

**Second Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation,
9 - 11 September 1998,
Apia, Samoa**

Meeting Report

Centre for
Information Resource Centre

VF 8089

Summary of the Roundtable II Decisions

Working Group on Indicators

To complete the development of Objectives indicators, the Roundtable decided that a small Working Group on Indicators comprising of Audrey Newman, Peter Hunnam, Roger Cornforth and SPREP representatives be assigned this task and to report to the next Roundtable III Meeting on progress made.

Amendment to Objective 6

The Action Strategy Objective 6 was revised as follow:

“To develop local, national and regional sources of funding and develop and advocate appropriate new funding mechanisms, recognising that it will be necessary to secure long-term support from multilateral and bilateral donors to achieve the sustainable conservation and management of natural resources.”

Frequency of Future Meetings

The Roundtable members agreed to meet twice in 1999 and annually thereafter. Early to mid February 1999 was suggested for the next meeting.

Venue for the next Roundtable Meeting

The Meeting accepted the offer from WWF-SP to host the next meeting in Suva, Fiji.

Revised Mandate for the Roundtable Meeting

The Meeting agreed that the mandate for the next Roundtable shall be

To increase effective conservation action in the Pacific islands by:

- ⇒ fostering greater coordination and collaboration among regional and international organisations*
- ⇒ providing feedback on the effectiveness of conservation activities through monitoring and evaluation of the Action Strategy*
- ⇒ identifying and addressing critical gaps in regional conservation activities, and*
- ⇒ recruiting new partners for Pacific island conservation*

Provisional Agenda for the February 1999 Meeting

For the February 1999 Meeting, the following agenda was provisionally agreed to:

- ⇒ finalise the indicators
- ⇒ discuss monitoring and measuring progress methodology
- ⇒ undertake an analysis of gaps, overlaps and opportunities to plug the gaps
- ⇒ look at indicators for the use of the Action Strategy as a whole
- ⇒ develop means for communicating and presenting the strategy to donors and to countries
- ⇒ reformatted matrix
- ⇒ investigate putting the strategy on line via SPREP's website and give feedback on the idea

Assignment of Work for the next Roundtable Meeting

In preparation for the next Roundtable Meeting, it was agreed that the following tasks be assigned as bracketed:

- indicators need to be worked on and finalised (Peter, Audrey, Roger, SPREP)
- reformatting the matrix (SPREP, Roger, Sophia)
- web site design (SPREP and user need analysis)
- link to donor's information (Roger, Sofia)
- links to countries - NBSAPs (Cedric, Sue)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>No.</i>		<i>page</i>
	Summary of Roundtable II Decisions	2
	Assignment of Work for the next Roundtable Meeting	3
1	Opening	5
2	Participants Introduction	5
3	Meeting Arrangements	5
4	Rules, Agenda and Expected Outcomes	5
5	Workshop on Collaboration and Facilitation	6
6	Recap of Previous Meeting and Summary of Progress to Date	7
7	The Development of Indicators	11
	7.1 Conceptual Framework	11
	7.2 Process	12
	7.3 First Pass Indicators	12
	7.4 Second Pass Indicators	13
8	Review of Objective 6	19
9	Next Steps and Other Business	19
10	Action Strategy Signing Ceremony	20
11	Closing	21
14	Attachment 1: Participants List	22
	Attachment 2: Agenda	25
	Attachment 3: Minister's Opening Remarks	27
	Attachment 4: Director of SPREP's Remarks	29
	Attachment 5: Facilitator's Report	32
	Attachment 6: Matrix of Conservation Activities	36

1. Opening

Mr. Iosefatu Reti of SPREP called the Second Roundtable Meeting to order and invited Reverend Nuuausala Siaosi to begin the Meeting with a prayer. Following the opening prayer, the Minister of Lands, Surveys and Environment, Honourable Tuala Sale Tagaloa, made his opening remarks and officially opened the Meeting.

In his opening statement, Honourable Tuala Tagaloa welcomed participants on behalf of the people and Government of Samoa to the Pacific Islands Roundtable on Nature Conservation. He reflected on the successful outcomes of the First Roundtable Meeting and commended the participants for those outcomes. He urged the Meeting to continue on the successful path paved in the First Roundtable and to preserve the Roundtable mechanism to service the Action Strategy's implementation. He also noted the relevance of applying this Roundtable model to bring together interested stakeholders in other regional issues such as climate change, international waters, waste management and others. Finally, he wished the participants well and invited them to take time to enjoy the hospitality of Samoa.

Mr. Tamari'i Tutangata, Director of SPREP, then presented his opening remarks. He thanked the Reverend and the Minister for their inspiring addresses. He welcomed all participants to the second Roundtable on behalf of SPREP and reflected on the first Roundtable Meeting as a tentative first step that ended in a sprint with all the participating organizations and countries emerging as joint winners. He echoed the Minister's call to sustain the Roundtable process, reflected on the symbolic importance of the signing ceremony planned for later in the Roundtable Meeting to the collective ownership of the Action Strategy and invited organizations that have yet to indicate signing to consider doing so. On the issues of indicators and monitoring, Mr. Tutangata cautioned against indicators that are not simple and difficult to measure and flagged the option of the Roundtable evolving into a forum for monitoring and reporting on implementation. In closing his remarks, Mr. Tutangata urged the meeting to build on the successes of the first Meeting.

2. Participants Introduction

The 22 participants representing 15 major international organizations and the Facilitator then introduced themselves [see Annex 1: Participants List]. Each briefly described his/her background, his/her organization's programs in the Pacific islands and his/her expectations for this meeting. Overall, the group emphasized their desire to use this meeting to learn about other organizations and programs in the region. Many participants also highlighted their hopes that this meeting would help them to work together more actively and effectively, to identify regional priorities for action and to use what they learn in planning future projects that meet the region's needs.

3. Meeting Arrangements

Meeting arrangements were briefly outlined including: documentation, flight confirmation, reimbursements and per diems, meals, transportation, cocktail function and banking services. Some participants advised the Meeting of their early departure and arrangements were made for the informal signing ceremony of the Foreword planned for later in the Roundtable to fit in with their schedules.

4. Rules, Agenda and Expected Outputs

At the instigation of the Facilitator, the Meeting agreed on the following set of protocols for operating the Meeting.

- all ideas are greatly welcome
- "hats' off" unless you say they are on

- search for common ground about future (about 4 - 5 years)
- operate by consensus
- flexible agenda and process
- nothing is decided until we agree it is decided
- listen hard, don't monopolise
- have fun
- everything is voluntary

The Meeting also reviewed and reordered the Agenda (refer to Annex 2) and agreed on being flexible in order to make the best use of time.

The Meeting also considered the expected outputs for the Meeting and noted that the work load ahead of the Meeting was indeed considerable given the Meeting's limited duration. The expected outputs were

- objective indicators
- updated matrix
- identifying gaps and overlaps, and
- addressing the overlaps.

