

**Report of the
Sixth Oceania Regional Meeting for
COP12 of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands
Nadi, Fiji
18-20 August 2014.**



**A preparatory meeting for the 12th Meeting of the Conference of
the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Wetlands,
Punta del Este, Uruguay, June 2015.**

1. Introduction

The 6th Oceania Regional Meeting was held at the Tanoa International hotel in Nadi, Fiji from 18th to 20th August 2014. The meeting was co-organized by SPREP and the Ramsar Convention Secretariat and hosted by the Government of Fiji. Funding assistance for the meeting was provided by the Government of Australia and from the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, through voluntary contributions.

The final agenda for the meeting is presented in Annex 1 and the final list of participants in Annex 2.

1.2 Representation

Contracting Parties represented included Australia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea and Samoa. The Ramsar Convention's International Organization Partners were represented by the BirdLife Pacific and WWF Pacific. Observers from the Wildlife Conservation Society, Nature Fiji, Rivers Fiji, the Fiji Locally Managed Marine Areas and community representatives from two of Fiji's nominated Ramsar Sites also participated in the meeting. Secretarial support was provided by Makerita Atiga (SPREP), and facilitation of the meeting by Warren Lee Long, Dr Lew Young, Senior Regional Advisor for Asia and Oceania and Vainuupo Jungblut, Ramsar Oceania Officer.

1.3 Background

This report reflects key outcomes of the sixth Oceania meeting and is provided for the information of interested organizations and stakeholders, including the participants of the 12th Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Wetlands, to be held in Punta del Este, Uruguay from 1st to 9th June 2015.

1.4 Meeting Objectives

The objectives of the 6th Oceania Regional Meeting were:

- To discuss and share experiences on issues, priorities and challenges currently faced by the Ramsar Oceania Parties in the conservation of their wetlands.
- To gauge the progress of the national, regional and global implementation of the Ramsar Convention since the last COP (COP11) in 2012.
- To update on efforts for increasing synergy and cooperation between biodiversity related MEAs in the region.
- To take stock of progress of implementation of the Regional Wetlands Action Plan for the Pacific Islands (2011-2013) and discuss next steps for the action plan.
- To provide an update on COP12 preparations and issues that will constitute Draft Resolutions at the COP.
- To identify new Oceania representatives to the Ramsar STRP and Ramsar Standing Committee from COP12.

2. Meeting Record

Day 1, Monday 18th August 2014

2.1 Official Opening

The Sixth Oceania Regional Meeting for COP12 of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands was officially opened with a prayer by the delegate from the Marshall Islands (Tregar Albon Ishoda) and welcoming remarks by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and the Ramsar Convention Secretariat.

2.1.1 Ramsar Convention Secretariat

Opening Statement from the Secretary General, Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, delivered on his behalf by Dr Lew Young, Senior Regional Adviser for Asia/Oceania, Ramsar Convention Secretariat. The Secretary General apologised that due to work commitments he could not attend the meeting. He thanked the Government of Australia for their generous financial support for the meeting and SPREP for the much needed logistical support. He acknowledged the presence of stakeholders from Fiji's existing and future Ramsar Sites and highlighted the importance of such meetings as an opportunity for contracting parties and partners to discuss convention implementation successes and challenges and welcomed suggestions on how Ramsar implementation could be improved in the future. He further welcomed input to the fourth Ramsar Strategic Plan that was under development the opportunity, and mentioned that the document would set the convention's global roadmap for the next six years up to 2021. He drew attention to the joint CBD, CMS, Ramsar Pre-COP meeting (11-15 August 2014, Fiji) and the value of promoting closer synergies between the biodiversity-related conventions. He concluded by encouraging meeting participants to actively participate during the Pre-COP meeting and at COP12 itself, to actively raise their issues as well as suggestions on how to improve wetland conservation at either the national or regional level, and to look for opportunities to cooperation.

2.1.2 SPREP

Opening Statement from Director-General, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), delivered on his behalf by Warren Lee Long, SPREP Coastal and Marine Adviser. The Director-General welcomed participants to the meeting and noted that this was the sixth time that Oceania contracting parties and partners had come together as a region to prepare for the three-yearly Ramsar COP. He highlighted that SPREP has had a long and effective working relationship with the Ramsar Convention, acknowledged the support to the region from the Ramsar Secretariat and also the financial support from the Government of Australia and the SPREP-Ramsar partnership, which had made this meeting possible. He highlighted the theme of COP12 (Wetlands for our Future) and pointed out that the theme underlined the vital role that Pacific wetlands play in sustaining our livelihoods and unique island biodiversity. He mentioned that a number of important issues will be discussed during the meeting in preparation for COP12, including regional input to the new Ramsar Strategic Plan. He further mentioned that the meeting will play an important role in determining the Oceania position on the new plan. He drew attention to the Regional Wetlands Action Plan for the Pacific Islands 2011-2013 and pointed out that the implementation of the plan would be assessed during the meeting. He encouraged meeting participants to provide their views on priorities and to actively steer the focus and

direction of the new plan. He further encouraged meeting participants to make good use of the meeting as a mechanism for sharing information, experiences and lessons with one another on what works and what doesn't in their respective countries. He concluded by wishing meeting participants all the best for a successful meeting and mentioned that he looked forward to reviewing the meeting outcomes in due course.

2.1.3 Participant introductions

Each Participant was given the floor to introduce themselves and their expectations for the three-day meeting.

2.2 Meeting objectives and overview of day 1 agenda

A brief overview of the meeting objectives and the structure of the agenda for day 1 of the meeting was given by Vainuupo Jungblut.

3. Session 1: Update on the implementation of the Ramsar Convention since COP11

3.1 **Dr Lew Young (Ramsar Secretariat)** presented on the global implementation perspective of the Convention since COP11 in 2012. In his presentation he updated on the current staffing situation within the Ramsar Secretariat, particularly, the departure of the Deputy Secretary General (Nick Davidson), the retirement of Sandra Hails, CEPA Officer, the recruitment of Camilla Chalmers as the Secretariat's head of communication and the new Secretary General, Christopher Briggs, who replaced Anada Tiega. He also mentioned that the Asia/Oceania Assistant post, an 18-month intern position was in the process of being advertised. He provided an update on the process of the development of the new Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016-2021 and mentioned that on day 2 of the meeting there would be an opportunity for participants to provide their views to the consultant developing the plan via a Skype call. With regard to timelines for the plan's development, he explained that the first meeting of the Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) was held from 17-18 June 2014 and was attended by representatives from the Geneva Missions of the Governments from all the Ramsar regions, except Oceania. He further pointed out that the consultant would prepare the first draft of a discussion paper by the 25th of August for presentation to the 2nd SPWG meeting scheduled for 16-17 September 2014. Furthermore, he mentioned that the second draft would be prepared in time for the Ramsar Pre-COP Regional Meetings in October/November. He also mentioned that all documents would be available on the SPWG webpage: http://www.ramsar.org/cda/en/ramsar-documents-strategicplansc47/main/ramsar/1-31-605_4000_0. Lastly, he mentioned the review of the Convention's Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) approved by the Contracting parties at COP11 through Resolution XI.16 and outlined some of the current challenges to improving scientific and technical guidance produced by the STRP.

3.2 **Vainuupo Jungblut (SPREP)** presented on the regional implementation perspective of the Convention since COP11 in 2012. He provided an overview of his work over the last three years since the last regional meeting in Palau (2012). He presented some brief statistics on how Ramsar was doing in Oceania through the current number of Contracting Parties and Ramsar Sites in the region, specifically, that there were now a total of 8 Oceania Parties with Kiribati coming on board in 2013 as a new contracting party, 3 non-parties in the process of joining and a total of 81 Ramsar Sites across the region, most of which were in Australia. He further pointed out that while there were no new site designations for the 6 Pacific Island

contracting parties, a number of sites were under nomination and that the French Territories were also becoming increasingly active in designating Ramsar Sites. He mentioned the Regional Wetlands Action Plan for the Pacific Islands 2011-2013, the review of its implementation and the development of the new action plan. He also highlighted work underway to update wetland inventories for Palau, Kiribati and Vanuatu and that plans to update the inventories of a further three Pacific Island Countries was in the works. He pointed out that a priority also has been to increase synergies and cooperation between Ramsar, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on Migratory Species in the region and drew attention of the participants to the successful convening of a joint MEA Pre-COP meeting held in Fiji from 11-15 September 2014. He also mentioned some challenges he had faced with his work included high staff turnover, limited budget for travel/operations and communication difficulties with some countries. He provided his thoughts on the focus of work over the next three years up to 2018 where he highlighted that there would be continued promotion and encouragement to contracting parties to nominate/designate more coastal/marine Ramsar Sites that incorporated mangroves and coral reefs; that there would be continued efforts to facilitate closer collaboration and harmonization with other biodiversity-related MEAs (CBD, CMS); that assistance would be provided to relevant PIC contracting parties to establish National Ramsar Committees; that efforts to update national wetland inventories for PICs would continue as they formed an important baseline for national wetlands. Lastly, he encouraged contracting parties to improve their response and engagement in Ramsar implementation and related processes, including:

- The review and implementation of the new Ramsar Strategic Plan.
- New Regional Wetlands Action Plan – more ownership from contracting parties and partners is needed.
- STRP work plan – need to provide timely feedback on national scientific and technical priorities
- NBSAP review – need to fully use this opportunity for integration of wetland and Ramsar issues
- Annual contributions to the Convention budget – relevant contracting parties need to address this issue as soon as possible.
- Maximizing Oceania visibility and engagement at Ramsar COPs – need to make full use of the Pacific Voyage campaign and its tools and messages at COP12.
- Working together on regional wetland project(s) proposals that aimed to demonstrate the benefits/value of Ramsar designation.

In the discussions, participants noted that:

- Assistance was needed by some contracting parties to streamline the nomination and designation process for their new Ramsar Sites.
- The new Ramsar Management Planning Guidelines was available for use and could be used for non-Ramsar sites also.
- The management plans for non-Ramsar designated sites that met one or more of the Ramsar criteria could be recognised internationally as long as the criteria for international significance were reflected in the plan.
- There was a proposal to keep the COP12 theme “Wetlands for our Future” for the next triennium (2016-2018).
- There was a proposal from some contracting parties in other Ramsar regions to shift the World Wetlands Day date and that this proposal needed views from Oceania.

