

Coastal Zone Management Options in the Pacific Islands Region: issues for improved harmonisation and implementation.

**South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission
Meeting Room
Suva, Fiji**

10-12 December 2003

Summary of Discussion

1. Practitioners representing national, regional and international agencies, tertiary institutions and non-government organizations involved in coastal management met at the offices of the South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission (SOPAC) 10-12 December 2003. The meeting was convened by the Secretariat for the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) to discuss current initiatives and emerging issues relating to coastal management in the Pacific Islands region. A list of participants is appended at Attachment A.

Opening

2. Cristelle Pratt, Director-designate of SOPAC, welcomed participants to the meeting. She noted that coastal zone management was facing increasing challenges in the Pacific Islands region and that the results of this informal meeting would be of broad interest to many people and organizations interested in strengthening coastal management arrangements.

Agenda and schedule

3. A copy of the agenda and schedule for the meeting is at Appendix B.

Introduction

4. Andrew Wright from the International Waters Project (IWP) based at SPREP provided background to the meeting. He noted that the meeting was an initiative of the IWP that is implementing the Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the International Waters of the Pacific Small Island Developing States. The meeting was convened in response to a recommendation from the Mid-term Evaluation of the IWP which suggested that a review of the large number of national, regional and international agreements and arrangements formulated to address watershed and coastal issues in the Pacific Islands region should be undertaken. The 14 countries participating in the IWP adopted this recommendation during a Multipartite Review at Tonga in June 2003. Participating countries considered the review would provide an opportunity to assess gaps and identify options for improved coordination and synergies in the effective implementation of these instruments in respect of coastal and watershed management.

5. Mr Wright also noted that Pacific Island countries and territories are currently preparing for the First Pacific Island Regional Ocean Forum (PIROF) that will convene at the University of the South Pacific in February 2004. He noted that an anticipated output of the Forum is a framework for national and regional-level action to implement the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy that was adopted by the Thirty-Third Pacific Islands Forum held in Fiji in August 2002.

6. Mr Wright noted that improving the management of the marine ecosystem in the region is an overarching goal of the Policy. The Policy refers to the need for improved understanding of marine systems to provide a better basis for decision-making to maintain ecosystem integrity. The Policy suggests strategic action which could include the adoption of a trans-boundary approach, through harmonized institutional arrangements, to manage marine ecosystems for long-term sustainable benefit.

7. Mr Wright noted that the IWP offered an opportunity to integrate these two activities to start a process for addressing increasing concerns about the management of coastal areas and watersheds in the Pacific Islands region. With this in mind, the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) for the IWP had convened this meeting to:

- Review available information (including definitions, terms and processes) relevant to coastal and watershed management in the Pacific Islands region;
- Complete a preliminary gaps and needs assessment to promote integrated coastal and watershed management (ICWM) in the Pacific Islands region;
- Consider possible PIROF outcomes in relation to ICWM (particularly in relation to the proposed Framework for Action);
- Develop a strategy for promoting ICWM-related discussion during the PIROF to achieve those outcomes; and
- Assign roles, responsibilities and timeframes for implementing the ICWM strategy leading up to and including the PIROF.

Review of available information

8. A preliminary review of information relating to coastal management in the Pacific Islands region prepared by the PCU had been circulated to participants in advance of the meeting. Mr Wright presented a brief overview of the issues raised in the background paper to the meeting.

9. Professor Bill Aalbersberg from the University of the South Pacific suggested the meeting discuss the term that can adequately cover the broad subject of coastal area management. He suggested that the use of “integrated coastal and watershed management” was not entirely appropriate in an island context particularly as low islands have no watersheds and, in many instances, coastal management is in fact whole-of- island management.

10. Bismarck Crawley, a freelance consultant based in Samoa, noted the difficulty in adopting a term that adequately reflects both national and regional priorities in coastal management. He considered the term “coastal and watershed management” enables countries to be selective in the application of the term – focusing only on coastal processes, watershed processes or both - as appropriate.

11. Russell Nari from Vanuatu considered that, given the integral relationship between watersheds and coasts for the many large islands in the region, watersheds need to be appropriately reflected in coastal systems management terminology. Stephen Booth and Marc Overmars from SOPAC also considered the inclusion of the term “watershed” in integrated coastal management initiatives essential.

12. John Low from the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat reported that the term “integrated coastal management” had been used for many years. He reported that at a

recent international ocean, coasts and islands conference in Paris numerous experts had noted that it was becoming increasingly difficult to attract funding to support initiatives presented under the umbrella of integrated coastal management.

13. Dr Kenneth McKay, from the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, considered the use of terminology should not be constraining and, in the Pacific Islands context, that it involves watersheds on big islands. He considered that many donors were of the view that integrated coastal zone management (ICZM) had not delivered and that, in order to re-invigorate interest, there is a need to document lessons and failures of past ICZM projects.

14. Dr Tim Smith from the Commonwealth and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) in Australia considered that a prolonged debate on terminology would not necessarily be productive. He considered that the most important issue relates to maintaining dialogue with stakeholders and reaching a common understanding with them of the scope of issues a coastal management initiative is expected to address.

15. Cristelle Pratt noted that a general understanding of the scope of issues that comprise coastal and watershed management is essential. She also noted that marketing and branding of coastal management initiatives was becoming increasingly important – and that a strategy to achieve this may need to be considered in the context of the Framework for Action.

Institutional framework

16. The review prepared by the PCU focused on international and regional multilateral environment agreements (MEAs), arrangements and plans related to coastal systems management in the Pacific Islands region. Mr Wright noted that the information presented in the review provided a preliminary inventory of the MEAs which Pacific Island countries are associated with. He noted the more significant of these included the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Convention for Biological Diversity, the Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, particularly Technical Guideline Number 3 of the Code, and the Global Programme of Action for Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities.