5. Workshop on Collaboration and Facilitation: Principles and Practices of Joint Problem Solving

Mr. Peter Adler introduced the workshop on collaboration and facilitation, noting its relevance on the subsequent tasks of producing indicators and monitoring arrangements for the Action Strategy's implementation. He introduced basic concepts of joint problem solving and an exercise - 'the prisoners dilemma' - to demonstrate these concepts. The meeting then looked at the problems of lack of trust in negotiations and problem solving. This was noted as a common dilemma between cooperation and competition. In particular:

- competitors always drive each other into the ground
- co-operatives always lose in short term but can have greater benefits in long term
- 'free riders' often occur
- 'tit for tat' - react first in trust then change and then respond to opposition's decisions

Participants looked at the relevance of this game to the Roundtable Meeting and the need to meet the 'common interest' for cooperative work. In the Roundtable it was recognised that meeting at a strategic level means that all partners can win. It was also recognised that 'no deals' are always possible as well as 'win and win'. It was noted that more or less 'elegant' outcomes is an alternative term as 'win-win' can set up false expectations. The "free rider" syndrome needs to be watched for which is where there is benefit at no or low cost to one partner whilst the other partner has benefit but at high cost. It was noted that these are goals to strive for and it was important to not let the perfect be the enemy of the good i.e. the initiative need not fail and sometimes it is best to give a 'free ride' for awhile to achieve a greater good. Mr. Adler surmised that real life was obviously more complicated but these basic rules often apply.

The group discussed the nature of 'good' and 'bad' meetings and how agreements can come about. Successful agreements sometimes happen because of :

- discovering a common vision
- unearthing of compatible interests and needs
- creation of new procedures

- changing future relationships
- clarifying the interplay of rights and entitlements
- understanding each others sources of leverage and power
- finding the common enemy

A model for problem solving was presented by Mr. Adler which illustrated moving from conflict or distrust to agreement. Important aspects were:

- Conflict Analysis
- Process Design
- Forum
- Negotiation and Problem Solving

Key elements were the substance, process and relationships between partners involved. Participants then looked at an example of Manado Lagoon and designed a process for designing a meeting to address stakeholder issues for lagoon management. Types of process were discussed and their relevance noted for the Roundtable itself. In reaching agreement, Mr. Adler proposed a scale was often helpful to create a consensus:

1. enthusiastic support
2. acceptable
3. concerns but can live with it
4. strong reservations
5. must oppose

Or even 'no deal' or 'time out' to decide are also options if the above does not work.

A summary handout of these concepts were given to each participant. Mr. Adler's report on the Facilitation and Collaboration Workshop is appended in Annex 5.

6. Recap of Previous Meetings and Summary of Progress to Date

Mr. Peter Adler introduced this session by stressing the importance of the work undertaken so far on the Action Strategy. He noted that several - including himself - have just joined the Roundtable and for this reason, it was important for all participants to have a clear picture of the Roundtable process and model from the onset. This session focused on three aspects to achieve this:

- Recap
- Review of the Action strategy foreword
- Roundtable II meeting goals

6.1. Recap or Road Mapping for the Action Strategy and Roundtable

Sam Sesega initiated the recap explaining "Where does this Action Strategy and Roundtable process comes from?" He recalled that the 6th Conference on Nature Conservation held in November 1997 in Pohnpei set in motion the processes for formulating the 1999-2002 Action Strategy and Roundtable. He also recalled the mandate from the Pohnpei Conference for the first Roundtable Meeting and how that First Roundtable agreed to this Second Roundtable Meeting to complete the work not previously completed. He emphasised the significance of that mandate for regional organizations to focus on

regional and international action for the fact that it came from Pacific Islands government and non-governmental representatives and others comprising all levels of stakeholders for nature conservation in the region.

He explained the process for formulating the Action Strategy and how this started with the plenary workshop at the Pohnpei Conference and the work of the Action Strategy Review Committee set up by the Conference, the recommendation from this Review Committee to the Conference which plenary adopted and became a Conference recommendation for a Roundtable Meeting of regional organizations as referred to above.

The specific mandate for the first Roundtable was:

- To review and refine the regional and international key actions of the Action Strategy;
- To identify how and by whom actions will be implemented;
- To develop a way to regularly measure progress towards these objectives.

He noted that the first Roundtable Meeting on the 24 - 26 February 1998 produced a draft that went to an original list of 94 reviewers from whom many comments were received and were incorporated to produce second draft. The second draft is a working document of this Second Roundtable Meeting. The same document will be tabled at the September SPREP Meeting with SPREP member countries and territories expected to endorse it, culminating in a signing ceremony during that Meeting. (refer to Meeting Report of 1st Roundtable for a detailed summary of the step-by-step Formulation process). He also noted that comments from countries during the SPREP meeting will be incorporated in the final version before it is printed and distributed.

Audrey Newman further elaborated on the brief history of the Roundtable, recalling that the origins of the Pohnpei Conference was the 1993 Fifth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation in Tonga. She also related to the Meeting the experience of the Tennessee Land Protection Planning Committee - a roundtable forum of six agencies working together with a strong agenda and commitment to nature conservation that is voluntary yet very effective. This experience provided the inspiration and the model for the Pacific Islands Roundtable.

Following the recap, several comments were received from participants. Peter Hunnam (WWF) suggested that the Action Strategy document be kept "open" in order to consistently update it as more information and data comes in, while another option would be to incorporate the results of this 2nd Roundtable in the Strategy. Mr. Hunnam emphasised the importance of making this document a progress reporting document, and urged that the Meeting find ways for achieving it. Sofia Bettencourt (World Bank) noted the need to double check the list of reserves. Audrey Newman (TNC) observed that the strategy was a significant change from earlier ones in that it was targeting priorities for nature conservation and was focused on implementation.

It was agreed that regional and international agencies and organisation share responsibilities in both implementing and monitoring this strategy and act in harmony to support the national and local levels of implementation. The meeting noted the need for coordination in order to focus on priorities while assisting people at national level.

The Meeting then returned to the Roundtable I Mandate which defined on a voluntary basis who and how actions in the strategy would be implemented. It noted the following:

- there was a lot happening in nature conservation throughout the Pacific
- new actions that were not originally part of the strategy were taking place
- gaps needed to be identified

- there was a solid foundation of work to build on

It was agreed that a once-a-year frequency to meet and update was adequate for the process. The meeting agreed the most daunting task the Roundtable is faced with is to bring conservation into the development process.

Discussions also focused on the ownership of the Action Strategy. The importance of collective and regional ownership was reiterated. The Meeting agreed that this was well reflected in the Foreword and in the signatures of those organizations who have agreed to sign and the Chairman of the SPREP Meeting who was to sign on behalf of the SPREP members. SPREP expressed the hope that the new cover page had changed the impression that the Strategy was a SPREP document.

The EU representative queried the role of the SPREP Meeting in endorsing the Action Strategy. The SPREP representative explained that the SPREP Meeting consisting of national representatives from 21 member countries and territories would be asked to endorse both the Action Strategy and the Roundtable process itself. The Roundtable agreed on the significance of this gesture in efforts to regionalise the ownership of the Action Strategy. The Meeting also decided to leave it to SPREP to decide if the Action Strategy needed to be endorsed by the Forum Secretariat.

6.2 Matrix of Conservation Activities carried out by Conservation Organizations

The Meeting moved to a review of the Regional Conservation Activities and discussed the importance of the key actions versus the role of key activities. It was agreed that this exercise would better be done as homework for individual agency project updates and returned to the meeting convener for inclusion in a revised/updated matrix.

Roger Cornforth (NZODA) suggested that the Roundtable could use the matrix of Regional Conservation Activities as an open Action Strategy and possibly merge it with the CBP matrix used by donors for their projects in the region. After discussion on various aspects of the matrix, it was agreed to:

- Ensure regional key actions are corresponding to activities listed;
- Fix numbers to match;
- Change Targets (where or who for) to Location;
- Add an explanatory preface including a short status report on the Action Strategy, who are the funding agencies and the partners.