- There was great appreciation for the World Wetlands Day awareness materials produced by the Ramsar Secretariat and a call was made for this to continue into the future.
- Their views were welcomed on how the region could engage better with the Ramsar Secretariat.
- There was great potential for embracing technology – the use of online social media platforms to promote the work of the Convention in Oceania and that there were already successful examples undertaken in the region.
- There was a need to raise the level of awareness on wetlands in general.
- There was a need to market specific species that occurred within Ramsar Sites in the region.

4. Session 2: Updates from Oceania Contracting Parties

4.1 *Australia*: **Georgina Usher** presented on Australia's implementation of the Ramsar Convention. In her presentation, she mentioned that they had been a contracting party since 1974 and owned the world's first Ramsar Site – the Cobourg Peninsula, Northern Territory. She further pointed out that that this year marked the 40th anniversary of this site's Ramsar designation. She mentioned their most recent Ramsar Site - Piccaninnie Ponds Karst Wetlands located in South Australia, designated in 2012. She mentioned that Australia had 65 Ramsar Sites and that wetlands in Australia were highly unique and diverse. She highlighted the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC) 1999, which provided protection for threatened and migratory species and Ramsar Sites. She mentioned a number of national guidelines developed to assist with national implementation of the convention – these included guidelines on mapping and boundary descriptions (2014), describing the ecological character of Ramsar Sites (2008) and nominating new Ramsar Sites (2012). She also mentioned guidelines that were under development such as the national wetlands management toolkit and the National Wetlands Policy Statement. In terms of wetland management, restoration and rehabilitation, she outlined government programs to reduce the impact of invasive species, rehabilitate native habitat and improve land and water management practices and drew attention to some national CEPA products such as the Wetlands Australia magazine and fact sheets that have been produced that interpret Convention guidance. Some implementation challenges highlighted included an unpredictable and changing climate, the need to value ecosystem services of all wetlands, not just Ramsar Sites and wetland information and data needs. Lastly, she mentioned Australia's appreciation for the ongoing assistance from the Ramsar Secretariat and highlighted that improved administrative efficiencies would enable convention bodies to focus on achieving the conservation and wise use of all wetlands.

4.2 *Fiji*: **Rahul Chand** mentioned in his presentation that they joined the Ramsar Convention in 2006. He outlined the institutional arrangement for implementation of the convention at the national level and highlighted the types of wetlands found in Fiji. He mentioned that Fiji had a National Wetlands Steering Committee (NWSC) and that this committee reported to the National Environment Council which in turn report to Cabinet. He mentioned that the NWSC comprised representatives from government, NGOs, statutory bodies, Academic institutions, Private sector, landowners of Ramsar Sites and other proposed Ramsar Sites. He provided information on national activities and initiatives that implement the Regional Wetlands Action Plan. In terms of legislation, he explained that a gap analysis

was conducted by the Fiji Environment Law Association to gauge areas that need strengthening for the new protected area legislation that was under development. He further mentioned that this new law would also encompass the conservation and protection of national wetlands. With regard to threats and issues, he highlighted the following:

- Coastal / watershed construction/development
- Deforestation in watersheds
- Invasive species
- Pollutants – industrial, agricultural, mines
- Flow alteration – dams/irrigation/road culverts
- Overfishing /Destructive fishing practices

He mentioned that they had incorporated wetland activities into relevant national strategies such as the NBSAP and the National Resource Management Plan to facilitate collaborative implementation. In conclusion, he mentioned that collaboration with other MEAs facilitated through the NBSAP process has made it easier for them to meet their Ramsar obligations.

4.3 *Papua New Guinea*: **Michael Bongro** provided a verbal presentation where he outlined they had two Ramsar Sites with a few more under nomination and that they were looking at GEF funding to support the designation of three more Ramsar Sites. He highlighted that their national Administrative Authority for Ramsar, the Department of Environment and Conservation, was undergoing a restructuring process that would see it become the Environment and Conservation Authority. He mentioned that they were still familiarising with the biodiversity-related conventions that they have joined. In terms of threats and issues, he outlined mining and the oil and gas sectors that were affecting implementation of the Convention. He also mentioned that NGOs tended to communicate directly with local communities and did not go through the national government; he explained that this had resulted in the non-recognition by the national government of NGO initiatives and activities.

4.4 *New Zealand*: **Maj de Poorter** highlighted some of the successes in national implementation of the Ramsar Convention. These included multi-stakeholder involvement through both formal and informal partnerships, engaging central and local government, NGOs, communities, Iwi (tribes), primary producers and businesses for the nomination of new Ramsar Sites and the management and restoration of existing Ramsar Sites and wetlands in general. She mentioned some initiatives that were underway such as the Department of Conservation (DOC) Arawai Kakariki Wetlands restoration programme, the DOC draft guidelines for assessment of potential Ramsar Sites and the DOC-Fonterra \$20 million project for 5 key waterways. In terms of challenges, she explained the jurisdictional challenges faced between DOC, the Ministry of Environment and regional councils; that they have had prolonged droughts; that climate change aspects need to be incorporated into site management; that development and adjacent land use changes such as the expansion and intensification of dairy farming have led to increased nutrient loading in waterways; that pest and weed control remained an on-going challenge. In terms of next steps, she mentioned that they were in the process of finalising, publishing and distributing the user friendly guidelines; that they would prepare and submit revised Ramsar information sheets for their six Ramsar Sites; that they would develop new nominations before the end of the new triennium (i.e. – before the end of 2018); that they needed to gain more understanding and maximize the use

of lessons learned from current initiatives (e.g. – Awarai Kakariki) and that they were planning to increase understanding of climate change effects on their wetlands.

In the discussions, participants noted that:

- Some contracting parties were keen to see wider use of their specific tools for valuing wetlands as sites that were not assessed for their ecosystem services were more vulnerable to over-use, abuse and degradation.
- Specific contracting parties needed guidance on how to streamline the administration of biodiversity-related conventions at the national level.
- Many Pacific island contracting parties do not have specific wetland-related legislation
- Specific contracting parties have taken steps to integrate MEAs under their NBSAP programme and using partnerships with implementing partners and stakeholders.
- There are many advantages and benefits to be gained by working with multiple stakeholders to achieve outcomes that governments alone cannot achieve.
- Some contracting parties had really good working partnerships with NGOs, while others did not.

4.5 *Samoa*: **Elizabeth Kerstin** highlighted some of the successes they have had at the national level since COP11. These included awareness programmes to improve the understanding of wetland conservation, an increase protected area network through the inclusion of 60 new mangrove areas, the gathering of new data through various projects and initiatives such as the Samoa Rapid Biodiversity Assessment and the National Forest Inventory. She further highlighted that wetland conservation was effectively mainstreamed and integrated into national and sectoral development plans and that P3D models for the Lake Lanoto’o Ramsar Site and other national wetland areas have been developed through GEF project assistance. She also mentioned some of the challenges faced such as natural disasters and their impact (Cyclone Evan in 2012), lack of extra funding to support wetland activities, land tenure issues and their impact on wetland management efforts, the need for administrative support, training and capacity building for improved coordination and implementation of sectors and project activities with national wetland priorities and the absence of monitoring and enforcement due to difficult access and isolation of some wetland areas. For next steps, she outlined increased efforts for enforcement of environmental compliance, monitoring and enforcement (CEM) of actions and activities relates to wetlands; that awareness programmes would continue with the long term goal of getting people to appreciate the value and the significance of wetlands; that they would seek to secure funding opportunities through project proposals, for example, the GEF 5 Critical Ecosystems project; that the capacity of responsible staff would be strengthened to conduct surveys and payment of ecosystem services etc.; that they would progress the current 2 Ramsar Site nominations and the establishment a National Wetland Committee to oversee and prioritise the Convention’s work at the national level. Lastly, she outlined existing national projects and initiatives that have contributed to the implementation of the Regional Wetlands Action Plan, such as the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund/SPREP Rapid Biodiversity Assessment (BioRap) of Upland areas of Savaii island, Samoa, which improved forest and biodiversity management and filled knowledge gaps and the IUCN Oceania/Government of Germany: Mangrove Ecosystems for Climate Change Adaptation and Livelihood Samoa Project (MESCAL), which updated national baseline data on mangroves.

4.6 *Kiribati*: **Ratita Bebe** explained the process through which their first Ramsar Site was designated, which began with community consultations back in 2007. She also highlighted some products that were produced through Ramsar support for their Ramsar Site, including awareness materials for the community and signage. In terms of challenges, she mentioned that there had been limited community support due to limited understanding and limited funding; that communities owned most of the terrestrial and marine areas and this made it difficult to control their destructive activities (e.g. – mangrove cutting); that there was lack of support from the Eutan Tarawa Council (ETC) at the outset for Ramsar activities due to limited funding; that there was a lack of awareness and understanding at the community level of the importance of the Ramsar Convention and its work. In terms responses to these challenges, she mentioned that they were planning to step up efforts at awareness raising at all levels and that they were going to encourage the ETC and the Ramsar Site community to provide fuller support have greater ownership of the Ramsar related activities through volunteering. She mentioned that they were in the process of developing the management plan for the Nooto Ramsar Site and that they are moving to designate the whole of North Tarawa as a Ramsar Site, something that the ETC has already approved. For next steps, She mentioned that they would be developing and implementing a management plan for the Nooto Ramsar Site; that they will assist in completing their national wetland inventory; that they would be seeking Cabinet approval for Kiribati’s second Ramsar Site, Kiritimati island; that they would be seeking the assistance of SPREP, the Ramsar Secretariat and partners with the nomination and designation of new Ramsar Sites and with guidance on how to incorporate Ramsar and wetland activities into their NBSAP. She also mentioned national and regional partners that would/could assist them with to implement the next steps.