17. The meeting noted that while a relatively large number of Pacific regional and sub-regional arrangements had been implemented for oceanic fisheries the coastal region had not received the same degree of attention. One regional arrangement - the Noumea Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the Pacific Islands Region - provided some potential to accommodate integrated coastal management. It was also noted that the Action Plan for Managing the Environment of the Pacific Islands Region offered significant potential for describing regional and national priorities in relation to integrated coastal management. The Action Plan guides the work of SPREP and its member countries and territories in relation to all aspects of environmental governance – but does not necessarily currently apply to the work of other agencies in the region.

18. Mr Wright profiled the institutional collaborative framework that applies to marine and coastal affairs in the Pacific Islands region. He noted that, in addition to collaboration through the consultative arrangements associated the various MEAs Pacific Island countries and territories are party to, a well-developed level of collaboration was supported by South Pacific regional organizations that have mandates for issues relating to marine affairs. Numerous policy and technical advisory bodies were operating to promote inter-agency cooperation. He noted that

the Marine Sector Working Group (MSWG) had been responsible for the development of the Ocean Policy and was also taking responsibility for convening the Ocean Forum scheduled for February 2004.

19. The meeting noted that broader stakeholder engagement in these collaborative arrangements was gradually developing and that technical working groups such as the Sustainable Development Working Group and the Roundtable for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region included an increasing number of representatives from civil society.

20. Professor Aalbersberg considered that a macro-level approach in the Pacific Islands region is the wrong paradigm and does not work. He advocated that success will only come from greater community engagement.

21. Mr Wright noted that the PIROF recognizes the need for sustained effort at the community level. He considered, however, that not all coastal management problems can be solved through community-level action alone and that policy and institutional issues at the provincial and national level needs to complement community-level action – through a complementary two-pronged approach.

22. Professor Aalbersberg agreed that a two-pronged approach is essential – but that top down policy and activities should be driven and developed by community needs. He reported on the Fiji experience and the fact that government needs to identify value to support a particular course of action. If communities can identify the need, governments may act – responding to the need rather than a general principle embodied in a policy.

23. Dr Transform Aqorau, Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat, noted that there are an increasing number of examples of successful community-based approaches for coastal management supported by non-government organizations (NGOs). He cited the Arnavon Islands project in Solomon Islands and the work of The Nature Conservancy and the Worldwide Fund for Nature as providing useful examples in the region. He considered that the collaborative framework supported by non-State actors was rarely given the credit deserved in supporting initiatives to improve resource management at the community level and that inter-governmental regional organizations needed to strengthen their relationship with NGOs in this respect. He considered that the Ocean Forum offered an opportunity to start that process.

24. Mr Nari considered there are few examples for effective linkages between policy-making at the national level and community-level action and that the Framework for Action offers scope to address this weakness. He noted that the flow of information was constrained by limited national capacity. In many instances externally supported projects pulled back too early in the project cycle – at least 10 years was required for community-based initiatives to develop some degree of sustainability. Short time frames has resulted in the failure of many projects that had commenced with a high level of community engagement but, with the withdrawal of external support prior to the establishment of a sustainable basis for operations, had resulted in generally low levels of success. He cited the South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Project (SPBCP) at Vathe on Espirto Santo as an example where, despite the withdrawal of external support, project initiatives had been sustained successfully.

25. Dr Hugh Govan, Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific, supported the view that many government agencies have limited capacity to implement community-

level projects. He considered that more effort was required to assess how national policies actually reflect what community interests and priorities are. He advocated a need to be more accommodating to community needs and integrate them to government policy. He considered Governments do not have, and will not have in the medium term, the capacity to implement the vast majority of the actions needed in ICM. Thus, and more so than most of the places in the world, which have generated what is written about ICM, there is a huge dependency on community actions and stakeholder involvement.

26. Dr Govan noted that the nature of community participation in the Pacific Islands is such that people participate in direct proportion to the relevance of the actions to their own priorities and the benefits they perceive that will accrue to them from their investment. Given this, ICM actions outside of urban areas will not be implemented unless projects are designed with communities and driven by them. The processes required to achieve this sort of community ownership are rarely first nature to government and policy level staff and therefore principles etc would need to be more specific in this regard to be truly “guiding”.

27. Dr Joeli Veitayaki, University of the South Pacific, supported this observation and noted that the PIROF offers an opportunity to elucidate how the role of civil society, particularly at the community level, may be strengthened for improved coastal management in the region.

28. Dr Jackie Alder, University of British Columbia, reported that there are numerous successful community-based resource management examples from around the world. She noted that isolated local examples are generally not sustainable and that the challenge is to scale up these successes to support sustainable resource management on a national scale. This would then start the process to address national priorities in relation to economic development, employment, food security, poverty reduction, etc.

29. The meeting noted that more effective communications, including the availability and communication of appropriate information, was central to improved ICM in the region.

International perspectives

30. Dr Alder facilitated a session reviewing ICM developments elsewhere in the world. She noted that, contrary to previous assessments, only 40 per cent of the world population lives on the coast and that this is estimated to be increasing at less than one per cent annually. She added that 60 per cent of the world GNP originates within 100 kilometers of the coast and that this creates major management challenges for ICM around the globe. These include user conflict (particularly in relation to aquaculture and tourism), pollution, habitat degradation, lack of response planning for climate change, limited institutional capacity to implement an ecosystems-based approach, invasive species and challenges for improving livelihoods for coastal communities including the development of partnerships with industry. Partnerships were noted from the tourism sector where codes of practice are examples of best practice and in the shipping sector where industry has actively responded to the management of ballast water. She noted that local level ICM is still relevant but higher level attention to ICM, or scaling up local processes to effectively address national level needs over a long time frame, continues to present major challenges.