It was agreed that updates to be provided by all agencies needed to:

- identify the key action number;
- identify and provide changes, updates and new activities;
- use the same amended format as above.

It was also agreed that updates and revisions from individual organizations be submitted to Sam Sesega of SPREP for incorporation into the matrix.

6.3 Review of Action Strategy Foreword

The meeting agreed to include a 30 minutes discussion on the Foreword. It noted that the main message that needed to be conveyed was that all who contributed to this Strategy "have agreed to cooperate and share a common goal. The foreword was revised to ensure the maximum of agencies were satisfied with the text and that they could confirm their endorsement. Signatories identified

were SPREP, IUCN, USP, NZODA, WWF-South Pacific, UNESCO-WHC, FSP-International and TNC.

6.4 Review of Goals and Objectives of Roundtable II

Sam Sesega presented the Second Roundtable goals as follows, noting that these were agreed to in the first Roundtable Meeting:

1. Review activity lists to identify strategic gaps, duplications and opportunities for collaboration.
2. Review progress on activities.
3. Update activity list and streamline process.
4. Develop indicators/measures of success for the Action Strategy.

Following discussions, two more goals were added by the Roundtable:

5. Define the future of the roundtable and the next steps towards implementation.
6. Develop mechanisms for monitoring and plan for follow-up and reporting.

Some comments were made on the voluntary aspects of monitoring and the importance of this agreement as a group for the benefit of the Action Strategy.

7. The Development of Objective Indicators

7.1 Conceptual framework - attributes, criteria and assumptions

The Meeting took the first steps to addressing the complex issue of indicators by defining what constitute a good indicator both generally and in the context of the Action Strategy. This generated the following general attributes:

- some history already exists
- measure a change
- readily usable and simple
- adaptable
- relevance or fit with objective or key actions
- benchmarkable over time
- verifiable
- shows trends
- reliable and consistent
- that someone will use, and
- have a format that is reportable.

Taking this exercise further, the Meeting agreed that indicators for the Action Strategy should satisfy the following criteria:

- very few
- have at least one for each action
- impact indicators and/or activity indicators
- indicators as a reflection of objectives
- should be able to have a baseline
- should have indicators for Roundtable

Further discussion also revealed that a number of assumptions about the nature of the indicators were implicit in the dialogue. The Facilitator proposed that these assumptions be declared to better clarify the discussion. The Meeting listed them and agreed that the following were applicable:

- indicators won't be perfect but must give us measurable and useful feedback
- indicators will mostly be process indicator but some will be ecological/environmental
- ought to be able to help us envision more specific changes we are trying to achieve
- indicators may change
- some may be long term, some shorter
- use ecological indicator for mission level
- use process indicator for objective level
- use voluntary reporting from the Roundtable as 'indicator'
- indicate who/how to apply indicator when suggested; only use indicator that are practical/do-able
- use of overall project indicators

7.2 The Process

The Facilitator proposed the following process for developing indicators based on brainstorming by smaller groups. The process involved dividing the Meeting into six small groups and assigning to each group an Objective to brainstorm with ideas on possible indicators to be recorded on flip-charts. After a set period of time, flip-charts would be rotated to the next group who would add any new ideas to the chart. In this way, all six objectives are considered by all the groups. The sum total of potential indicators to be generated by this process would then be reviewed by the entire group who would rank them and retain the three or four 'best' ones. Indicators selected after this phase become the 'first pass' indicators. These 'first pass' indicators would then go through another phase of collective review to produce a more refined set of 'second pass' indicators.

In keeping with this process, the Meeting broke into smaller groups and the 'first pass' indicators were developed. The Meeting looked at the outputs generated, decided on the top three indicators for each objective and on indicators for the mission statement. The selected 'first pass' indicators for each objectives are presented below:

7.3 "First pass" Indicators for Objectives

Objective 1: Biodiversity Protection

- threat mitigation
- biodiversity health
- process indicator

Objective 2: Policy, Planning and Legal Frameworks

- country allocation of resources to environment/conservation agencies and the status of these agencies
- degree of integration measured through country's development plan

Objective 3: Local Communities and Customs

- measure of government support e.g. laws, policies that recognise community rights = enabling legislation/policy;
- number of partnership arrangements where local communities are decision makers, public/private partnerships where they are ultimate decision makers
- number of community based conservation projects designed and implemented with community involvement

Objective 4: Capacity Building

- institutional capacity of environment conservation agencies in government
- their relationship with other government agencies
- institutional capacity of environment/conservation NGOs
- environment initiatives/activities carried out by non environment groups
- level, quality, effort, number, and access to providers of capacity building
- training needs assessment built into programme/project design
- number of local versus outside consultants
- "vital" signs of capacity are needed in these key areas

Objective 5: Environmental Education (EE), Awareness and Information Sharing

- polling of environmental awareness and attitudes of target audiences policy-makers, leaders, communities,
- how EE education is used as a tool in the design and implementation of programmes and projects

- degree of formulation of EE into curricula/ providers of education and their capacity
- awareness- media coverage
- key Action Strategy audiences have timely access to information needed for decision making and have effective mechanisms to share their information-
- implementation of regional EE strategy

Objective 6 Financial Sustainability

- total \$ spent on environment/conservation
- % of local financing versus external funding
- number of new funding mechanisms/donors investigated, developed and/or operationalized during the Action Strategy's 5 years

7.4 'Second pass' Indicators for Objectives

The 'first pass' indicators were then reviewed. Each objective was assigned to a smaller group who then reported to the Meeting. The Meeting debated and discussed the proposed indicators and further refine them as appropriate. The output of this step were the following 'second pass' indicators.

Objective 1 Biodiversity Protection

For Objective 1, two sets of key indicators were proposed based on a network of site sampling such as areas already under protection, starting with SPBCP Conservation Areas, TNCs, WWF sites. The two sets of indicators were

- threat mitigation and,
- biodiversity health.

Threat Mitigation

For threat mitigation, it was suggested to

- identify and rank threats to biodiversity (every three years),
- highlight the most common or widespread threats and grade each one with a qualitative score (very high to nil) for each site sampled e.g. logging,
- then specify the relevant measurable indicator e.g. number of logging operations certified.
- standardize the list of threats to facilitate the easy identification of common/widespread threats; qualitative score (very high ...nil) - measure 1-3 years

Biodiversity Health

- select small number of conservation targets e.g. no. of species of a taxa; population of an indicator species; habitat extent/condition; ecosystem process e.g. stream-flow;
- define condition for ranking for each target
- measure each target every 3 - 5 years

Question of a 'site'

- defined by homogeneity of resources and management objectives e.g. can have multiple sites in one 'project area';
- need to sample "whole ecosystem" e.g. water catchment.

Extensive Mobile/System-wide threats

Identify critical threat (at country)	possible indicators
logging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • number of operations certified/not certified

were (i) rejected or (ii) modified as a result of an unfavourable EIA?	
b) Do sectoral policies/key policy documents specifically address conservation, NRM/sustainability?	Environ. reps.
c) Number and proportion of total staff working on conservation, enforcement/NRM?	Environ. reps.

3. Strength of Environment Unit

	Who?
a) status (is a ministry/Dept/Division/Unit?)	Environ. reps
b) number of line staff	
c) annual government budget	
d) does it have a legal framework?	
e) Have NBSAPs been completed? with participation by Finance & Planning staff?	
f) What resources have been allocated for NBSAPs implementation?	
g) Status/progress of NBSAPs	

4. Integration into National Policies

	Fish-eries		For-ests		Min-ing		Agri-culture		Tou-rism	
a. Are EIA required?		Y/N		Y/N		Y/N		Y/N		Y/N
b. Sector policies incorporated?		Y/N		Y/N		Y/N		Y/N		Y/N
c. % of staff working in environment?										