4.7 *Marshall Islands*: **Tregar Albon Ishoda** provided general overview of the Marshall Islands, its land area and population. He briefly explained the key national ministries and partners (including communities) that played a part in Ramsar implementation. He mentioned that their first Ramsar Site, Jaluit Atoll, was listed in 2004 and was managed by communities with technical assistance from the Ramsar National Administrative Authority - the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) and the Coastal Management Advisory Council (CMAC). He mentioned their second Ramsar Site, Namdrik Atoll, which was listed in 2012 and was awarded the UN Equator Initiative award that same year in recognition of community innovation in promoting a model of community self-sufficiency, local food security, adaptation and an integrated approach to ecosystem-based management. He mentioned that in addition to Ramsar, they were also a party to the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on Climate Change and highlighted some regional initiatives that they were participating in such as the Micronesian Challenge. He mentioned that their government had declared February 2 each year as National Wetlands Day to coincide with the global commemoration of the Convention’s birthday, he went on to explain that NWD activities had high level support from government and other partners and that it was also linked to the Micronesian Challenge. Lastly, he pointed out some challenges that were hindering their implementation of the convention – 1) remoteness of their islands, 2) limited financial resources and 3) limited technical capacity within the national government. He also pointed out that climate change is a major issue for them since their atolls are all low-lying.

In the discussions, participants noted that:

- Land tenure issues in some contracting parties presented challenges for wetland management, monitoring and enforcement.

- There were some good case studies of communities taking the initiative to promote an integrated approach to environmental management and livelihoods (e.g. – Namdrik Atoll, Marshall Islands).

5. **Session 3: Perspective of Ramsar’s regional partners and IOPs relating to the conservation and wise use of wetlands in Oceania.**

5.1 *Relevant regional projects under SPREP:* **Warren Lee Long** provided a brief presentation on relevant projects undertaken by SPREP in the region. These included work on the State of the Environment (SOE) reporting by SPREP member countries, work on the NBSAP review and assistance to SPREP member countries on this and work on Marine Spatial Planning through the Pacific Oceanic Ecosystem Analysis (PACIOCEA) project.

5.2 *The Great Sea Reef - A nominated Ramsar Site for Food and Economic Security:* **Alfred Ralifo (WWF Pacific)** began his presentation by providing a brief background to the Great Sea Reef (GSR), which spanned approximately 517km in length, had a total area of about 202,700 square kilometres, ran through four provinces (Ba, Ra, Bua and Macuata) and hosted 26 traditional fishing grounds or “qoliqoli”. He went on to provide some statistics that emphasised the importance of the GSR, for instance, that it contained 44 percent of Fiji’s endemic reef species and that 12 species found at the site were listed on the IUCN Red List. He highlighted that the portion of the GSR under Ramsar nomination was known as “Qoliqoli Cokovata”, which spanned four districts, included 35 villages and had a total land area of approximately 2,064 square kilometres. He went onto mention the threats to the GSR, which were the unsustainable development and use of resources – Fisheries, Agriculture, Forestry and coastal development; pollution and waste; extractive industry; increasing population; invasive species; climate change and sea bed mining (an emerging issue). He highlighted the Qoliqoli Cokovata Conservation Initiative which focused on ecosystem based management and outlined some of the associated activities such as the development of a network of Marine Managed and Protected Areas and management plans, reforestation projects, rehabilitation of riparian zones and mangrove replanting and the development of the GSR management strategy. Some of the challenges faced included remoteness – distance from site and communication constraints, the lack of an integrated approach between various sectors and stakeholders, compliance and enforcement, funding, resources and capacity – data gaps, etc., the lack of incentives/enabling environment to support and promote sustainable development and untested assumptions regarding livelihoods. He concluded by mentioning that to designate the Qoliqoli Cokovata as a Ramsar Site would facilitate the recognition of community efforts and initiatives both nationally and internationally, that it would strengthen governance, leadership, compliance and enforcement, that it would foster community empowerment and participation, the continuous support of the national government, strengthen community livelihoods and economic development, encourage and promote sustainable development and greater awareness on the value and significance of the GSR.

5.3 *Waterbirds in Oceania – potential new Ramsar Sites based on Important Bird Areas:* **Don Stewart (Birdlife Pacific)** drew attention to the Aichi Target 11 adopted at the CBD COP10 in Nagoya, which aimed to conserve an increased number of terrestrial, coastal and marine areas important for biodiversity, and noted that this provided an opportunity to increase the coverage of wetland protected areas in the Pacific. He provided background to the Important Bird Area (IBA) network in the region and mentioned that there were 180 land-based IBAs across the Pacific island countries and territories, of which 37 were triggered by

water bird species. He pointed out that 26 of these fulfilled Criterion 5 of the Ramsar Criteria, 4 sites that fulfilled Criterion 6 (1% criteria) for the Bristle-thighed Curlew and 37 sites that fulfilled Criterion 6 for terns and noddies. The main threats to waterbirds were invasive species, extreme weather events and over-exploitation. He also noted that some of the site-based data on waterbirds was very outdated.

5.4 *Wetlands Management in Fiji – Perspectives and lessons learnt from a local NGO:* **Nunia Thomas (Nature Fiji/Mareqeti Viti)** began her presentation with some background on wetland issues in Fiji, the use of wetlands in Fiji in terms of their role as a provider of clean drinking water, an essential and free ecosystem service. She explained the “ridge to reef” nature of wetlands in Fiji and highlighted Fiji’s wetlands supported 164 species of fish and that over 28 percent of these fish species spend their life stages along the whole water catchment from the headwaters to inshore marine areas. She provided an analysis of Fiji’s policies and legislation, whether they were working and how they related to wetland management, in this analysis she cited Fiji’s NBSAP (2007), the Fiji Environment Management Act (2005), the Fiji Endangered and Protected Species Act (2002) and the Fiji Climate Change Policy. She mentioned their perspective on community and stakeholder engagement and that if a site was proposed for conservation purposes, that there were a lot of questions that needed to be answered in order to facilitate stakeholder buy-in to the concept, such as what would be in it for them with regard to monetary value, ecosystem services and infrastructural development? In terms of capacity building programmes they undertook, she outlined site exchange programmes and eco-camps for children (either day trips or weekend camps) that were aimed at raising kids’ appreciation of the wildlife in their own backyards and allowing their interaction with local and international wildlife experts. She also outlined that they ran participatory forums within communities aimed at raising awareness, gathering baseline information on land use, resource knowledge and attitudes/perceptions towards environmental resources. She provided background on the work that they have been conducting at the Upper Navua Conservation Area Ramsar Site and some of the resulting lessons learnt such as those dealing with the Ramsar Site’s land lease and forest harvesting issues. She briefly outlined their work on Taveuni Island where there were issues of unsustainable landuse practices, illegal land use arrangements and encroachment of the forest reserve boundaries. She explained that they had held landowner forums in three protected areas (Taveuni Forestry Reserve, Ravilevu Nature Reserve, Bouma National Heritage Park) to gather baseline information. She mentioned capacity building initiatives that they had organized for landowners including field visits to Protected Areas on Taveuni and on the island of Viti Levu as well as landowner discussions on lessons learnt from their respective protected areas. In conclusion, she provided a summary of issues to consider based on their national work, such as the land ownership, of which 80 percent is owned by communities, the issue of stakeholder engagement in Ramsar Site management, who will manage the Ramsar Site?, how will management be monitored? How do we identify successful management? She also touched on issues with communication tools and capacity needs.

5.5 *An Ecosystem Based Management Approach – from Ridge to Reef:* **Kini Qounadovu (Wildlife Conservation Society)** provided a definition of Ecosystem-based Management (EBM), mentioning that it was an approach that considered the connection between humans and their environment, emphasising connectivity within and between ecosystems, protection and restoration of key processes and functions and the maintenance of ecosystem services on which people depend. He explained that EBM was a framework for managing threats such as land use change, population increase, fishing pressure and climate change in a holistic

manner. He went on to highlight the work that they were conducting in Fiji on EBM, such as helping the Kubulau District to establish Fiji's first EBM plan to manage 20 marine protected areas and adjacent watersheds and that it was being replicated in other districts across Fiji. He mentioned that they had carried out management planning workshops for the communities that brought together traditional knowledge and scientific information and where they facilitated the mapping of traditional knowledge on resources and their use. He mentioned that the data they had collected had supported local management effort and confirmed some trends, for example, that the loss of forest cover and non-native fish introductions was associated with declines in native biodiversity. Through the EBM approach, they had also helped the communities to develop management recommendations and rules together with options for their enforcement.

5.6 Fiji Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMA)

Kiniviliame Ravonoloa gave a brief verbal presentation on the work of the Fiji LMMA network.

In the discussions, participants noted that:

- Site management plans had to be flexible and adaptable to changing circumstances and new information.
- The costs of managing Ramsar Sites were hugely underestimated.
- Working with children at sites such as the Upper Navua Conservation Area has helped to consolidate community support.
- Making species central to conservation programmes had attracted stronger local stakeholder support and involvement in local action.

6. Session 4: One Pacific Voyage at COP12

6.1 *Pacific Voyage to Punta del Este, Ramsar COP12: Nanette Woonton (SPREP)* guided participants' through a brief media skills training, including tips on how to best prepare for television, radio and newspaper interviews – what to do and not what to do. She also carried out a brief exercise to help participants put together concise striking statements or “sound bites” to help them prepare ahead of anticipated media interviews at COPs and other key related events.

Day 2, Tuesday 19th August 2014

7. Session 5: Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 and beyond

7.1 Day 2 started off with a Skype call between the meeting participants and the consultant developing the new Strategic Plan, Peter Hislaire. The main purpose of the Skype call was to get feedback from Oceania on the new Strategic Plan. The consultant provided a brief background to the development process and timeline for the new strategic plan and mentioned that. He mentioned that the new plan would align with the CBD, CMS and other relevant MEAs.

In terms of issues from Oceania, he mentioned the following based on the information that was available to him:

- Developing national level frameworks to guide implementation.
- Gathering further data on the value of wetlands and their ecosystem services.
- Strengthening the integrating of wetlands into local/traditional practices.
- Better coordination and synergies between MEAs and at the national level within government circles.
- Continue updating national wetland inventories
- Strengthening cooperation with the private sector
- How to accommodate new and emerging pressures – climate change, extractive industries, urbanization
- Increasing understanding of wetland dynamics
- How to measure wetland values/processes and to increase awareness

The consultant pointed out that with MEA implementation the administrative pressure was great, especially in situations where there was an insufficient number of staff members at the national level. On this point, he further sought the views of the meeting participants on 1) the extent of Ramsar IOP support for national capacity and 2) the effectiveness of National Ramsar/Wetland Committees or equivalent instruments in reducing administrative burden related to MEA implementation and promoting greater synergies. Participants raised the following issues:

With regard to 1), the Ramsar Secretariat (Lew Young) pointed out that there had been many examples from day 1 presentations on the support that Ramsar's IOPs have been providing for Pacific island contracting parties.