31. Dr Jim Reynolds, University of the South Pacific, noted that ICM is an evolving process and that experience had demonstrated that when communities express interest political support is often forthcoming. Dr Veitayaki agreed but noted that coordinated support for ICM through government agencies was often constrained by inconsistent advice and policy implementation by different agencies of the same government.

32. Dr Smith discussed some emerging international natural resource management conversations and suggested that effective institutional arrangements for ICM need to focus on, and strengthen, the functional aspects of institutions (e.g. learning, connectivity, adaptability, equity, etc.), rather than focusing on the structural aspects (e.g. formalized responsibilities). He also discussed a need to re-examine science and society issues - to shift the paradigm of how research is undertaken (discussed in the literature as 'post-normal science') by accepting that science is value laden and uncertain, and ultimately a social process.

33. Mr Crawley noted that a lack of appropriate data, including social data and anecdotal data from communities, creates significant challenges for ICM. He considered that national planning needs to elaborate and adapt regional guidelines and that the lack of capacity at the national level constrained this. In relation to partnerships, he considered it imperative to engage governments in ICM dialogue as they are the vehicle that is often expected to sustain ICM initiatives commenced by external stakeholders.

34. Mr Nari considered that some of the challenges for ICM were a result of insecurity – in terms of ownership and management of coastal management initiatives. He considered there is a need to focus efforts on people so that they are the ones that take responsibility for managing their coastal resources and habitats. He reported on two watershed catchment initiatives on Efate in Vanuatu where multi-sectoral committees, including national and provincial agencies and NGOs, had been established to support consultative arrangements for watershed management.

35. In a response to a request for additional information on successful ICM initiatives from beyond the Pacific region, Steve Tilley from the Commonwealth of Northern Marianas (CNMI) reported on initiatives from Washington State in the United States and from Indonesia. Both these initiatives sought to build sectoral capacity and to improve coordination among sectoral agencies, such as fisheries, land use, and water quality.

36. Dr McKay also reported on an initiative in the Philippines. He noted that while government was working with the support of USAID in a top down approach to establishing regional and district coastal management committees, NGOs were working simultaneously at the community level. Experience demonstrated that at least three years was required to effectively engage local communities in this process. This underscored the need for an appropriate policy and institutional framework at the national level to support long term community engagement processes.

37. Professor Aalbersberg drew the meeting's attention to the work of the University of Rhode Island's Coastal Resources Centre. He noted the Centre produced a quarterly Newsletter that published details for ICM case studies. He advised that one recent issue focused on 10 estuary projects from around the world – all of which had one issue in common – excess nutrients.

38. Although unsure of how it might be adapted for a Pacific context, Dr Smith reported on a radical shift in thinking in supporting watershed management in Australia. Changes in management arrangements involved regionalized governance with coordination occurring through independent groups with representatives from government agencies – but not controlled by them. Each group is tasked with developing a regional strategic plan for resources management. Government agencies provide technical backstopping and financial support.

39. Mr Crawley reported on the Samoa Coastal Infrastructure Management Project. The Project is funded by the World Bank for an amount of US\$33 million. He noted that, with 70 per cent of the Samoan population living on the coasts, the Project was addressing an issue of national interest. He noted that a review of legislation and institutional arrangements for coastal management was among the first tasks of the Project. The meeting agreed that needs-driven projects with a narrow practical focus, such as the Samoan project, offer considerable opportunity for scaling up.

40. Ms Gene Brighthouse from American Samoa reported on new initiatives supported through the Pew and U.S. Ocean Commissions in the U.S. The Pew Commission recently completed its document, the US Ocean Commission which was established by Presidential Order is scheduled to be out for all State Governor's comments by January 2004. This body is concerned with developing policies relating to oceans and coastal areas. Ms Brighthouse advised the findings of these Commission are likely to have significant impacts on all coastal management programs in the US, territories and commonwealths.

41. The meeting subsequently discussed various formal and informal institutional arrangements for coastal management in Chile, Sri Lanka, Indonesia and Mexico.

42. Ms Mary Power from SPREP recalled a 1993 initiative by a Fiji Leader's Seminar to establish a national marine affairs coordinating committee. Ms Pratt reported that the Committee functioned well for several years but, because it was driven by personalities, and was not effectively institutionalized, it was gradually disbanded.

43. Dr Veitayaki considered that institutions responsible for coastal management need to be powerful enough to coordinate the work of line ministries. They also need sufficient authority to be able to enforce decisions.

44. The meeting noted encouraging developments in Pacific Island countries that may support strengthened institutional arrangements for ICM. These included efforts to establish national sustainable development working groups or commissions. It was considered that, if this was operationalized effectively, such groups or commissions could include sub-committees responsible for ICM. It was noted that sub-groups for specific issues, such as the fisheries advisory management committees, which worked well in a similar context in countries such as Australia, may serve as useful models for appropriate adaptation to Pacific island situations.

45. In relation to this, Mr Nari advised that Vanuatu is currently in the process of drafting legislation to establish a National Scientific Research Council and that the Council, once established, would coordinate all types of research – scientific, social, cultural and economic. He added Vanuatu is also in the process of establishing a national sustainable development council or committee. The meeting considered such

developments offered the opportunity to establish subsidiary consultative arrangements, among which may be arrangements supporting ICM.