The meeting acknowledged that most indicators were easily measurable but warned that for most of the countries in the region, existence of a particular plan, policy, legislation or regulation did not necessarily translate into compliance and action for the environment. It was also felt that too much emphasis was put on EIA as an indicator and that it was often unreliable, with EIA recommendations not necessarily being implemented. Some suggested the use of financial factors, such as the level of budget expenditures allocated or the proportion of discretionary donor funding related to the environment.

Objective 3 - Local Communities and Customs

The 'second pass' indicators for Objective 3 reclassified the 'first pass' indicators into four monitoring categories. Under each category, potential indicators and how they were to be measured were identified.

1. Community involvement in conservation projects
2. Enabling legislation and policies
3. Involvement of local communities in substantive national decision-making
4. Effective partnership arrangements led by communities

1. Community involvement in conservation projects

What

- number of organized community groups involved in project management

How

- document & track:
 - ⇒ number of resource owners/clan groups (need to define 'community group')
 - ⇒ number of groups working with Environment Units/Depts..

2. Enabling legislation and policies

What

- degree to which legislation and policies require community consultation and participation (document bottom-up development planning)
- degree to which communities are involved in formulation and implementation of legislation and policies.
- number of countries with EIA legislation in place.

3. Involvement of local communities in substantive national decision-making processes.

What

- Number of projects which have EIA completed

How

- survey EIA bodies in each country

4. Effective partnership arrangements led by communities

What

- proportion of community members on project management committees
- number of donors that require community consultations.

How

- survey existing projects

Objective 4 Capacity Building

The 'second pass' indicators for Objective 4 concentrated on measuring institutional capacity from regional organisations, national level agencies and NGOs using the following four categories:

1. Organisational capacity
2. Technical capacity
3. Capacity to build productive partnerships
4. Complementary strategies for capacity development

Institutional Capacity focus = national level

regional organizations				
government agencies - • environment • other				
NGOs • environment • non-environment				
	organizational capacity.	Technical capacity	productive partnerships	complementary strategy

Indicators

Vital signs for tracking national level institutional capacity.

- is there an active agency?
- number of operational staff
- budget allocations
- set indicators organizational capacity (leadership; organizational planning, budget supply & management etc.)
- set indicators organizational technical capacity relative to functions (policy devt., facilitation, etc., etc..)
- set indicators - ability to build productive partnerships
- set indicators - re: integrated planning for capacity development
- set overall outcome indicators (ratio of local to external technical assistance; number of project cap., training needs assessments)

Monitoring using all the vital signs (listed above) constituted the ideal situation with the first few indicators comprising the minimum for monitoring institutional capacity at the national level. Monitoring should be carried out annually over say a five-year period.

Objective 5 Environmental Education (EE), Awareness and Information Sharing

The 'second pass' indicators for Objective 5 comprised of five key monitoring categories using input / output indicators as follows:

1. Community Awareness and attitudes towards environmental threats & national conservation values
2. Formal environment education capacity and delivery
3. Environment education and information in projects and programmes
4. Information-sharing formats and tools
5. NGO training and background in EE for communities

Community Awareness and attitudes

1. document the level of community awareness & attitudes towards environmental threats & national conservation values (by polling technique). Target :
 - policy-makers and decision makers
 - natural resource users and owners
 - private sectors
 - NGOs (part non-environmental NGOs)
 - general public - both urban and rural

Formal environmental education capacity and delivery

2. document formal environmental education capacity and delivery of
 - trainer-training programmes directed at Environmental Education and Nature Conservation
 - number of Environmental Education subject areas in primary and secondary schools;
 - number of Environmental Education and Nature Conservation courses in tertiary institutions
 - number of Environmental Education and Nature Conservation courses in continuing education
 - number of participants in tertiary and continuing educational courses;

Environment education and information in projects and programmes

3. number of programmes and projects which integrate and use Environmental Education and information sharing as a key tool during initial stages (design) and implementation.

Information-sharing formats and tools

4. Document variety of formats used for information sharing including
 - media-print, radio, TV
 - web pages - number of organizations involved; regularity of updates & available;
 - networking (e.g. electronically) and meetings;
 - number of conservation newsletter distributed;
 - number of database specifically developed for information collection, analysis and distributed : SPREP focal points;

NGO training and background in EE for communities

5. Training and background in NGOs
 - background/training for working with community groups

Note: formal education courses - track field based content.

Objective 6 Financial Sustainability

The following 'second pass' indicators were agreed on for Objective 6:

- Are the majority of CA's now under SPBCP & BCN operating with decreased ratios of external donor financing to self financing? Do projects have an exit strategy?
- Is there an increase in conservation activities (community and national levels) that are not funded by external donors assistance.
- Is there an increase in conservation areas and conservation activities that are securing their funding from non-traditional sources and mechanisms?
 - ⇒ -how many trust funds? amounts?
 - ⇒ how many examples of debt for nature swaps?
 - ⇒ how many examples of private sector sponsors for conservation activities?
 - ⇒ are there new donor members to partners?
- Are national government budgets allocated to conservation/environment activities being maintained at current levels or increased?
- Are donors cycles of longer term? - agency budgets and trends increasing community activity funding?

Indicators for the Mission Statement

There was general discussion of the level and type of indicators required to monitor the mission statement and if, in effect, there was a need for a separate set of indicators. It was agreed that the mission statement is very close to the first objective on biodiversity protection and could be monitored more or less with a replication of Objective 1 key indicators.

At the conclusion of the 'second pass', the Meeting reviewed progress made on indicators and noted that while it was a complex exercise, significant progress had been made. It noted that further refinements were needed to be made before indicators could be considered final. To complete this work, the Roundtable decided that a small Working Group on Indicators comprising of Audrey Newman, Peter Hunnam, Roger Cornforth and SPREP representatives be assigned this task and to report to the next Roundtable III Meeting on progress made.

8. Review of Objective 6

The meeting agreed to review the wording of Objective 6 following comments made by the AusAID representative Chris Wheeler. There was some discussion over the emphasis placed in the current wording on external funding and the negative message it may convey to potential donor partners. It was felt that wording that reflect an emphasis on developing internal funding sources first with external assistance to come second is more consistent with the spirit of self-reliance and the goal of sustainability that the Action Strategy is promoting.

The Meeting agreed that the text of Objective 6 be reviewed but cautioned that it should not change dramatically and a sub-group was formed to undertake the review. The following amendment was proposed which the Meeting accepted:

“To develop local, national and regional sources of funding and develop and advocate appropriate new funding mechanisms, recognising that it will be necessary to secure long-term support from multilateral and bilateral donors to achieve the sustainable conservation and management of natural resources.”

9. Next Steps & Other Business

9.1 Next Steps

The Meeting took a summary view regarding the Roundtable, indicators and its future. The following points were discussed:

- the importance maintaining a regional focus,
- the need to have indicators for monitoring how the Action Strategy is implemented in an overall manner,
- that indicators for objectives need to be few and focused on all levels of action,
- the Action Strategy is a guide and not binding and there is a need for specific indicators at higher process levels
- that SPBCP is developing indicators for Conservation Areas and will test these in 1998,
- the need to clarify the Roundtable mandate (currently we are a group of organisations voluntarily coming together to enable cooperation and collaboration) and the mandate from Pohnpei gave a responsibility to share the revision, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the Action Strategy
- the Roundtable has had a mandate in the development of the Action Strategy and now needs to look at possible roles in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of this strategy and key tools needed to be developed in this regard
- the usefulness of the matrix of activities
- interest in on-line available of monitoring tools

It was further noted that the Action Strategy will be endorsed by SPREP member governments, in addition the SPREP Meeting will be asked to endorse the Roundtable process.