With regard to 2), the following was raised:

- Samoa mentioned that they did not have a national wetland committee but mentioned that they would be setting up an environment coordination unit under their Environment ministry that would coordinate MEA implementation at the national level.
- Fiji mentioned that their NWSC worked quite well to input wetland issues into their NBSAP
- WWF Pacific mentioned that the NBSAP should be the overarching national guiding framework for biodiversity for the Pacific Island Countries and it needed to be endorsed/recognised at the highest level in order to effectively promote MEA synergies and to feed into the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

With regard to the post-2015 SDGs, the consultant pointed out these had not yet been defined yet and sought participants' views on how Ramsar should use the SDGs.

In response, the participants raised the following:

- Nature Fiji mentioned that Fiji was developing a Green Growth Framework at a high level that this framework would contribute to the SDGs
- Fiji pointed out that that their national wetlands steering committee was actively working to ensure that wetland issues were well integrated with other emerging environmental issues at the national level.

The consultant sought the views of participants on shifting the focus of the Convention from Ramsar Site management to broader work on river basins and water issues, in order to address SDGs, livelihoods and water quality.

In response, participants raised the following:

- Nature Fiji pointed out that many of the high volcanic island countries in the Pacific were beginning to adopt the river basin/catchment management approach.
- Australia mentioned that those issues were already addressed in the current Ramsar Strategic Plan.

The consultant further pointed out that there are some within the Convention circles who felt that there should be a greater move towards focusing on the River basin level, and sought the view of participants as to whether the convention should be conducting monitoring at that level. In response, SPREP mentioned that some may feel this was a valid change of focus in light of climate change issues.

The consultant sought participants' views on STRP and CEPA issues. In response, Nature Fiji mentioned that the Convention's World Wetlands Day CEPA tools and awareness materials had been particularly useful for Fiji over the years. The posters, stickers and booklet were helpful to the national awareness campaigns given that they could be adapted to the local context and language. This support from the Convention should continue.

The consultant mentioned that the STRP was undergoing a separate review of its own and sought participant views on national priorities for the next three to six years. In response, participants raised the following:

- Nature Fiji mentioned that their priorities included addressing unchecked gravel extraction from rivers and raising the awareness of government of the impact of this activity on communities and Fiji's biodiversity.
- Samoa mentioned that their priorities included putting in place monitoring at sites, strengthening technical capacity, awareness raising, funding opportunities for further wetland ecological surveys, community compensation for lands taken by government for public purposes.
- WWF Pacific mentioned that that their priority was the sustainable management of specific wetland sites such as the Great Sea Reef and strengthening work with local communities
- SPREP mentioned that better baseline information was needed and so updating/developing national wetland inventories was a priority for the region.
- Papua New Guinea mentioned that their priorities included addressing policy issues (i.e. - amending their environment legislation), finalisation of their draft Protected Areas policy.
- FLMMA mentioned that their priority was to launch a multi-provincial resource management committee (I-taukei national resource committee).
- SPREP mentioned the need for more sustainable financing mechanisms for biodiversity conservation beyond traditional sources and cited that this was an outcome of the joint CBD, CMS, Ramsar Pre-COP meeting held the week before.

- New Zealand mentioned that Invasive Alien Species (IAS) needs to be retained in the new plan and update it to link also with new information and work on IAS carried out recently under the CBD.
- UNEP mentioned that regarding synergies, there was a need for projects that cut across MEAs (e.g.- GEF/CMS Dugong-Seagrass project). Donors also need to be encouraged to promote this joint MEA project approach.
- Australia asked the consultant what similar issues faced in Oceania were also faced in other regions. The consultant explained that there were common issues that were manifested differently for each region (changing rainfall patterns, urbanization, modernization) but that there were distinct differences as well between regions such as on trans-boundary water issues.
- The Ramsar Secretariat asked about how regional differences and similarities would be addressed in the new plan. The consultant mentioned that this issue would be discussed during the September meeting of the SPWG. He mentioned that new issues needed to be included, formulated at the global level but tailored to be specific at the regional/national level. He further mentioned that he would try to find language that would work at the global level and then would give more details for the regional/national level.
- SPREP mentioned that Small Island Developing States (SIDS) needed external support and mechanisms for developing capacity and systems to implement MEAs.
- The consultant reiterated the timeline for the new plan – that the first draft would go to out on 25 August and then the second draft would go to specific regional meetings. The third draft would go to the SPWG end of November, prior to tabling at the Standing committee 48 in January next year. He re-emphasized the importance of getting Oceania's comments and views on the draft plan and mentioned that all the documents would be available on the Ramsar website where contracting parties could access and provide comments back to him or the co-chairs of the SPWG, Finland or France.
- Lastly, the consultant invited interested contracting parties to provide their contact details for their inclusion on the SPWG mailing list. Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Fiji, Tonga and Samoa showed interest and gave their details.
- The participants thanked the consultant for his time and for guiding the constructive discussions on the new strategic plan.

In the discussions, participants noted that:

- The draft plan would only be available for some of the COP12 regional meetings to consider, excluding the Oceania meeting.
- The new plan aimed to reflect global, regional and national aspirations
- The new plan should be able to adapt to a changing world
- The new plan needed to be usable at the global level, but flexible to also accommodate regional and national level issues.
- An issue to be defined was whether Ramsar was a convention focused on water, biodiversity or sustainable development.
- CEPA tools had been very helpful to some contracting parties

8. Session 6: Ramsar COP12, 2015

Update on COP12 preparations and issues: **Lew Young (Ramsar Secretariat)** provided background and an overview of important issues for COP12 in June 2015 and also provided key information on arrangements and key sessions at the upcoming COP. He mentioned that this COP was to be a paperless conference and that the venue of the COP was the Hotel Conrad in Punta del Este, about 130 Kilometres east of Montevideo and about 1.5 hours from Carrasco International Airport. He provided a summary of the agenda for the COP which began with registration on the morning of June 1 and ended with a plenary session on the afternoon of the June 9. He mentioned that the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee would be held on June 1, after which the Committee would meet daily before each plenary as the ‘Conference Committee’. He pointed out that the Standing Committee appointees from each region for the next three year cycle would observe at meetings of the conference committee. He mentioned that the 50th meeting of the Standing Committee would meet on June 9 at the end of the COP and would include incoming members, electing officers and subgroup members. This meeting would agree on the date and venue of the first full meeting of the Standing Committee (Standing Committee 51). He outlined the 20 Draft Resolutions (DR) that would be discussed at the COP, explained the rationale of each and the country/agency responsible for them. He also highlighted the timeline for preparation of the DRs, with September 10 being the deadline for submission of DRs for editing and translation; January 26-30, 2015 for the presentation of the DRs to the 48th meeting of the Standing Committee and the end of April 2015, where all DRs would be available on the Ramsar website for contracting parties to access. He flagged with participants the idea of holding an Oceania side event at the COP and if so, what would be the topic, who would be the speakers, who would organize it and who would cover the cost of the event. Lastly, he mentioned that there was a need to fundraise to cover the cost of getting the Pacific Island Contracting Parties to the COP and provided some preliminary figures for the information of the participants.

In the discussions, participants noted that:

- The cost of convening the COP came from voluntary contributions
- It would take close to 50,000 US Dollars to get Pacific Island Contracting Parties to the COP – fundraising would be needed.
- It would be good to the proposed Oceania Side Event to one of the COP DRs, this would increase the likelihood of its acceptance.
- Oceania had a good track record with COP credentials and this needed to continue.
- That there were challenges to producing Ecological Character Descriptions (ECDs) for Ramsar Sites, such as cost and lack of technical expertise.
- That there had been a slow uptake of ECDs around the world.

9. Session 7: Harmonization and integration of Biodiversity MEAs in the region

9.1 *Working towards greater harmonization an integration of Biodiversity-related MEAs in the Pacific:* **Vainuupo Jungblut (SPREP)** provided an overview of the outcomes of the Joint Pre-COP meeting for CBD, CMS and Ramsar held the week before in Fiji (11-15 August). He mentioned that the joint meeting was a result of efforts within SPREP to facilitate closer collaboration between Biodiversity-related MEAs in the Pacific; that the meeting was the first of its kind at the global level and that it engaged the Secretariats of CBD, CMS, Ramsar, CITES and also UNEP. He pointed out that the meeting generated a lot of good ideas for increasing MEA synergies and cooperation in the region and that there was

positive feedback from MEA Secretariats and PICs who attended. In terms of content, he mentioned that there was maximized group work and interactive sessions, experience sharing, an informative panel discussion for MEA Secretariats, discussions on the Pacific Voyage – key regional messages to take to COPs. Lastly, he highlighted the outcomes dealing with ‘Cooperation across MEAs’ for the information of participants and mentioned that the key outcomes consolidated for the meeting as a whole would be disseminated widely within the region and beyond.

In the discussion, participants noted that:

- The meeting was praised by the MEA Secretariats that participated.
- The meeting was one of many joint activities planned by SPREP to increase MEA synergies and cooperation in the region.
- The meeting agreed on 32 outcome statements dealing with MEA synergies, NBSAPs, CBD Aichi Targets, IAS, harmonized reporting, recognition of local community conservation efforts etc.
- There was a group activity facilitated by Ramsar which produced some interesting results related to MEA national focal points and their interaction.
- Increased collaboration should be country-driven and implemented through a practical process.
- There was a need to look at opportunities to enhance collaboration between MEAs at the regional level, e.g. through regional organizations such as SPREP or other similar organizations.

10. Session 8: Discussions on Regional Priorities for Ramsar COP12 Draft Resolutions

10.1 This session was conducted as a group work session where the meeting broke into two groups to discuss relevant DRs earlier introduced by the Ramsar Secretariat. Each group undertook an analysis of each relevant DR, discussed and noted specific issues for Oceania in relation to the DR, put together recommendations and identified responsible MEAs, Convention Parties, NGOs and other partners that worked on this issue outlined in each DR. Group work results are at Annex 3 Following the group work, it was noted that Contracting Parties needed to coordinate and come up with a unified view on the DRs. Lew Young mentioned that contracting parties could provide comments on the DRs through email; that the DRs would be online by mid-October and that November 21 was the deadline for providing comments. He mentioned that another opportunity for providing comments would be during Standing Committee 48 in January next year. He pointed out that SPREP would notify contracting parties once the DRs were online and would also coordinate feedback on the DRs.

