and Soifua.