8.2 Frequency of future Roundtable Meetings

The Meeting agreed to meet twice in 1999 and perhaps annually after this. Early to mid February was suggested for the next meeting and WWF offered to host this next meeting.

8.3 Roundtable III Agenda, Mandate and Preparatory Work Assignment *Provisional Agenda*

For the February 1999 Meeting to be hosted by WWF-SPP, the following agenda was provisionally agreed to:

- ⇒ finalise the indicators
- ⇒ discuss monitoring and measuring progress methodology
- ⇒ undertake an analysis of gaps, overlaps and opportunities to plug the gaps
- ⇒ look at indicators for the use of the Action Strategy as a whole
- ⇒ develop means for communicating and presenting the strategy to donors and to countries
- ⇒ reformatted matrix
- ⇒ investigate putting the strategy on line via SPREP's website and give feedback on the idea

Roundtable Mandate

The Meeting noted that the Roundtable has fulfilled its mandate of developing the Action Strategy and now needs to look at possible roles in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of this strategy and key tools needed to be developed in this regard. The Meeting agreed that the Roundtable mandate be refined as follows

To increase effective conservation action in the Pacific islands by:

- ⇒ *fostering greater coordination and collaboration among regional and international organisations*
- ⇒ *providing feedback on the effectiveness of conservation activities through monitoring and evaluation of the Action Strategy*
- ⇒ *identifying and addressing critical gaps in regional conservation activities, and*
- ⇒ *recruiting new partners for Pacific island conservation*

It was further noted that it should be clarified that this process is about increasing the effectiveness of conservation action and not a commitment to funding the implementation of the Action Strategy as a whole. Funding of the Roundtable process was briefly discussed and members agreed that as far as possible members should fund their own costs in this process.

Assignment of Work for the next Roundtable Meeting

In preparation for the next Roundtable Meeting, it was agreed that the following tasks be assigned as bracketed:

- indicators need to be worked on and finalised (Peter, Audrey, Roger, SPREP)
- reformatting the matrix (SPREP, Roger, Sophia)
- web site design (SPREP and user need analysis)
- link to donor's information (Roger, Sofia)
- links to countries - NBSAPs (Cedric, Sue)

8.5 ICPL/SPREP Training Strategy

Mr. Don Stewart, SPREP Consultant, introduced the draft Training Strategy and suggested the need for an explicit link between the training strategy and the Action Strategy. Participants offered to give feedback on the draft strategy. It was noted that the Roundtable welcomed groups who were prepared to take lead on certain areas such as training. Detailed discussion of this item was deferred until the following morning's special meeting on the ICPL proposal.

10. Action Strategy Signing Ceremony

Mr. Tamari'i Tutangata, SPREP's Director, noted the significance of the occasion as the culmination of a long and arduous process in which all participating organizations had heavily invested. The result of this process emphasised the ongoing importance and need to work together. He noted that a key challenge for the next strategy could be the inclusion of the private sector in the next Action Strategy.

Following Mr. Tutangata's remarks, the following participants then signed the Foreword on behalf of their respective organizations. They were Audrey Newman for TNC, Peter Hunnam for WWF, Diane Tarte for IUCN and Fonoti Lafi Fuatai for the USP. Mr. Tutangata sincerely thanked the representatives on behalf of SPREP and reminded the Meeting that SPREP, NZODA, FSP-I and the Chair of the SPREP Meeting would sign the Action Strategy in the coming week.

11. Closing

Participants thanked SPREP, the facilitator Mr. Peter Adler, and each other for the energy and commitment given at the second Roundtable Meeting. Particular recognition was given to Audrey Newman and Sam Sesega for the work before the Roundtable to make it happen.

In his closing remarks, Mr. Tamarii Tutangata thanked everyone for their continuing commitment to the Roundtable. He thanked Mr. Adler especially for his outstanding contribution as the facilitator. He also thanked WWF-SP for the offer to host the next Roundtable and noted that this marked a significant evolution in keeping with the spirit of cooperation of the Roundtable and of sharing the workload. He reminded that the spirit of the Roundtable is to give what we have and SPREP hopes that this process will continue. He noted that signing the Action Strategy is an important milestone and signifies progress in sharing vision and work for nature conservation in the region. Finally, he looked forward to seeing everyone at the next meeting.

Annex 1: List of Roundtable Participants



South Pacific Regional Environment Programme

Pacific Island Roundtable for Nature Conservation
9 - 11 September 1998, Apia, Western Samoa
List of Delegates to Roundtable II

NAMES	TEL/FAX/E-MAIL ADDRESS
1. Mr. Peter Hunnam WWF - South Pacific Fiji Private Mail Bag 4 Ma'afu Street, Suva Fiji	Tel (679) 315-533 Fax (679) 315-410 Email: wwfspp@is.com.fj
2. Mr. Cedric Schuster, WWF - South Pacific Fiji Private Mail Bag 4 Ma'afu Street, Suva Fiji	Tel (679) 315-533 Fax (679) 315-410 Email: wwfspp@is.com.fj
3. Ms Kathy Fry Manager FSP-I PO Box 951, Port Vila Vanuatu	Tel (678) 22-915 Fax (678) 24-510 Email: kfry@vanuatu.com.vu
4. Ms Diane Tarte, IUCN Oceania c/- Aust. Marine Conservn Soc., Box 3139 Level 1, 92 Hyde Rd, Yeronga, QLD 4104, Australia.	Tel (61-7) 3848-5235 Fax (61-7) 3892-5814 Email: dtarte@ozemail.com.au Websites: www.ozemail.com.au/amcs
5. Ms Audrey Newman Deputy Director Asia/Pacific Regional Office The Nature Conservancy TNC 1116 Smith Street #201, Honolulu Hawaii 96817	Tel (808) 537-4508 Ext 284 Fax (808) 545-2019 Email: anewman@tnc.org
6. Mr. Sealii Sesega Programme Officer UNDP Private Mail Bag Apia Samoa	Tel (685) 23-670/1/2 Fax (685) 23-555 Email: undp.sam@talofa.net

7.	Ms Susana Roson, Economic Adviser European Union Suva Fiji	Tel (679) 31-3633 Fax (679) 30-0370 Email: susana@eu.org.fj
8.	Mr. N. Ishwaran, Specialist, Natural Heritage Centre, UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 7 Place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France	Tel (33-1) 45-68-1404 Fax (33-1) 45-68-5570 Email: n.ishwaran@unesco.org Website: http://www.unesco.org/whc/
9.	Mr. Roger Cornforth, Environmental Specialist, NZODA Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade, Private Mail Bag, Wellington, New Zealand	Tel (64-4) 473-2146 Fax (64-4) 494-8514 Email: Roger.Cornforth@mfat.govt.nz
10.	Ms Sofia Bettencourt Senior Natural Resource Economist, Rural Development & Natural Resources Sector Unit East Asia and Pacific Region The World Bank 1818 H Street N.W. Washington DC 20433, USA	Tel (202) 458-2554 Fax (202) 522-1674 Email: sbettencourt@worldbank.org
11.	Ms Jenny Bryant-Tokalau Sustainable Development Adviser, UNDP - Suva Private Mail Bag SUVA Fiji	Tel (679) 302-088 Fax (679) 301-718 Email: jbryant@undp.org.fj Webpage: www.undp.org.fj
12.	Mr. Michael Beresford, Director, International Centre for Protected Landscapes PO Box 15 Machynlleth, POWYS SY20 8 WP WALES United Kingdom	Tel (044) 1654-703-838 Fax (044) 1654-703-838 Email: cf.sh@virgin.net

Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, 9 - 11 September 1998, Apia, Samoa.