There was also a wider discussion on resource mobilization, given that this was particularly an important issue for Oceania. Through the discussion, participants noted that:

- There was a need to ensure that resource mobilization was done effectively in the region
- A possible resource mobilization plan for wetlands in the region was flagged
- The ability of governments to absorb projects was an issue

- There were opportunities to link the resource mobilization for NBSAPs and that of other MEAs
- It was good to have resource mobilization plans, but more importantly to ensure that they were being implemented.

11. Session 9: Scientific and Technical Needs

This session was held as a brainstorming session with brief discussion on the Scientific and technical needs of Oceania Contracting Parties. The results of the session are in Annex 4

The last part of Day 2 was devoted to the discussion of ideas for an Oceania side event at COP12. For this session, participants broke into two groups to discuss ideas for the content of the proposed side event. The results of the group work are in Annex 5.

Day 3, Wednesday 20th August 2014

Before the sessions began on the morning of day 3, the meeting heard presentations from Birdlife Pacific, the Pew Foundation/charitable trust and UNEP Regional Office for Asia/Pacific.

Don Stewart of Birdlife Pacific gave a brief overview of their fundraising efforts, mentioned that this was their main preoccupation for the moment and outlined the main sources of funding for their work in the region, which came from a variety of trusts and wealthy people.

The representative from the Pew Foundation provided background to their work and mentioned that they were headquartered in Philadelphia, USA. He mentioned that they did a lot of work on the conservation of Penguins and Sharks. He mentioned that they were well resourced and invited meeting participants to engage with them and to let them know where they could be of assistance. He explained that they were not a lobby group but an advocacy group. He further asked the meeting as to how they could facilitate the ‘science-to-policy’ work in the region in a strategic way.

Makiko Yashiro of UNEP provided a brief background to her work in the region which was to facilitate enhanced MEA coordination and synergies. She also provided an overview of existing financial support mechanisms that are in place for the implementation of the Convention, including the information on the programmatic focus and required procedures to develop projects under GEF-6.

12. Session 10: Ramsar Sites information

12.1 *Changes to the Ramsar information Sheet and Ramsar Sites Information Service:* **Lew Young (Ramsar Secretariat)** provided a brief background to changes that were being made to the Ramsar Information Sheet and the online Ramsar Site database, the Ramsar Sites Information Service (RSIS). Mainly, that the data from the old RSIS was being transferred to the new RSIS and that the Ramsar Information Sheets were going to be completed online from late in the second half of 2014. He continued to provide an online demonstration of the new RSIS and invited participants to have a try at it.

In the discussions, participants noted that there were still a few technical glitches (bugs) with the new RSIS and that these should be sorted before it was launched.

13. Session 11: Regional Wetlands Action Plan for the Pacific Islands (RWAP)

Vainuupo Jungblut (SPREP) provided a brief background to the Action Plan, mentioning that it was first developed in 1999 and then was updated in 2012 to cover the period 2011-2013. He explained that it was developed and finalized by 13 Pacific Island Countries and Territories, that it covered all wetland types in the Pacific Islands region for both high islands and atolls; that it implemented both the SPREP and Ramsar Strategic Plans. We went on to outline the themes covered in the plan such as increasing wetland related awareness, documenting and preserving wetland-related traditional knowledge, improving policies and customary laws, improving access to wetland information at all levels etc. He mentioned the review process for the Action Plan and pointed out a questionnaire was sent out in August 2013 to PICTs and regional partners to gauge the progress of the Plan's implementation. He further pointed out that there was a low rate of responses received.

In the discussions, participants noted that:

- The formulation process for the Action Plan was driven by the PICTs
- The Action Plan reflected the most current priorities of PICTs
- The Success of the Action Plan ultimately relied heavily on the support and efforts of all stakeholders.
- The Action Plan was the guiding plan/strategy for mangroves in the region
- All current/future related regional efforts should align with the new Action Plan.
- The actions of the RWAP have or are being addressed both directly and indirectly through various national and regional projects and initiatives.
- Generally, there had been a low uptake of the action plan in the region.
- That there were some gaps, such as increasing synergies and coordination with other biodiversity MEAs.
- There was no proper implementation/resourcing strategy for the Action Plan.
- There was a need to step up promotional efforts for the new action plan, once developed.
- Alignment of the RWAP with the new Ramsar Strategic Plan, new SPREP Strategic Plan and new Regional Framework for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas was important.

Following this introductory presentation, the meeting broke into two groups in which each group discussed site-level and national-level issues that would inform the focus of the new Action Plan. The results of the group work are in Annex 6

13. Session 12: Wrap Up & Next Steps

In terms of next steps, **Vainuupo Jungblut (SPREP)** mentioned that the first draft of the meeting report was expected to be sent to all participants by Wednesday 10 September.

Warren Lee Long (SPREP) presented the draft summary of key outcomes for participant feedback. Many suggestions were raised and these were captured for further revision of the summary. It was agreed that the draft summary would be sent out to all participants together with the draft meeting report for further comments.

14. Session 13: Meeting Closure

Brief closing statements were made by the Ramsar Secretariat, SPREP, Oceania Contracting Parties, national and regional partners and community representatives.

The closing prayer was conducted by the representative of the Wildlife Conservation Society (Kini Qounadovu).

MEETING CLOSED AT 5.00PM

Nadi, August 2014

Meeting report and photos prepared by the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and the Ramsar Convention Secretariat.

List of Annexes:

Annex	Title
Annex 1	Final Meeting Agenda
Annex 2	Final List of Participants
Annex 3	Group work results – discussion on the COP12 Draft Resolutions (Day 2)
Annex 4	Discussion results – Scientific and technical needs (Day 2)
Annex 5	Group work results – COP12 Side event ideas (Day 2)
Annex 6	Group work results – Regional Wetlands Action Plan session (Day 3)



**6th Oceania Regional Preparatory Meeting
for the 12th Conference of the Contracting Parties
to the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran 1971)**

**Nadi, Fiji
18-20 August 2014**

FINAL AGENDA

Day 1 – Monday 18 August 2014	
8.30 – 9:00am	Registration (SPREP/Ramsar)
9.00 – 9:45am	<p>Official Opening Emcee – Vainuupo Jungblut (SPREP/Ramsar Secretariat)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening Prayer: tbc (3mins) • Opening Remarks: (20mins) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - David Sheppard, Director-General, SPREP - Dr. Lew Young, Ramsar Convention Secretariat. • Meeting objectives & brief participant introductions (20mins) • Brief overview of Day 1 agenda
9:45 - 10.30am	GROUP PHOTO & MORNING TEA
10.30- 11.15am	<p>Session 1: Update on the implementation of the Ramsar Convention since COP11 (Chair – Australia. 15 mins per presentation) <i>Rapporteur – Warren Lee Long</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global implementation perspective (<i>Dr. Lew Young, Ramsar Secretariat</i>) • Regional implementation perspective - Oceania (<i>Vainuupo Jungblut, SPREP/Ramsar Secretariat</i>) <p>Discussions (15 mins at end of presentations)</p>
11.15 - 12.30pm	<p>Session 2: Updates from Oceania Contracting Parties (Chair – Marshall Islands. 15 mins per presentation) <i>Rapporteur – Lew Young</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australia

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiji • Papua New Guinea • New Zealand <p>Discussions (15 mins at the end of presentations)</p>
12.30 - 1.15pm	LUNCH BREAK
1.15 – 2.30pm	<p>Session 2: Contracting Party updates continued (Chair – Fiji. 15 mins per presentation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samoa • Kiribati • Marshall Islands <p>Discussions (15 mins at the end of presentations)</p>
2.30- 3.00pm	<p>Session 3: Perspective of Ramsar’s regional partners and IOPs relating to the conservation and wise use of wetlands in Oceania (Chair – Kiribati. 15 mins per presentation) <i>Rapporteur – Vainuupo Jungblut</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPREP case study (<i>Warren Lee Long</i>) • WWF Pacific case study (<i>Alfred Ralifo</i>)
3.00 – 3.30pm	AFTERNOON TEA
3.30 – 5.00pm	<p>Session 3: continued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birdlife Pacific case study (<i>Don Stewart</i>) • Nature Fiji case study (<i>Nunia Thomas</i>) • WCS case study (<i>Kini Qounadovu</i>) • Fiji LMMA case study (<i>Kiniviliame Ravonoloa</i>) <p>Discussions (15 mins at the end of presentations)</p>
5.00 – 6.15pm	<p>Session 4: One Pacific Voice at COP12 (Chair – Fiji) <i>Rapporteur – Warren Lee Long</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pacific Voyage to Punta del Este, Ramsar COP12 (<i>Nanette Woonton, SPREP</i>) <p>Discussions (15 mins at end of session)</p>
6:15pm	End of Day 1
Day 2 – Tuesday 19 August 2014	
8.30 – 10.30am	<p>Session 5: Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016 and beyond (Chair – New Zealand). <i>Rapporteur – Lew Young</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback on the new Ramsar Strategic Plan (<i>Skype video call with strategic plan</i>)

	<p><i>consultant, Peter Hislaire) – 15 mins presentation</i></p> <p>Thoughts, feedback, discussions (1 hr, 45 mins)</p>
10.30 – 11.00am	MORNING TEA
11.00 – 11.30am	<p>Session 6: Ramsar COP12, 2015 (Chair – Papua New Guinea) <i>Rapporteur – Vainuupo Jungblut</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on COP12 preparations and issues (<i>Lew Young – Ramsar Secretariat</i>) (Including information on arrangements for regional meetings, PIC sponsorship, side events and other useful information/ issues for participants to be aware of prior to COP12). <p>Discussions (15 mins at the end of presentation)</p>
11.30 - 12.30pm	<p>Session 7: Harmonization and integration of Biodiversity MEAs in the region (Chair – Australia. 15 mins presentation) <i>Rapporteur – Lew Young</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working towards greater harmonization and integration of Biodiversity-related MEAs in the Pacific – Key outcomes from the joint CBD, CMS, Ramsar prep meeting 11-15 August. (<i>Vainuupo Jungblut</i>) <p>Discussions (15 mins at the end of presentation)</p>
12.30 – 1.30pm	LUNCH BREAK
1.30pm - 2.00pm	<p>Session 9: COP12 Draft Resolutions (Chair - Fiji) <i>Rapporteur – Lew Young</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group work - Discussion of Ramsar COP12 Draft Resolutions
2.00 – 3.00pm	Session 9 (continued)
3:00 - 3:30pm	AFTERNOON TEA
3:30 – 4:30pm	<p>Session 10: Ramsar implementation issue – Scientific and technical needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group work and report back – identification of contracting parties’ scientific and technical needs to better implement the convention
4.30pm – 5.30pm	<p>Session 11: COP 12 Side Event</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group work and report back – develop a plan for an Oceania side event at COP12 (theme, audience, potential funders, basic logistics etc.)
End of Day 2	