National perspectives

46. Ms Brighthouse facilitated a session to consider Pacific island experiences in relation to ICM. She introduced the session with an overview of the American Samoa Coastal Management Program (ASCMP) which contained the following; history, mandate, and discussion on the program focus areas which included an overview of permitting, community wetlands management program, ocean resources management, non-point source pollution, geographical informational system, public education & awareness, cumulative & secondary impacts programs. She also provided an overview of integration activities in the Territory via several collaborative efforts such as the 8 member permitting board, Coral Reef Advisory Group, Ocean Resource Council, and Population Implementation Committee.

47. Ms Brighthouse advised that the main constraints to the development of ICM included time and resources management, a high turnover of key staff and associated impact on retention of corporate memory, enforcement of agreed policy and regulations, difficulties associated with generating sustainable budgets and the active engagement of political leaders.

48. The meeting considered that the American Samoa initiative represented a genuine reef to ridge or white water/blue water initiative in the Pacific. Mr Tilley noted that CNMI has a different situation from most Pacific Islands because customary practices were lost following World War II. In CNMI coastal activities are regulated through a development permit system that is administered by an inter-agency task force. CNMI has just reorganized to improve coordination on coral reef issues. These are interpreted broadly to include land-base pollution, recreation, fisheries, and public outreach. CNMI also participates in the US national task force for coral reefs that, for CNMI, is supporting the development of a Local Coral Reef Action Strategy.

49. The meeting again considered the importance of awareness raising and communications in ICM. It was generally agreed that the effectiveness of awareness raising campaigns are rarely assessed. It was suggested that an assessment of all available tools for campaigns and the extent awareness messages are received or understood by target audiences was required to promote the awareness raising efforts in respect of all facets of ICM. It was noted that, in effect, communications is aimed at changing people's behavior to achieve sustainable resource management. As a result, ICM should be based on an understanding of social, cultural and economic driving factors that influence people's behavior in the coastal zone.

50. Mr Nari observed that, in most Pacific Island countries, a sectoral approach to management of coastal activities still predominates. He noted that a large number of high-level committees placed significant demands on the limited capacity of most government environment and resource management agencies. To attempt to service obligations for inter-agency consultation junior officers were often tasked with representing senior officials. Junior officers rarely had sufficient authority to take decisions during inter-agency meetings with the result efficient decision-making was significantly constrained. He added that, wherever possible existing consultative processes should be strengthened rather than new processes established.

51. Ms Batiri Thaman, from USP, supported the observation that too many committees operated at a junior level with very limited capacity for taking decisions.

52. Mr Crawley reported on the Samoa Coastal Infrastructure Management Project which is focusing on hazards associated with erosion, landslides and flooding. He noted that the project was supporting the development of a national coastal management policy based on six elements: national principles, local principles, information evaluation and monitoring, education and awareness, the management and use of resources and intervention actions. The Project produced 15 District Management Plans in the first phase just completed. The aim is to complete 44 such Plans in subsequent phases. Positive aspects of the project included accurate assessment of the roles of different stakeholders in coastal management in Samoa and full community engagement in project activities.

53. Mr Robert Smith from SOPAC observed that while the Samoan project forms the basis for an excellent regional model basic coastal bathymetric information was not yet available and the impact of land activities on coral offshore reefs was not assessed. He stated that the Project supported an excellent database but further value could be added if it was made publicly accessible. This was a common problem in relation to ICM in the region – data was either totally lacking or what data was available was not open access.

54. Mr Overmars reiterated the need to adopt an integrated approach to coastal resource management - inclusive of watersheds. He advised of the establishment of cross-sectoral National Water Committees in Tuvalu, Papua New Guinea, Fiji and Kiribati. He noted that the review document prepared for the meeting by the PCU had omitted discussion of water management concepts such as Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and Integrated River Basin Management (IRBM). He suggested that this component of ICM be included in any revision of the concept document with references being made to the Regional Action Plan on Sustainable Water Management which includes six thematic areas (viz. Water Resources Management; Island Vulnerability; Awareness; Technology; Institutional Arrangements and Financing). Furthermore, reference should be made to the Pacific Wastewater Policy and Pacific Wastewater Strategic Framework for Action which are results of a SPREP/SOPAC-led regional consultation under the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities (GPA).

55. Mr Nari observed that the Samoa experience emphasizes the power of mapping and GIS to support decision-making. He advised Vanuatu would like to be able to duplicate the Samoan experience but that limited capacity, technical and financial, made that difficult. He reported that, with the assistance of SOAPC, a similar initiative was being piloted for one island in Vanuatu. Mr Crawley noted that sustainability in the Samoan situation was promoted as a result of the integrating the project to government initiatives – including adoption of the project strategy by the Samoan Cabinet.

56. Mr Eric Tawney from Vanuatu presented an overview of two watershed management initiatives on Efate Island – one to promote improved management of the Tagabe watershed and another to establish a botanical garden in the watershed. The meeting welcomed the presentation as a practical example of watershed management issues in a Pacific Island context. The meeting suggested that the potential for the success for such initiatives are increased if a major focus of the work

involves the engagement of stakeholders in local communities. Top-down government driven local resource management initiatives had generally proven to be unsustainable in the region. Understanding the role and interests of different stakeholders and actively engaging them in the decision-making process generally requires an understanding of the social, cultural and economics factors that influence local stakeholder decisions in respect of local resources.

57. In closing this session the meeting noted the importance of high-level political support to sustain ICM. In this respect it was suggested that at local, national and regional levels, ICM required champions who could support an appropriate profile to support ICM initiatives.