13.	Mr. Steve Nagler, Country Director, Peace Corps Samoa/Niue, Apia, Samoa	Tel: (685) 22 346 Fax: (685) 20 450 E-mail: snagler@ws.peacecorps.gov Website: http://www.peacecorps.gov
14.	Mr. Chris Wheeler, First Secretary, AusAID, Apia, Samoa	Tel: (685) 23 411 Fax: (685) 26 872 E-mail: Chris_Wheeler@ausaid.gov.au Website: www.ausaid.gov.au
15.	Mr. Lafi Fuatai, Acting Pro Vice-Chancellor, University of the South Pacific, Alafua Campus, Samoa	Tel: 685 21 671 Fax: 685 22 933 E-mail: fuatai_1@samoa.net
16.	Mr. Don Stewart 31 Castor Bay Road Castor Bay Whangarei Auckland New Zealand	Tel (64-9) 410-9522 Fax (64-9) 412-9522 E-mail: dondaisy@voyager.co.nz

FACILITATOR	
17. Mr. Peter Adler 2471 Manoa Road Honolulu Hawaii 96822	Tel (1-808) 537-3886 Fax (1-808) 528-1974 Email: padler@hawaii.edu

SECRETARIAT - SPREP PO Box 240, Apia, Samoa, Tel (685) 21-929, Fax 20-231	18. Mr. Tamarii Tutangata, Director Email: tamariit@sprep.org.ws
19. Mr Joe Reti, Programme Manager, SPBCP, Head, Conservation of Natural Resources Division Email: joer@sprep.org.ws	20. Mr. Sam Sesega, Programme Officer (Resource Mgt) Email: sams@sprep.org.ws
21. Mr. Francois Martel, Consultant, Programme Officer (Socio-Economics) Email: francoism@sprep.org.ws	22. Ms Sue Miller, Biodiversity Officer (Species) Email: suem@sprep.org.ws
23. Ms Sarona Stanley, Assistant, CNR Email: saronas@sprep.org.ws	

Annex 2: Roundtable Agenda

Pacific Islands Roundtable II for Nature Conservation
9 - 11 September 1998,
Central Bank Conference Room,
Central Bank Building, Apia, Samoa.

Provisional Agenda

Wednesday, 9 September, 1998

Session 1: Registration and Official Opening

8:00 - 8:30 am Registration

8:30 - 10:15 am Opening Prayer - Reverend Nu'uausala (10 mins)

Opening Remarks

- ◆ Minister of Lands, Surveys and Environment, Hon Tuala Sale Tagaloa (10 mins)
- ◆ Tamarii Tutangata, Director SPREP (20 mins)

Introduction of Participants (15 mins).

Photo Session (10 mins)

9:45 - 10:15 am *Morning Tea Break (30 mins)*

Session 2: Workshop

10:15 am - 1:15 pm Workshop on Collaboration and Facilitation: "Principles and Practices of Joint Problem Solving" (3 hrs)

1:15 pm - 2:15 pm *Lunch Break (1 hr)*

Session 3: Outcomes

2:15 pm - 3:45 pm Recap of previous Meetings and Summary of Progress to Date (15 minutes)
Review and Affirm Specific Goals and Products for the Meeting (15 minutes)
Individual Project Updates: A Summary of Key Recent Changes on Key Projects (1 hr)

3:45 - 4:00 pm *Afternoon Tea Break (15 mins)*

Session 4: Outcomes (cont'd.)

4:00 - 5:30 pm Outcomes, Indicators, and Benchmarks: An Overview (20 min)
From Objectives to Outcomes: Recasting and Restating the Objectives in a Different Language (1 hr)

- ◆ Work on one set as a whole group
- ◆ Break out into smaller groups to develop outcome statements
- ◆ Review all statements

6:30 - 9:00 pm *Cocktails: Lesina's Lounge*

Thursday, 10 September 1998

Session 5: Indicators

8:30 - 10:00 am Discussion: Developing Useful Indicators (30 min)
"Developing Primary and Secondary Indicators for Restated Objectives". (2.5 hrs)

- ◆ Work on one set as a whole group
- ◆ Break out into smaller groups to develop potential indicators
- ◆ Review all potential indicators

10:00 - 10:30 am *Morning Tea*

Session 6: Indicators (cont'd.)

10:30 am - 1:15 pm Indicators (cont'd.)

1:15 - 2:15 pm *Lunch Break*

Session 7: Indicators (cont'd.)

2:15 - 3:30 pm Indicators for Restated Objectives (3 hrs)

3:30 - 3:45 pm *Afternoon tea (15 mins)*

Session 8: Indicators (cont'd.)

3:45 - 5:30 pm Indicators for Restated Objectives (cont'd.)

How to Monitor

Benchmarking the Indicators: Developing a 5 yr. Report Card for regions, Sub-regions, and Countries

Friday 11 September 1998

Session 9:

Strategic Gaps

8:30 - 10:00 am Review Activity Lists to Identify Essential Activities Needed to Reach Benchmarks

- ◆ Cracks, Canyons and Voids at the regional level

10:00 - 10:30 am *Morning Tea Break*

10:30 - 1:15 pm Review Activity Lists (cont'd.)

1:15 - 2:15 pm *Lunch Break*

Session 10: Next Steps & Other Business

2:15 - 3:15 pm Where to from here? Next Meeting?

3:15 - 3:30 pm *Afternoon tea*

3:30 - 5:00 pm Signing Ceremony during SPREP Meeting
Close of Roundtable

- ◆ Closing Remarks by SPREP Director
- ◆ Remarks by others

7:00 - 9:00 pm **Dinner: Sails Restaurant**

Annex 3: Minister for the Environment's Opening Address

Reverend Nuuausala,
Distinguished Guests,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is with distinct pleasure that I accept this invitation to offer a few remarks and to open officially this important *Second Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation*. But before doing so, let me first extend to you on behalf of the Government and people of Samoa, a warm and friendly welcome to our island nation. Welcome and *Talofa!*

I vividly recall the First Roundtable Meeting in February this year, which I also had the honour of opening officially. I recall in particular the excitement over the fact that it was happening at all, and how it had originated from the Sixth Conference in Pohnpei in 1997. On that occasion, I spoke about how the concepts of 'consultation' and 'collaboration' between any group of stakeholders were so often bandied about in rhetoric with little or no real serious attempt at making it work in practice, and how refreshing it was that you had all come together at your own expense, to make it happen.

I have since learned of the significant outcomes of the First Roundtable. And it is my regret that I did not have the opportunity then to return to witness the closing of that Meeting and to commend you for the contribution you all made to revising and strengthening the objectives and regional actions of the *1999 - 2002 Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region*. Or more importantly, to thank you for offering to take the lead responsibility in implementing most of the key regional actions of the Action Strategy.