Day 3 – Wednesday 20 August 2014	
9.00 – 9.50am	<p>Additional Presentations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birdlife Pacific Partnership – fundraising/ resource mobilisation efforts • Pew Foundation Charitable Trusts – introduction to their work • UNEP ROAP – Introduction to related work on MEAs
9.50 – 10.30am	<p>Session 12: Ramsar Sites Information (Chair – Samoa) Rapporteur – Warren Lee Long</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to the Ramsar Information Sheet and Ramsar Sites Information Service (RSIS) – Dr. Lew Young, Ramsar Secretariat • Hands on session about the new Ramsar Information Sheet online format and how it works – Dr. Lew Young, Ramsar Secretariat <p>Discussions (15 mins)</p>
10.30 - 10.45am	MORNING TEA
10.45 - 12.15pm	<p>Session 10: Regional Wetlands Action Plan for the Pacific Islands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Wetlands Action Plan – implementation and review (<i>Vainuupo Jungblut</i>) • Group work and report back - discussion and prioritization of future actions for RWAP – national and site level issues
12.15- 1.15pm	LUNCH BREAK
1.15 - 3.00pm	Session 10 (continued)
3.00 – 3.30pm	AFTERNOON TEA
3.30 - 4.30pm	<p>Session 11: Wrap up & next steps Rapporteur – Warren Lee Long</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORM-6 meeting report (<i>Vainuupo Jungblut</i>) • ORM-6 meeting statement/summary (<i>Warren Lee Long</i>)
4.30pm – 5.00pm	<p>Session 12: Meeting Closure Rapporteur – Warren Lee Long</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closing Statements - Ramsar Secretariat, SPREP, Oceania Contracting Parties, national and regional partners and community representatives. • Closing Prayer – Kini Qounadovu (<i>Wildlife Conservation Society</i>)
5.00pm	CLOSE



Sixth Oceania Regional Meeting for Ramsar COP12 (ORM-6)

18th to 20th August 2014, Nadi, Fiji

Tanoa Conference Room - Tanoa International Hotel

Participants List

Countries

AUSTRALIA

Mr David Papps
Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder
Commonwealth Environmental Water Office
Department of the Environment
Australian Government
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 6275 9246
Fax: (+61) 2 6275 9376
Email: david.papps@environment.gov.au

Ms Georgina Usher
Assistant Director
Wetlands Section
Commonwealth Environmental Water Office
Department of the Environment
Australian Government
GPO Box 787
Canberra ACT 2601
Australia

Phone: (+61) 2 6274 2526
Fax: (+61) 2 6274 2186
Email: georgina.usher@environment.gov.au

FIJI

Mr Rahul Arvind Chand
Senior Environmental Officer
Resources Management Unit
Department of Environment
Ministry of Local Government Urban Development
Housing & Environment (MLGUDHE)
P O Box 2109
Government Building
Suva
Fiji

Phone: (+679) 3311699
Fax: (+679) 3312879
Email: rahul.chand@govnet.gov.fj
rahularvindchand@gmail.com

KIRIBATI

Ms Ratita Bebe
Wildlife Officer
Ministry of Environment, Lands and Agriculture
Development (MELAD)
Environment & Conservation Division
Bikenibeu
Tarawa
Kiribati

Phone: (+686) 28425 (Tarawa)
Phone: (+686) 81211 (Christmas Island)
Email: taibwa@gmail.com

MARSHALL ISLANDS

Mr. Albon Ishoda
Adviser
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Republic of the Marshall Islands
Majuro, MH. 96960
Marshall Islands

Phone: (692) 625-3012/3181
Fax:
Email: taishoda@gmail.com

NEW ZEALAND

Dr Maj De Poorter
Senior International Partner Liaison Officer
Strategic Partnerships Team
Department of Conservation - Te Papa Atawhai
PO Box 10-420
Wellington 6143
New Zealand

Phone: (+04) 471 3030
Fax:
Email: mdepoorter@doc.govt.nz

Ms Karen Denyer
NGO Co-focal point for CEPA/ National Wetland
Trust Executive Officer
National Wetland Trust of New Zealand
27 Grey Street
Cambridge 3434
New Zealand

Phone: (+64) 7823 0405
Fax:
Email: Karen.denyer@wetlandtrust.org.nz

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Mr Michael K. Bongro
Executive Manager - Policy & International
Department of Environment & Conservation
P O Box 6601
Boroko
National Capital District
Papua New Guinea

Phone: (+675) 301 4500 or 301 4534
Fax: (+675) 325 0182
Email: mkbkunabau@gmail.com

SAMOA

Ms Elizabeth Kerstin
Principal Forestry Research and Development
Officer
Forestry Division, Ministry of Natural Resources &
Environment
Private Mail Bag

Phone: (+685) 67000
Fax: (+685) 23176
Email: elizabeth.kerstin@mnre.gov.ws or

Apia
Samoa

elizabeth.kerstin83@gmail.com

Community Representatives

FIJI LOCALLY MANAGED MARINE PROTECTED AREA (FLMMA) NETWORK

Mr Kiniviliame Ravonoloa

Network Western Divisional representative

Votua Village

Nadroga

Fiji

Phone: (+679) 653 0211

Mobile: (+679) 918 8325

Email: kravonoloa@gmail.com

GREAT SEA REEF

Mr Peni Donu

Mata ni Tikina for Macuata

Qoliqoli Cokovata Management Committee

District of Macuata

Fiji

Phone: (+679) 820 1115

Fax:

Email: penidonu@gmail.com

LAKE TAGIMAUCIA (TAVEUNI)

Mr Berenado Soroalau

Mataqali Matakuro

Lavena

Bouma

Fiji

Phone: (+679) 822 1741

Fax:

Email: -

UPPER NAVUA CONSERVATION AREA

Mr Kim Andersen

General Manager

Rivers Fiji Ltd

P O Box 307

Pacific Harbour

Fiji

Phone: (+679) 345 0147

Mobile: (+679) 992 2254

Email: gm@riversfiji.com or
divekiribati@juno.com

Partner Organizations

NATURE FIJI-MAREQETI VITI

Ms Nunia Thomas

Nature Fiji – Mareqeti Viti (NFMV)

Director of NFMV

14 Hamilton-Beattie Street

Suva

Fiji

Phone: (+679) 310 0598

Fax: (+679) 310 582

Email: nuniateresa@gmail.com

BIRDLIFE PACIFIC

Mr Don Stewart
Director
Birdlife Pacific Regional Office
10 MacGregor Road
Suva
Fiji

Phone: (+679) 331 3492
Fax: (+679) 331 9658
Email: don.stewart@birdlife.org

RAMSAR

Mr Llewellyn Young
Senior Regional Advisor for Asia/Oceania
Ramsar Convention Secretariat
Rue Mauverney 28
Gland CH-1196
Switzerland

Phone: (+41) 22 999 0177
Fax: (+41) 79 290 2625
Email: young@ramsar.org

UNEP REGIONAL OFFICE FOR ASIA AND THE
PACIFIC

Ms Makiko Yashiro
Programme Officer
UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
(ROAP)
UN Building, 2nd Floor
Rajdamnern Avenue
Bangkok 10200
Thailand

Phone: (+66 2) 288 1256
Fax: (+66 2) 280 3829
Email: makiko.yashiro@unep.org

WCS

Mr Kini Qounadovu
Chairman of the National Wetlands Steering
Group
Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
Fiji

Phone: (+679) 331 5174
Mobile: (+679) 936 0615
Email: kkoto@wcs.org

WWF PACIFIC

Mr Alfred Ralifo
WWF – Pacific
Private Mail Bag
4 Ma'afu Street
Suva
Fiji

Phone: (+679) 331 5533
Mobile: (+679) 920 4355
Email: aralifo@wwfpacific.org

SPREP

Mr Vainuupo Jungblut
Ramsar Officer
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment
Programme (SPREP)
P O Box 240
Apia
Samoa

Phone: (+685) 21929 ext.282
Fax: (+685) 20231
Email: vainuupoj@sprep.org

Mr Warren Lee Long
Coastal and Marine Adviser
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment
Programme (SPREP)
P O Box 240
Apia
Samoa

Phone: (+685) 21929 264
Fax: (+685) 20231
Email: warrenl@sprep.org

Ms Easter Galuvao
Biodiversity Adviser
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment
Programme (SPREP)
P O Box 240
Apia
Samoa

Phone: (+685) 21929 265
Fax: (+685) 20231
Email: easterg@sprep.org

Ms Nanette Woonton
Media & Public Relations Officer
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment
Programme (SPREP)
P O Box 240
Apia
Samoa

Phone: (+685) 21929
Fax: (+685) 20231
Email: nanettew@sprep.org

Ms Makerita Atiga
BEM Divisional Assistant
Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment
Programme (SPREP)
P O Box 240
Apia
Samoa

Phone: (+685) 21929 272
Fax: (+685) 20231
Email: makeritaa@sprep.org

Group work results – discussion on the COP12 Draft Resolutions (Day 2)