Regional perspectives

58. Ms Mary Powers from SPREP facilitated a session to consider regional issues associated with ICM. She noted that the MSWG had gradually strengthened its role as a regional consultative arrangement for coordination and cooperation on marine issues for regional organizations. She noted that the preparations for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002 had provided a good vehicle for inter-agency collaboration in the region. It was generally agreed that Pacific countries had championed the cause for Small Island Developing States during the Summit. A similar degree of collaboration was now being applied to preparations for the 10-year review of the Barbados Programme for Action schedule for Mauritius in August 2004. She recalled the 1993 SPREP initiative to improve ICM arrangements in the region had experienced difficulty generating a regional momentum. Although there were isolated projects that demonstrated some progress in relation to this in Pacific Island countries regional coordination for ICM remained weak. She invited meeting participants to consider if there is a role for a regional approach to ICM, and if there was such a role, what form that might take.

59. Ms Brighthouse asked the meeting to consider the most appropriate message to relay to regional organizations in relation to ICM. One such role was perhaps in supporting the establishment of a buddy system for an exchange programme for ICM for the member countries of the respective organisations.

60. Dr Veitayaki recalled the common view of Pacific island countries that they generally lack capacity to adequately service the obligations of the large number of MEAs to which they are party. He agreed that Pacific Island countries face a significant challenge in securing the same benefits and regional collaboration for ICM as is already achieved for the oceanic fisheries sector.

61. The meeting considered the large number of international and regional instruments that Pacific Island countries and territories are party to and the challenges they experience in meeting their obligations in respect of these instruments. A preliminary profile of national legislation demonstrated the largely sectoral approach to management of the environment and resources in Pacific Island countries. It was suggested that an analysis of gaps, overlaps and constraints affecting implementation of MEAs, including regional and sub-regional arrangements, could be useful for Pacific island countries to assess relative value and identify opportunities for harmonization or rationalization.

62. Mr Crawley considered backstopping member country's needs in relation to MEAs was one of the more important services provided by regional organizations.

He suggested such services should focus on reporting, appraisal, research or technical backstopping and awareness raising.

63. In subsequent discussion it was noted that Pacific Island regional organizations themselves also often have limited capacity to service all the needs of member countries and territories in respect of MEAs and ICM. It was suggested that to assist with the delivery of both regional and national services in respect of MEAs the national focal points for regional organizations were also obligated to strengthen national consultative arrangements on MEA issues.

64. Mr Nari advised that the respective roles of the different regional organizations were still not adequately understood at the national level. He noted that while the technical advice and coordinating function of regional organizations was generally valued the understanding of the role of respective organizations was limited to a relatively small number of national officials. At the community level an understanding of regional organization roles was virtually non-existent.

65. Mr Tilley noted that funding opportunities often drive priority setting. He added that there appeared to be a regional and national need to elaborate what the practical priorities for ICM in the region. It was suggested that the Framework for Action may offer an opportunity to do that. Practical examples of such action may include a Year of the Coasts, a high-level coastal management forum, the negotiation of a regional ICM instrument or action plan that provides a long term vision for ICM in the region, a formal clearing house for ICM in a regional organization, dedicated ICM courses for practitioners, an ICM website and a directory of ICM expertise in the region, among others.

An ICM Framework

66. The meeting convened in small working groups to undertake some preliminary work to consider a vision for ICM in the region, the key elements of ICM for the Pacific Islands region, the constraints to effective ICM in the region and activities or projects that could address the constraints and contribute towards the achievement of the vision. The results the initial deliberation of meeting participants in relation to these key elements of ICM, broad constraints to achieving improved ICM and potential responses to support improved ICM is presented at Attachment C and Attachment D.

ICM at the Ocean Forum

67. With the assistance of Mr Low, the meeting considered options for raising the profile of ICM, as an integral component of the Ocean Policy, during the Ocean Forum at USP in February 2004. The meeting recommended:

- The preparation of a flyer or brochure for ICM for distribution at the Forum (a draft is appended at Attachment E);
- Early identification of the five keynote speakers for the Forum and an understanding of their respective roles in Forum proceedings;
- Early identification of experts identified to present on ocean issues during the Wednesday morning session;
- A request be presented to the conference secretariat for a lunch time session dedicated to ICM; and

- Early clarification on the working procedures for the Forum, the roles of the working groups and strategies to finalize a Framework for Action.

Closing

68. Mr Wright thanked meeting participants for their respective contributions to the 3 days of ICM discussions. He thanked SOPAC management and staff for the support and services provided for the meeting.

69. Ms Pratt closed the meeting. She welcomed the collaboration between SOPAC and SPREP that had resulted in the meeting and looked forward to continuing support for ICM elements of the Ocean Policy during the forthcoming Ocean Forum.

**INTERNATIONAL WATERS WORKSHOP
SOPAC Secretariat, Suva, Fiji Islands**

10th –12th December 2003

PARTICIPANTS LIST

AMERICAN SAMOA

Ms Genevieve (Gene) Brighthouse
Department of Commerce
American Samoa Coastal Management Program
American Samoa Government
Executive Office Building
Utulei, Pagopago 96799
AMERICAN SAMOA
Tel: (684) 633 5155
Fax: (684) 633 4195
Email: Gene.Brighthouse@noaa.gov

AUSTRALIA

Dr Tim Smith
CSIRO Sustainable Ecosystems
306 Carmody Road
St Lucia Queensland 4067
AUSTRALIA
Tel: (617) 321 42331
Fax: (617) 3214 2308
Email: Tim.Smith@csiro.au

CANADA

Dr Jackie Alder
Sea Around US Project
University of British Columbia
2259 Lower Mall
Vancouver BC
CANADA V6T 1Z4
Tel: (1-604) 822 6903
Fax: (1-604) 822 8934
Email: j.alder@fisheries.ubc.ca

Prof. Philip Saunders
Dalhousie Law School
6061 University Ave
Halifax, Nova Scotia
B38 2N4
CANADA
Tel: (1-902) 494 6735