On reflection, we can now say that the first Roundtable took regional collaboration in nature conservation to heights never before achieved. We now have a solid foundation in the form of a sound and practical strategy and in committed partnerships that should make implementation effective and successful. The Roundtable process also provided a model for regional planning that others dealing with regional issues in all areas should emulate. On this occasion therefore, I extend to you all my personal congratulations for the achievements of the first Roundtable Meeting.

That was then and this is now. Today, we are here with yet another challenging agenda. The acid test of our commitment to nature conservation is in the implementation. The issues of monitoring, indicators and reporting lie at the very heart of implementation. It will require of you, individually as implementers, a degree of compliance and accountability to each other and collectively to this Roundtable mechanism.

The success of the first Roundtable gives me no reason to doubt the outcomes of this Meeting. I am also equally optimistic that you will be successful in implementing activities you will be taking on, because it is based on what you believe can be realistically implemented.

For the majority of you who attended the first Roundtable Meeting, your return is a confirmation of your commitment to resolving the outstanding issues on the agenda, and to the Roundtable mechanism. For our new friends and partners who have joined us in this Meeting, your presence is a refreshing endorsement of this Roundtable process. There is a certain novelty in this approach - of getting all regional stakeholders involved in conservation in the Pacific around the one table to coordinate their work - that is enticing and exciting. More importantly, I do not doubt the sense of purpose and commitment you bring with you to this Meeting.

There is not much that I can offer to an august gathering such as this, other than my wholehearted support and encouragement. But I want to leave you with a few thoughts. A number of things are worthy of emulating from this Roundtable series. The greater lesson of this Roundtable series is that we have developed a mechanism for regional collaboration that is working. We should nurture and strengthen it for nature conservation and find a role for it to service the implementation and monitoring phase of the Strategy. It should not end with this Meeting.

There is also merit in the same model being considered for addressing other pressing regional issues such as climate change, waste management, international waters and possibly others. I urge all of you, including SPREP and our donor partners, to be open-minded to this possibility.

Finally, my thanks to SPREP for organizing this Second Roundtable Meeting and for securing the financial resources for funding it. I am told that financial assistance from AusAID and NZODA is funding the logistical costs of this Meeting. It is my pleasure to acknowledge it - thank you for this contribution.

To all Roundtable delegates, I wish you the very best in your deliberations over the three days of this Meeting. I am pleased to note that the timing of the Roundtable coincides with our *Teuila Festival* - the highlight event of our annual Tourism programme. Many interesting aspects of our culture will be on public display this week. Please take some time off to enjoy the many cultural activities of our *Teuila Festival*, and to share in the hospitality of our people and in the beauty of our natural environment.

With those brief remarks, it gives me great pleasure to now officially declare *The Second Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation* open! Soifua.

Annex 4 : Opening Remarks by Mr. Tamarii Tutangata, Director of SPREP

Reverend Nu'uausala,
Honourable Minister of Lands Surveys and Environment, Afioga Tuala Sale Tagaloa,
Distinguished Guests,
Ladies and Gentlemen.

Thank you Reverend for your inspiring message.

Honourable Minister, thank you also for eloquently setting the tone and the challenge for this Meeting so clearly. May I also express our appreciation for your continuing interest in and support for this Roundtable series, and for officially opening this Second Roundtable.

To our distinguished participants, on behalf of SPREP, our warmest welcome. Thank you especially for accepting my invitation to participate in this Meeting and be a part of this Roundtable process. It is pleasing to see friends returning and those who had to go further than they anticipated courtesy of Air New Zealand. I am equally grateful for our colleagues who are attending for the first time. Many of you are long time partners of SPREP and, I am sure, of other regional organizations, in nature conservation as well as other areas of our mandate. Welcome to Apia and welcome especially to this Second Roundtable Meeting.

The Honourable Minister's remarks have offered us food for thought to ponder over during this Roundtable Meeting. We all left the last Roundtable with a well deserved sense of having achieved a lot - we all worked hard in reviewing the objectives and regional actions of the Action Strategy. In the course of the three days of that Meeting, we proved to ourselves that sitting down together around one table as equal partners to find solutions to issues of common concern was indeed a workable approach - for coordinating our work, for fostering and strengthening partnerships amongst ourselves, for exchanging ideas on how best to share the responsibility for implementation, and of course, for revitalising existing bonds and forging new friendships. There was a real sense of excitement that we had started something special and an adventurous spirit of "let's give it a shot and see how it turns out". That was the remarkable thing about the first Roundtable. It was an expedition into the unknown. We took our first tentative step and we ended on the fast track. We all invested heavily in taking that first step, and ended in a sprint across the line with all of us as well as the countries and people that we serve as joint winners.

This Second Roundtable Meeting is somewhat different from the first. We are building on the success of the first meeting. We have specific issues to address - unfinished business from the previous Roundtable and new ones. And our expectation of being successful is inevitably higher. And so it should be. But it will require the same formula for success - a substantial investment of our ideas, patience, understanding of our differences and similarities and the willingness to compromise and build consensus. I believe we have these attributes in abundance in this Room.

The Honourable Minister has also invited us to sustain this Roundtable process. Let us keep that challenge in mind as we address the issues before us. Bear in mind that keeping the

Roundtable process alive would mean redefining its mission. I believe that this task should not be too difficult since it should evolve naturally as we identify the requirements for monitoring and reporting. The more demanding part is our collective commitment to achieving its mission. Again, it will start with our individual commitment to the implementation of the Action Strategy and our willingness to be accountable to each other around this table for the tasks we will be taking upon ourselves.

We spoke often of collective ownership of the Action Strategy. We agreed that our respective organizations should be given the option of signing the Foreword to the Action Strategy to reflect that collective ownership. I do appreciate that this is a difficult issue for some of you, for a whole range of valid reasons. Nevertheless we feel that a signing ceremony would be a fitting climax for the hard work that has gone into the Action Strategy, and a clear gesture of unity and commitment to its implementation. We are organizing such a signing ceremony to take place during the SPREP Meeting next week for those who will be staying for that Meeting, and a short one this Friday for others who are unable to attend next week's ceremony. I thank those who have confirmed their intention to sign the Foreword and look forward to having others joining.

I am tempted to dwell on the success of the last Roundtable but the challenging workload ahead of us demands immediate attention. The major task of this Roundtable is related to monitoring and reporting. Indicators and benchmarks play a key role in these activities and we need to define them in this Meeting. We all know that this is not an easy task. Even now, this is an area of on-going research and studies in the field of nature conservation. However, it seems to us, in SPREP, that indicators that are practical and easy to measure do make sense in our context. No doubt, our collective experience is that whenever the reporting requirements are complex and cumbersome, it becomes a bottleneck.

The thorny issue of 'how to monitor' will inevitably lead to questions of who monitors what, what format should be used, what frequency should reporting be based on, and to who should we should be reporting. I see no better system than one that is capable of self-evaluation and self-review. And the more I ponder the issue of who to report to, the more I see this Roundtable mechanism evolving into this role. I am hesitant to extrapolate further on the logical implications of this line of thinking lest I preempt the outcomes of our deliberations. But it is clear to me that the future of this Roundtable forum will be limited only if that is the collective wish of those of us around this table.

Finally, allow me to make the following observations. We have done well at strengthening the regional actions of the Strategy and we now look forward to their implementation. While doing so, let us not forget that there are no boundaries between regional and national actions. Our regional scope is simply the sum of our actions over several local and national situations. Regional actions that do not address some local or national concern are misdirected and irrelevant. Thus the links between our regional actions and national issues should be transparent. Perhaps the linkages themselves should be reflected in our indicators. In making this observation, I am mindful that Pacific Islands parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity are in the process of formulating national Biodiversity Action Plans. We should seize this opportunity to forge linkages with the national actions of the Action Strategy, and with our own activities at the regional level.