Oceania Region priorities for Ramsar CoP12 Draft Resolutions - Group 1

No.	Draft Resolution / Key Issue	Specific issues for Oceania	Suggested recommendations	Responsible Convention Party (plus NGO/ other partners)
1	UN languages	<p>Specific interest is financial implication on the region.</p> <p>Potential effect on flow on funding from Convention, not related to subscriptions</p> <p>Potential for reduced services from Ramsar Secretariat.</p>	We can support this DR contingent on add funding available and not affecting the issues identified by the region.	n/a
2	Additional follow up to Resolution XI.1	<p>Raising visibility, synergies of the Ramsar Convention</p> <p>High level/ministerial segment at COPs</p> <p>Ministerial involvement in absence of a high level segment may not be useful.</p> <p>Quite important to engage ministers at COPs,</p> <p>being strategic with use of ministerial participation High level Side Events</p> <p>More important to maintain technical discussions within</p>	<p>If there is no high level segment at COP we invite parties to use their discretion concerning ministerial involvement at COP</p> <p>The outcomes of the Joint MEAs meeting are relevant to this DR, particularly those focusing on increased synergies and improved coordination across MEAs</p> <p>The meeting outcomes, once approved, should be closely linked to this DR</p>	Fiji, SPREP, WWF Pacific, IUCN ORO

No.	Draft Resolution / Key Issue	Specific issues for Oceania	Suggested recommendations	Responsible Convention Party (plus NGO/ other partners)
		<p>COPs, without potential political distractions</p> <p>If required to increase cost of hosting COP</p> <p>Different target audience at different levels and through different mechanisms</p>		
3	Financial and budgetary matters	<p>Parties want increased service delivery but without a budget increase for the Secretariat to do so.</p> <p>No budget increase since 2012 for Secretariat.</p> <p>Implications on the Ramsar SGF</p> <p>Voluntary contributions</p> <p>Annual contributions</p>	<p>Encourage developed country parties to continue voluntary contributions to the work of the Convention</p> <p>Parties need to see the benefit of being a party, this would help with making a case for paying annual subs on time.</p> <p>We recognize the importance of media, profiling Ramsar achievements and benefits continuously</p>	Samoa, SPREP,
4	Ramsar Strategic Plan 2016-2021	<p>Core issues vs developing issues</p> <p>Extreme events</p> <p>Climate change is a core issue rather than a developing issue in Oceania</p> <p>Whatever we decide</p>	Refer to specific issues	Australia (lead), Oceania Parties – Fiji, Tonga, PNG, Samoa, NZ, Kiribati?, Palau?

No.	Draft Resolution / Key Issue	Specific issues for Oceania	Suggested recommendations	Responsible Convention Party (plus NGO/ other partners)
		<p>for new Regional Wetlands Action Plan, need to re-check that priorities are aligned.</p> <p>Ensuring that socio-economic indicators continue to be reflected (linking wetlands with cultural practices)</p> <p>Focus of Ramsar – water, sustainable development, biodiversity?</p> <p>Synergies with other MEAs</p> <p>Developing/updating National Wetland Inventories</p> <p>Linking Traditional Knowledge with science</p>		
5	Communications and CEPA	<p>CEPA tools that are useful to Oceania are included in the work programme for the next 3 years</p> <p>Embracing social media – implications for the region?</p> <p>Improving awareness of wetland values – not just communications but also public participation and engagement at all</p>	<p>That the focus remain on CEPA and not focus only on communications (participation, education)</p> <p>Adapt useful tools from other MEAs/fora into Ramsar CEPA tools/mechanisms. Showcase good examples (Ramsar website)</p> <p>Need to verify impact of national awareness programmes, an important point for inclusion in the next CEPA WP.</p>	Papua New Guinea (lead), SPREP, WWF Pacific, Nature Fiji

No.	Draft Resolution / Key Issue	Specific issues for Oceania	Suggested recommendations	Responsible Convention Party (plus NGO/ other partners)
		<p>levels</p> <p>Changing the date of annual WWD</p>	<p>There needs to be extensive consultation at all levels prior to any decision on changing the date of World Wetlands Day.</p>	
6	Status of Ramsar Sites	Party-specific DR		
7	Regional Initiatives in the framework of the Ramsar Convention	<p>East Asian Australasian Flyway Partnership (EAAFP) – already established, doesn't receive Convention funding</p> <p>No plans to develop a new initiative</p>		Australia (lead)
8	Partnerships (including IOPs)	Adding Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT) as an IOP	Ensure PIC organisations reflected in the DR – Pacific Ocean Alliance, Oceanscape Vision and Framework, Pacific Island Round Table	
9	Future implementation of scientific and technical aspects of the Convention (STRP workplan)	<p>Disconnect between Scientific and Technical Review Panel and Parties' needs.. getting things done at the national level.</p> <p>Transparent prioritization of STRP work according to identified criteria</p> <p>Apply regional experience to guidance</p> <p>FAQs developed by STRPs</p> <p>Streamlined</p>	STRP work cooperatively with MEA technical bodies (integration/coordination of work programs)	NZ

No.	Draft Resolution / Key Issue	Specific issues for Oceania	Suggested recommendations	Responsible Convention Party (plus NGO/ other partners)
		reporting – integration of templates.		

Oceania Region priorities for Ramsar CoP12 Draft Resolutions – Group 2

No.	Draft Resolution / Key Issue	Specific issues for Oceania	Suggested recommendations	Responsible Convention Party (plus NGO/ other partners)
10	Mainstreaming wetland conservation and wise use with poverty eradication into international and national policies and programmes for poverty eradication	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of connection between national level and community 2. Poverty in the Pacific (= lack of access/ unable to access basic needs: clean water, healthy food, good sanitation. 3. Addressing Poverty. How can development organisations in the Pacific contribute to enabling individuals' continued access to basic needs, free ecosystem services: clean drinking water, healthy food, good sanitation, through better wetland management. 4. 	<p>Approaches to addressing the gaps between policies and actual implementation on the ground? Use existing case studies that engage all policies and are successfully implemented on the ground.</p> <p>Fiji: undergoing NBSAP review, aligning it to Aichi Targets. Is the ministry responsible for poverty alleviation involved in the NBSAP review process?</p> <p>How can the following case studies be replicated/ taken beyond the site?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Navala village 2. Votua village – wetland filtration pond 3. Rivers Fiji – water treatment project in Nakavika 	<p>CBD, Access Benefit Sharing? Each country to address this.</p> <p>Oceania countries/ NGOs operating in Oceania</p> <p>Dept. Env. Fiji</p> <p>FLMMA</p> <p>Rivers Fiji</p>
11	Assessing effectiveness of management of Ramsar Sites and other wetlands	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No management plans at most of our Ramsar sites; 2. Management plans do not necessarily measure outcomes. 	<p>Existing case studies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. FLMMA socio-economic data 2. IBA monitoring framework in Fiji 3. EBM (WCS, FIJI) 	<p>FLMMA</p> <p>NFMV</p> <p>WCS</p> <p>Australia/NZ and SIDS in</p>

No.	Draft Resolution / Key Issue	Specific issues for Oceania	Suggested recommendations	Responsible Convention Party (plus NGO/ other partners)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Lack of a relevant methodology to assess outcomes 4. Sometimes we do not have the monitoring framework; at other times, we do have the framework, but not the capacity nor the funds to implement it. 5. What happens to wetlands that are not in PAs? 6. Communication with other communities. 	<p>Need information and skills transfer between nations;</p> <p>Need case studies on monitoring and assessments from other sites (what do they monitor, how did they come up with the monitoring framework?)</p> <p>Need guidelines on communicating with other stakeholders</p>	<p>Oceania</p> <p>Lew (Ramsar Secretariat)</p> <p>Ramsar Secretariat, Lessons learnt from FLMMA</p>
12	Wetland city accreditation			
13	Adjustments to the regional categorization of countries under the Convention			
14	Wetlands and disaster risk reduction	<p>Lack of enforcement of EIA regulations</p> <p>No master national land-use plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Kiribati – Master plan for Christmas Island to help the Department to monitor development on the island; 2. WANI project (Nadi, Fiji) – quick response to flooding. 3. Development of master/ national land-use plan 4. How can DoE include wetland issues into Climate Change Unit’s Vulnerability 	<p>Kiribati</p> <p>Dept. Environment, Fiji</p> <p>Dept. Env. Fiji</p>

No.	Draft Resolution / Key Issue	Specific issues for Oceania	Suggested recommendations	Responsible Convention Party (plus NGO/ other partners)
			Assessment	
15	Ecological flow	High sedimentation in our coral reefs Mangrove reclamation River gravel extraction	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keep a healthy environment to ensure that both upstream and downstream communities can benefit. 2. Australia: Environmental watering in the Murray Darling Basin (the environment has legal entitlement to water) 3. Ecosystem-based management project (WCS, Fiji) 4. Ridge to reef project (Department of Environment, Fiji) 5. This will raise the issue of Payment of Ecosystem Services which may be a complication for the Pacific context because of the land tenure system. More information on the Australia mediation case study, and any other case studies if this being implemented would be useful. 	<p>Australia</p> <p>WCS (Fiji)</p> <p>Dept. Env. Fiji</p> <p>Australia, Ramsar Secretariat</p>
16	Resource mobilization	Green Fund (Palau)		
17	Conservation of small Mediterranean island wetlands			

No.	Draft Resolution / Key Issue	Specific issues for Oceania	Suggested recommendations	Responsible Convention Party (plus NGO/ other partners)
18	Thanks to the Host country			

Discussion results – Scientific and technical needs (Day 3)

Raw responses from participants (post-it notes)

- Management planning
- Technical expertise
- Research on threats to wetlands
- Information on role of wetlands in climate change mitigation
- Change in ecological character for sites
- Adapting site management to changing circumstances
- Addressing data gaps for improved site management
- Guidelines for Ramsar site management plan for communities
- Checklist for site prioritization
- Capacity building (unspecified) for communities
- Guidance on how to carry out analysis of climate change impacts on wetlands
- Guidance on delineating/nominating Ramsar Sites comprised of scattered sites
- Guidance on minimum requirements for Ramsar management plan template
- Guidance on applying fish criteria (7&8)
- Guidance on developing management plans for Ramsar Sites
- Guidance on assessing/monitoring ecological character at Ramsar Sites
- Breaking down /simplifying technical guidance for communities
- Capacity building and awareness

These were then categorized into the 5 following broad themes:

1. Identifying and nominating Ramsar Sites
2. Capacity Building and Awareness
3. Ramsar COP follow-up
4. Climate Change adaptation
5. Ramsar Site management and financing

Group work results – COP12 Side event ideas

Group 1:

Title: Pacific Wetlands – Our Communities, Our Culture, Our Livelihoods

Presentations: 3 levels of stakeholders

Note: these could be in the form of a story or a video presentation (film)

Presentations from two community representatives

- The role of Wetlands in Disaster Risk Reduction
- Traditional knowledge and effective management of Ramsar Sites

Presentation from a Private Sector representative

- Wetlands and Poverty Alleviation

Presentation from Government

- Effective site management and resource mobilization
- Synergies at the national level

Giveaways for the side event:

- Flash drives
- Posters
- Light Refreshments (finger foods/drinks/Kava)

Group 2:

Title: two options below

1. Taste of the Pacific – Embracing Traditional Knowledge for the Future
2. Learning from the Past to implement sustainable wetland management in the future

Presentations

- Short video showcasing the sounds and colours of the Pacific (3 minutes)
- Short talks by Oceania Contracting Parties (3 minutes each), for example, using traditional knowledge for sustainable development/wetland management

Relevant examples:

- Grouper Pledge (Fiji)
- Use of wetland reeds/palms as a source of livelihood
- Herbal medicines (Samoa)
- Traditional co-management of Ramsar Sites (Australia)
- Maori traditional fisheries (New Zealand)
- Giant swamp taro (Kiribati)

Drawing in the crowd:

- Use of flyers – attractive, vibrant, Pacific food tasting
- Drum beats at the side event venue and coconut scraping activity
- Traditional Oceania dress
- Food from Pacific wetlands (eg – Robert Oliver’s recipe book).