Fax: (1-902) 494 1316
Email: p.saunders@dal.ca

FIJI ISLANDS

Ms Marilyn Cornelius
Department of Environment
Ministry of Local Government, Housing, Squatter Settlement & Environment
4 Gladstone Road
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS
Tel: (679) 3311 699
Fax: (679) 3312 879
Email: iwpassistant@connect.com.fj

Mrs. Asenaca Ravuvu
UNDP Suva
Private Mail Bag
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS
Tel: (679) 331 2500
Fax: (679) 330 1718
Email: asenaca.ravuvu@undp.org

Ms. Sandeep Singh
Ministry of Local Government
Housing settlement & Environment
4 Gladstone Rd
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS
Tel: (679) 331 6580
Fax: (679) 331 2879
Email: iwpcfj@connect.com.fj
ssingh0090@yahoo.com

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Mr Steve Tilley
Deputy Director
Coastal Resources Management Office
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
P O Box 10007
Saipan, MP 96950
USA
Tel: (670) 664 8307
Fax: (670) 664 8315
Email: steve.tilley@crm.gov.mp

VANUATU

Mr Eric Tawney
Shefa Provincial Council and Environment Unit (National Government)
PMB 9097
Port Vila
VANUATU
Tel: (687) 22 752
Fax:
Email: eric.vanuatupcv@hotmail.com

Mr. Russell Nari
Deputy Director
Environment Unit
PMB
Port Vila
VANUATU
Tel: (687) 22 752

SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Dr Hugh Govan
Coastal Programme
F.S.P. International Secretariat
P O Box 18006
Suva
FIJI ISLAND
Mobile: (679) 9921224
Fax: (679) 3312 2298
Email: hgovan@compuserv.com

Mr Bismarck Crawley
Principal Consultant
Environment Consulting and Procurement Services
Tiapapata
SAMOA
Tel: (685) 29275
Fax:
Email: vonbis@ipasifica.net

REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS OF THE PACIFIC

University of the South Pacific

Dr. Bill Aalbersberg
Institute of Applied Science
University of the South Pacific
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS
Fax: (679) 3312 952

Tel: (679) 3300 373
Email: Aalbersberg@usp.ac.fj

Dr Joeli Veitayaki
Marine Studies Programme
University of the South Pacific
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS
Tel: (679) 3212 960
Fax: (679) 3301 490
Email: veitayaki_j@usp.ac.fj

Dr Jim Reynolds
Institute of Applied Sciences
University of the South Pacific
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS
Tel: (679) 321 2974
Fax: (679) ffjbr@vaf.edu

Ms Batiri Thaman
IAS
University of the South Pacific
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS
Tel:(679) 3212 969
Fax: (679) 3300 373
Email: thaman_b@usp.ac.fj

Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat

Dr Kenneth MacKay
C-SPOD
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
Private Mail Bag
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS
Tel: (679) 3312 600
Fax: (679) 3312 696
Email: kmackay@islandnet.com

Mr John Low
Natural Resources Advisor
Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat
Private Mail Bag
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS

Tel: (679) 3312 600
Fax: (679) 3300192
Email: johnl@forumsec.org.fj

SPREP

Andrew Wright
International Waters Program
Apia
SAMOA
Tel: (685) 21 929
Fax: (685) 202 31
Email: andrewr@sprep.org.ws

Mary Power
Natural Resources Management
Apia
SAMOA
Tel: (685) 21 929
Fax: (685) 202 31
Email: maryp@sprep.org.ws

SOPAC Secretariat

Cristelle Pratt
Ocean & Islands Programme
Private Mail Bag
Suva
FIJI ISLANDS
Tel: (679) 3381 377
Fax: (679) 33700 40477135
Email: cristelle@sopac.org

Reginald Sandy
Email: reg@sopac.org

Robert Smith
Email: Robert@sopac.org

Marc Overmars
Email: marc@sopac.org

Famiza Yunus
Email: famiza@sopac.org

Frances Dobui
Email: frances@sopac.org

Coastal Zone Management Options in the Pacific Islands Region: issues for improved harmonisation and implementation.

South Pacific Applied Geosciences Commission (SOPAC)

Meeting Room

Suva, Fiji

10-12 December 2003

Agenda and Schedule

	Wednesday 10	Thursday 11	Friday 12
0830-1000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening Introductions Agenda and session work plan Background to the Meeting (Policy and the PIROF) - Discussion Paper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impediments to ICWM – Pacific experience and elsewhere. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider achievable objectives in preparation for PIROF
Break			
1030-1200	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other Perspectives – experience exchange, lessons learned and applied best practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An ICWM Framework for the Pacific Islands Region: Options and considerations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PIROF outcomes – strategies (cont.)
Lunch			
1300-1430	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options for ICWM approaches in the Pacific Islands region – national perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider useful objectives and guiding principles for ICWM in the Pacific Islands region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outline of work and responsibilities to achieve possible PIROF outcomes
Break			
1500-1700	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options for ICWM approaches in the Pacific Islands region – regional perspectives Stock-take and key issues for Thursday 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Framework (cont.) Stock-take and key issues for Friday 	

Draft Vision and principles

Vision

Healthy coastal ecosystems sustaining Pacific Island communities.