We have also identified the issue of mainstreaming nature conservation into all levels of policy making, planning and budgeting at the national level as a major area of attention in the immediate future. The lack of it at the national level will continue to limit the effectiveness of nature conservation actions at all levels. Thinking aloud, given the importance of mainstreaming in this Action Strategy, keeping track of the extent of progress in mainstreaming may be an idea as an indicator of our own effectiveness.

One other point that we would like to clarify at this time is that we discussed with the Forum Secretariat the possibility of the Forum's endorsement of the Strategy and concluded that the appropriate body to perform this role is the Tenth SPREP Meeting being held next week.

Let me now extend a special welcome to our Facilitator for this Roundtable Meeting, Mr. Peter Adler, who has kindly agreed to perform this vital role. I also would like to thank our drafting team - Sam and Audrey - who took on the task of coordinating the review process, reviewing comments,

and finding the right words to express the many excellent ideas and suggestions that came out of that process.

Let us build on the success of the first Roundtable Meeting. Let us again cross that finishing line together as joint winners, unlike the *fautasi* race that we have earlier witnessed. there cannot be any losers in our race against time and man's own contributions.

Soifua.

Annex 5 : Mr. Peter Adler's Report on the Roundtable Meeting and Workshop

FACILITATOR'S REPORT

on

The Second Pacific Islands Roundtable Meeting on Nature Conservation

Apia, Western Samoa
September 9 - 11, 1998

Peter S. Adler
Honolulu, Hawaii
November 11, 1998

I. Background

The Roundtable was created by the Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in Pohnpei in 1997. The central idea of the Roundtable is for regional organizations that are active in conservation to join hands and work together to review and update the regional/international actions of the Action Strategy. The initial formulation of an action strategy was completed at the first meeting held in February 1998. However, participants recognized that many other issues, including monitoring, indicator formulation, identification of gaps, and implementation, remained unaddressed.

II. Consultant's Role

I was asked to serve as an independent Facilitator for the Roundtable Meeting, to work closely with SPREP, the Roundtable's Secretariat, in agenda-building and logistics arrangements, to conduct a half day training session on facilitation techniques, and to facilitate the meeting itself to the highest and best possible outcomes. As consultant, I was also asked to succinctly report on the facilitation training and the Roundtable's meeting and to make recommendations for facilitating future Roundtable Meetings.

III. Collaboration and Facilitation Workshop

The 3-hour workshop on facilitation and collaboration was held on September 9, 1998. The workshop had three goals: to stimulate the thinking of Roundtable members as to how collaboration can be facilitated; to help advance the skills of Roundtable members so that they can further environmental and organizational collaborations; and to help set the stage for the Roundtable's second meeting. During the workshop, I asked participants to engage in a number of short exercises and problems and presented a range of materials pertinent to collaboration, facilitation, and mediation. I also used various video tapes, newspaper articles, and cartoons to help augment the teaching.

Among the topics discussed were cooperation and competition as a central dilemma for groups of stakeholders; negotiation dynamics and the substantive, relational, and procedural challenges of "Getting to Yes"; the many different avenues to agreement ("The Alchemy of Agreement Making"); the ritual of resolution and the various steps and stages in facilitating and mediating groups to agreement.

This workshop was not meant to be an exhaustive training but rather a brief and stimulating review of some key concepts and ideas. In great part, it was meant to reinforce the good collaboration that is already underway by the Roundtable and to help Roundtable members further define the kind of coordination, networking, and cooperation they aspire to. Although no formal evaluation of the training was done, participants seemed to enjoy the training and find it useful.

IV. The Meeting

Prior to the workshop, opening remarks had been offered by the Reverend Nuuasala, the Honourable Tuala Sale, and Director Tutangata. The formal meeting of the Roundtable commenced on Wednesday, September 9th immediately after the collaboration workshop. The meeting ended on Friday, September 11th. The initial working ground rules for the Roundtable were again ratified, especially those assuring participants that the development and implementation of the plan and its implementation steps are voluntary. The prepared agenda included the following major items:

⇒ Recap of Previous Meetings and Summary or Progress

- ⇒ Review and Affirm Specific Goals and Products for the Meeting
- ⇒ Project Updates: Summary of Key Recent Changes on Key Projects
- ⇒ Discussion of Outcomes, Indicators, and Benchmarks
- ⇒ Recasting and Restating the Objectives in Different Language
- ⇒ Development of Indicators
- ⇒ Benchmarks: Developing a 5-yr Report Card for Regions, Subregions, and Countries
- ⇒ Identification of Gaps At the Regional, Sub-Regional, and National Levels

However, it was understood and agreed that the meeting process would be flexible, that it would move at a pace comfortable to all, and that it would continue to operate on the basis of full consensus.

The majority of workshop time over the ensuing two days spent on the development of potential action plan indicators a report of which has been prepared by SPREP and endorsed by SPREP. It was further agreed that the Roundtable would explore the development of a website / clearinghouse and that a subgroup would do further refinements to the list of indicators in anticipation of the Roundtable III meeting in Fiji in early 1999.

V. Observations and Recommendations

1. The Roundtable has established a very thoughtful and very creative process. It is slowly but surely producing the elements of a workable action strategy that has buy-in and that will make a difference. The keys thus far -- and the likely keys to future successes -- have been excellent secretariat work by SPREP and agreed upon collaboration and collegiality among participants. This should be maintained at all costs.

2. Roundtable I did an excellent job of mapping who is doing what and framing joint goals and objectives for the future. Roundtable II focused on indicators and building further structures (website, clearinghouse) to anchor the Roundtable's work. The challenge in the next set of Roundtables will be to:

- ⇒ Identify major gaps in the plan and formulate any additional goals and indicators that may be needed.
- ⇒ Establish some kind of key benchmarks for critical indicators.
- ⇒ Update and maintain current information on which organizations are doing what kinds of activities and where.
- ⇒ Determine methods for monitoring the plan by establishing feedback and information loop-back mechanisms.
- ⇒ Keep the "spirit of the collaboration" alive and well.

3. The Roundtable's biggest challenge is the continuous balancing of three needs: substantive productivity (the need to get concrete work done), maintenance of good relationships (the need to maintain a voluntary and non-coercive approach to organizational involvement) and good process (the need to insure that the process is enjoyable and productive. By nature, then, this will be a slow process.

4. Planning and goal setting for each meeting must be done in such a way that the agendas are reasonable, that substance, relationships, and process are balanced, and that the plan moves ahead. The secretariat's work in all this is essential. They are the glue that keeps this together.

5. Continuity in representation at each meeting is highly desirable. The same people should be

encouraged to attend each meeting. Where that can't be done, it is important to insure that persons attending are well briefed and that they have at least some measure of "portfolio" to enter into discussions and potential agreements.

In closing, I want to congratulate all of the organizations and individuals who are participating in the Roundtable's work. I am honoured to have played a small role in Roundtable-II and look forward to helping in the future.

Peter S. Adler, Ph.D.

Contact:

c/o Hawaii Justice Foundation
810 Richards Street, Suite 645
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

tel: 808/537-3886

fax: 808/528-1974

e-mail: padler@aloha.net

**Annex 6 : Matrix of Conservation Activities by Conservation Organizations
in the Pacific Islands Region.**