Group work results – discussion on the COP12 Draft Resolutions (Day 2)

Group 1:

National level issues

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
Remoteness	Take this issue into account when planning programmes and management initiatives and financing	Yes	Government (both national and local), communities, NGOs, regional partners	n/a (need case studies from sites of similar use)
Ownership of the concept by stakeholders	Targeted engagement/Consultation, Awareness and education based on Stakeholder analysis	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Tenureship (land, freshwater, marine resources)	Targeted engagement/Consultation, Awareness and education based on Stakeholder analysis	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
Saltwater intrusion (effect on root crops)	Developing and implementing a national landuse masterplan Implementing EIA	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Limited government support for site management /enforcement	Develop site management and resource mobilisation plan prior to Ramsar submission to cabinet.	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of technical expertise for site-based monitoring and management	Conduct a capacity needs assessment during the stakeholder analysis Identify where the resource capacity lies (USP,FNU, local community- TK etc.)	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
Sustainable financing	Need to identify sustainable financing mechanisms and opportunities at an early stage of Ramsar submission, linked to local, national and regional interests.	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Sustaining human capacity	Strengthen the link between local site level efforts to national enabling policy frameworks Site level projects should have decadal planning horizon and commitment Need to link this issue to stakeholder analysis and capacity needs assessment.	Yes	Government (both), academia, communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of collaborative approaches	Identify cross cutting issues early in the Ramsar project planning phase, stakeholder analysis and	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs,	GEF projects, Government (both),

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
	Capacity Needs Assessment. Facilitate governance arrangements to ensure stakeholder participation in decision making.		regional partners, private sector	Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of ecological flows/ecosystem approach	Negotiate or acquire access to water for environmental purposes. Include this issue in initial (consultation/engagement) phase.	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
NATIONAL PROJECTS				
Interpreting COP guidance/resolutions for local bodies, planners, NGOs	User friendly package that interprets COP guidance/resolutions for local use Post COP analysis (of relevance to each CP) and summary of all actions agreed at COP	Ramsar – CMS and CBD depending on scope of Res	Government (both) , communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector, academics, SPREP	GEF projects, Government (both), NGOs (local/regl) , charitable trusts and foundations,
Technical difficulties e.g. internet access, GIS dept, data collection, access, management, analysis No dedicated	Simple tool to support mapping of sites, delineation of sites... particularly a system that can be used off line Eg. New RIS template –	yes	Government (both) , communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector,	GEF projects, Government (both), NGOs (local/regl) , charitable

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
national/local staff for Ramsar reporting	need for off line version		academics, Ramsar Secretariat	trusts and foundations
Inventory and monitoring Data out of date or non-existent Need for monitoring to inform management	BioRAP – baseline and trend monitoring Capacity building and training in monitoring Utilizing/capturing traditional knowledge related to monitoring Site specific information National Wetland Inventory Bioblitz Ecological character descriptions Development approvals/conditions to include monitoring requirements	yes	Government (both) , communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector, academics, Ramsar Secretariat, SPREP	GEF projects, Government (both), NGOs (local/regl) , charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of sustainable resourcing - e.g no dedicated national/local staff for Ramsar reporting	Seek funding to recruit (mobilise resources) Institutionalize position into Government structure Integrate work on wetlands wise use across MEAs Private sector contributions to management Payment for ecosystem services	Yes	Government (both) , communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector, academics, Ramsar Secretariat, SPREP	GEF projects, Government (both), NGOs (local/regl) , charitable trusts and foundations

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?

Site level issues – Group 1

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
Remoteness	Take this issue into account when planning programmes and management initiatives and financing	Yes	Government (both national and local), communities, NGOs, regional partners	n/a (need case studies from sites of similar use)
Ownership of the concept by stakeholders	Targeted engagement/Consultation, Awareness and education based on Stakeholder analysis	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Tenureship (land, freshwater, marine resources)	Targeted engagement/Consultation, Awareness and education based on Stakeholder analysis	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private

				Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Saltwater intrusion (effect on root crops)	Developing and implementing a national landuse master plan Implementing EIA	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Limited government support for site management /enforcement	Develop site management and resource mobilisation plan prior to Ramsar submission to cabinet.	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of technical expertise for site-based monitoring and management	Conduct a capacity needs assessment during the stakeholder analysis Identify where the resource capacity lies (USP, FNU, local community- TK etc.)	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations

Sustainable financing	Need to identify sustainable financing mechanisms and opportunities at an early stage of Ramsar submission, linked to local, national and regional interests.	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Sustaining human capacity	Strengthen the link between local site level efforts to national enabling policy frameworks Site level projects should have decadal planning horizon and commitment Need to link this issue to stakeholder analysis and capacity needs assessment.	Yes	Government (both), academia, communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of collaborative approaches	Identify cross cutting issues early in the Ramsar project planning phase, stakeholder analysis and Capacity Needs Assessment. Facilitate governance arrangements to ensure stakeholder participation in decision making.	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and

				foundations
Lack of ecological flows/ecosystem approach	Negotiate or acquire access to water for environmental purposes. Include this issue in initial (consultation/engagement) phase.	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations

National level issues – Group 2

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
Lack of coordination between ministries on land-use issues	Enhancing integrated land-use planning (Samoa currently doing this)	yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of enforcement of land-use planning practices	Developing and implementing a national landuse master plan Implementing EIA Strengthening the implementation of legislations	Yes	Government (both), communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl), Private

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
	<p>Targeted civil servant education on land-use issues</p> <p>Targeted community education on land-use policies and issues</p>			Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of collaborative approaches	<p>Identify cross cutting issues early in the Ramsar project planning phase, stakeholder analysis and Capacity Needs Assessment.</p> <p>Facilitate governance arrangements to ensure stakeholder participation in decision making.</p>	Yes	Government (both), ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of inventory of natural resources at the national level	<p>Collect baseline information (trend monitoring)</p> <p>Build local expertise to collect baseline information</p>	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Ownership of the concept by stakeholders	Targeted engagement/Consultation, Awareness and education based on Stakeholder analysis	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
				(local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of ecological flows/ecosystem approach	Negotiate or acquire access to water for environmental purposes. Include this issue in initial (consultation/engagement) phase.	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Tenureship (land,freshwater,marine resources)	Targeted engagement/Consultation, Awareness and education based on Stakeholder analysis	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Limited government support for site management /enforcement	Develop site management and resource mobilisation plan prior to Ramsar submission to cabinet. Review the processes that government uses for submission of a Ramsar site (establish Standard Operating Procedures)	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector,

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
				charitable trusts and foundations
Lack of technical expertise and resources for national monitoring and management	<p>Conduct a capacity needs assessment during the stakeholder analysis</p> <p>Identify where the resource capacity lies (USP,FNU, local community- TK etc.)</p>	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Sustainable financing	<p>Need to identify sustainable financing mechanisms and opportunities at an early stage of Ramsar submission, linked to local, national and regional interests.</p> <p>Look up models created by UNEP, UNDP, IUCN etc; and countries who have engaged expert economists to guide them in this process (learn from them).</p> <p>Secure funding to hire a consultant on Sustainable financing.</p> <p>Learn from Palau Green Fund (how did they come up with that idea?, what was their process?)</p>	Yes	<p>Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector</p> <p>Economists who are experts in Sustainable financing</p>	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Sustaining human capacity	Strengthen the link between local site level	Yes	Government (both),	GEF projects,

Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
	<p>efforts to national enabling policy frameworks</p> <p>Site level projects should have decadal planning horizon and commitment</p> <p>Need to link this issue to stakeholder analysis and capacity needs assessment.</p>		academia ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations
Donors (to government) have specific requirements e.g. Linking bird areas to sustainable livelihood.	<p>Ramsar can assist the countries in developing the Project Information Paper.</p> <p>Incorporate climate change elements as a core issue for wetlands.</p> <p>Each country to have a portfolio of their projects.</p>	Yes	Government (both) ,communities, NGOs, regional partners, private sector	GEF projects, Government (both), Darwin initiative, NGOs (local/regl) , Private Sector, charitable trusts and foundations

Site Level Issues – Group 2

	Challenges	Activities to overcome those challenges	Can those activities meet the goals of Ramsar, CMS, CBD?	Partners?	Funding source?
Fiji	Poaching – lack of enforcement, no materials/resources	Awareness education for communities, commercial fisheries such as workshops	Yes is going to meet Ramsar	Fiji government, Fisheries Department	WWF network, Packard Foundation

	Overfishing – using of net, gas, compressor, habitat distraction (removal of coral)	CEM (Compliance, Enforcement and Monitoring) Providing resources for fish wardens Strengthening network between fish wardens, police and fisheries	CMS and CBD.		, NZ Aid, AusAid
Samoa	Land tenure system	PES Taking of land	Yes	Samoa Government, NGOs, communities	GEF, UNDP, Australian AID, FAO
	Extra funding - for wetland projects (i.e. MESCAL)	Secure funding through project proposals			
	M & E - in terms of access and isolation of wetland areas creates a barrier to implement activities in a periodic manner	Strengthen collaboration and partnership with NGOs and local communities			