Guiding Principles

- Inspired and innovative **leadership** supporting integrated and coordinated legislation, policy, planning, and implementation
- Empowered communities working in collaboration with other stakeholders to ensure **equitable benefits** of sustainable coastal development for present and future generations.
- Applied and locally appropriate systems of **good governance** demonstrating participation, transparent and accountable decision-making and linkages between local, national and international policy priorities.
- Timely and **appropriate information** generated and effectively **communicated** to support decision-making and the fostering of partnerships.
- Valued and applied **traditional knowledge** and customary practices.
- Manage using the principles of **adaptive management** based on continuous learning and the **ecosystem** approach
- **Building capacity** strategically in an ongoing process and at all levels

Attachment D

Identification of key elements of ICM in the Pacific Islands region, broad constraints to achieving improved ICM and potential responses to support improved ICM (Draft).

Constraint	Response	Degree of Difficulty 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Timeframe [Immediate/ <3 years/long term
Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare a regional strategy for building and maintaining human resource capacity to conduct ICM. 	2	Immediate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage national and regional databases profiling ICM expertise. 	2	Immediate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission and promote ICM-related material for school curricula. 	2	Medium
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake an assessment of training needs to support national ICM. 	3	Medium
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote ICM-related: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ on-the-job training, 	3/4	Immediate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ regional training institutes, 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ internet-based training, 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ resource libraries, 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ tertiary study, 	4	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ executive management training, 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ training for politicians, 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ training for communities, 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ expert technical assistance via the internet, 	3	Long
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ training for trainers, etc. 	3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a collaborative action plan, with national and regional components, to implement a ICM-related training strategies. 	4	Medium
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request national governments to provide annual updates on ICM-related training activities, needs, what worked and what didn't. 	3	Medium
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and support a national and regional consultation framework for ICM. 	3	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote ICM-related careers through secondary schools and tertiary institutions. 	3	Medium/Long	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure resources to support scholarships to support ICM-related tertiary and post-graduate research. 	2	g	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secure resources to support ICM-related exchanges – regional and international. 	3	Medium/Long	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase means to access international programmes of assistance to Pacific Island ICM initiatives – e.g. through the Global Programme of Action for Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA). 		g	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote training in participatory natural resource management processes to support ICM. 		Medium	
Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement a Regional ICM Policy/Plan/Code of Practice. 	2	Immediate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide briefings for politicians on coastal issues and the role of politicians in ICM. 	4	Immediate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support efforts to value and improve traditional knowledge and 	3	Immediate
		3	Medium

Constraint	Response	Degree of Difficulty 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Timeframe [Immediate/ <3 years/long term]
	<p>customary practice in ICM.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and implement a Coastal Campaign to raise awareness, influence behavior and promote transparent and consultative decision-making. • Undertake a national/regional constituent benefits study for improved ICM • Secure resources for ICM-related public fora. • Secure resources for study tours and exchanges to ICM best practice sites for Pacific ICM practitioners. • Refine existing and further develop Pacific Islands-appropriate ICM monitoring and evaluation tools and processes. • Review national ICM-related policy and legislation with a view to assessing gaps, achieving consolidation and promoting harmonization and integration. • Support an Annual National ICM consultation in Island countries. • Strengthen and resource science, social assessment and participation and economic information input to ICM-related initiatives and decision-making. • Design, resource and implement a Regional Year of Coast campaign in 2006. • Plan a high-level briefing mechanism (Heads of Regional Organizations and Heads of National Lead Agencies) on ICM issues. • Develop and publish an Annual State of the Coasts Report (national and regional synthesis). • Promote the development and achievement of a 10-year vision for coastal management and state of the coasts at national and regional scales. • Develop and circulate case studies of good practices in ICM governance at the community and national levels. • Develop and distribute a simple training package for newly elected political leaders to educate them about their role in ICM. • Congratulate and publicize successes – give regular awards for exemplary community, nongovernmental, and national projects or programs. 	<p>4</p> <p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Immediate/Medium</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Immediate/Medium</p> <p>Medium</p>
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insist on regional coordination and resource sharing to support ICM (in regional organizations). • Promote research associated with traditional knowledge and customary practice. • Lobby national decision-makers for research budget increases to ICM-related national agencies. • Stress practical, applied, client-orientated research • Strengthen and resource science, social assessment and participation and economic information to ICM-related initiatives and decision-making. • Promote data for monitoring and evaluation as integral components of ICM initiatives. • Design and establish effective national and regional clearing house mechanisms. 	<p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Long</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Medium/Long</p>

Constraint	Response	Degree of Difficulty 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Timeframe [Immediate/ <3 years/long term]
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase financial and human resources for ICM-related research • Build and manage baseline datasets (minimum needs). • Develop, implement and promote appropriate information management protocols. • Strengthen research backstopping services in regional organizations and Pacific-focused tertiary institutions. • Promote studies that demonstrate the social and economic costs of coastal degradation. • Develop research orientated communication strategies. • Promote decision-making based on accurate information and research. 	<p style="text-align: center;">3 3 4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">g Long Medium/Long g Medium/Long g Medium/Long g Immediate/Long Immediate/Long</p>
Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build national multisectoral institutional mechanisms that trigger/drive coordination and communication processes – e.g. horizontal and vertical National ICM Committee. • Support the implementation of coordinated national institutional framework for ICM-related MEAs – gap analysis, harmonization and capability assessment. • Encourage regional organizations involved in ICM to prepare an Annual Report on ICM for the region (or at least include ICM as a chapter in other reports – such as the State of the Environment Report). • Encourage the CROP Marine Sector Working Group to develop a strategic focus for ICM [goals, objectives and schedule] based on the Framework for Action to be drafted at the Ocean Forum. • Encourage the CROP Land Resources, Marine Sector and Sustainable Development Working Groups to develop and publicize a common strategy for ICM. • Task a regional organization to be the designated clearing house for ICM. • Promote the ICM focus among donor countries and institutions. • In the immediate term, encourage national and regional multisectoral consultations involving environment, fisheries and land use agencies, institutions and organizations. 	<p style="text-align: center;">4 3 3 3 3 2 3 4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Medium/Long g Immediate/Medium Medium Medium Medium Immediate Medium Immediate</p>
Funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compile a regional wish list of ICM projects and assign responsibilities for marketing them to various funding sources. • Encourage national governments to develop wish lists that can become subsets of the regional lists. • Invite donors to a donors' fair as part of regional conferences with a significant ICM element. • Develop technical assistance materials and guidelines to improve knowledge about ongoing financing of coastal programs and projects. Publish such material on the web. • Prepare case studies of innovative financing techniques. • Prepare guidelines for alternative income generating considerations in island communities. • Approach major businesses as potential partners for ICM initiatives. 	<p style="text-align: center;">3 3 4 3 4 3 2 4 3 2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Immediate Immediate Medium Medium Medium Medium Immediate/Medium Medium/Long g</p>

Constraint	Response	Degree of Difficulty 1 (easy) to 5 (very hard)	Timeframe [Immediate/ <3 years/long term]
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve annual budgetary and allocation process to support ICM. • Publish (on the web) a directory funding organizations with potential to fund ICM initiatives. • Strengthen the capacity of regional organizations to provide technical assistance to countries to prepare ICM-related funding proposals. • Research and promote user pays and cost recovery incentives in respect of ICM. • Insist on regional organizations and other implementing agencies, such as NGOs, to reduce overheads in regional projects. • Encourage regional organizations to actively research novel and long-term sources of funding – and report on such efforts at each annual session of the respective organizations. • Explore prospects for active private sector engagement in ICM initiatives. • Support and market donor images and roles to raise the profile of donors in ICM. 	<p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Immediate</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Immediate/Medium</p> <p>Immediate/Long</p>
Information management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design an ICM-focused communication strategy that has monitoring and evaluation components. • Establish a Pacific Islands ICM website. • Establish an ICM clearing house in a regional organization or tertiary institution (databases, information sets, etc) – and publicise services through the web site. • Promote and develop libraries, summaries of current national and regional programs and pilot projects, contact lists, cases studies, media page with news releases, calendar of events, etc. related to ICM. • Convene regular national and regional coastal management conferences to highlight successes, share techniques, inspire leadership, and provide public visibility for ICM issues. • Formulate and publicise an appropriate Pacific slogan and logo for Pacific Islands ICM (in the same vein as “ridge to reef”; bluewater/white water, etc.) • Develop and implement an ICM-focused media strategy. • Conduct training for ICM managers on how to use the media to obtain exposure and increase political visibility of ICM projects. • Prepare locally-appropriate news releases, advertisements and special features and regularly distribute to media in each market. • Promote social marketing as a potentially useful means to improve ICM efforts. 	<p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Immediate</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Immediate</p> <p>Immediate/Medium</p> <p>Medium/Long</p> <p>Immediate/Long</p> <p>Medium/Long</p>

Draft ICM Brochure for the Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Forum

Illustrations

- International waters logo (no wording)
- fishing
- waste
- erosion/sea wall
- tourism
- mangroves
- reef pigs

Title

Linking Land, Coasts and Oceans: integrated coastal management for our Pacific Islands.

Introduction

The Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy provides broad direction for managing our oceans, coasts and associated watersheds. The Forum will produce a Framework for Action that prioritises activities to achieve a healthy ocean sustaining the livelihoods and aspirations of Pacific Island communities. The Framework for Action will focus local, national and regional effort to support sustainable use of our oceans and coasts.

Management of the coast is complex because of the number of stakeholders and their competing interests. To reduce threats to our coasts and to ensure future generations enjoy the same benefits we do it is imperative that a key focus for the Framework for Action is integrated coastal management (ICM).

This leaflet:

- opens discussion on ICM in the context of the Ocean Forum, and
- highlights the need for the incorporation of key ICM principles in the Framework for Action.

Why we need ICM in the Framework for Action?

Our current sectoral approach to managing the coast is clearly not working. The quality and functions of our coasts and watersheds continue to decline. The future health of the ocean is intimately linked to what we do on our islands. ICM connects these systems. ICM offers a mechanism for managing the impacts of our activities and securing the goods and services our coasts provide.

ICM is a process that supports:

- Sustainable use of coastal ecosystems;
- Mechanisms for government agencies to collaborate for a common cause;
- Broad engagement of all stakeholders;
- Transparent and accountable decision-making;
- Empowerment of coastal communities; and

How ICM is achieved:

Integrated coastal management is a strategic approach for supporting action to help deal with these problems. It achieves this by:

- Government departments working together;
- Public-private sector partnerships;
- Working closely with communities;
- Valuing traditional knowledge and customary practice
- Sharing quality information that is freely available; and
- Strengthening capacity at all levels
- Adopting an ecosystems based approach
- Adaptive Management

Back of page

Considerations for incorporating ICM in the Framework for Action.

Vision for ICM

Healthy coastal ecosystems sustaining Pacific Island communities.

Guiding Principles

- Inspired and innovative **leadership** supporting integrated and coordinated legislation, policy, planning, and implementation
- Empowered communities working in collaboration with other stakeholders to ensure **equitable benefits** of sustainable coastal development for present and future generations.
- Applied and locally appropriate systems of **good governance** demonstrating participation, transparent and accountable decision-making and linkages between local, national and international policy priorities.
- Timely and **appropriate information** generated and effectively **communicated** to support decision-making and the fostering of partnerships.
- Valued and applied **traditional knowledge** and customary practices.
- Manage using the principles of **adaptive management** based on continuous learning and the **ecosystem** approach
- **Building capacity** strategically in an ongoing process and at all levels