

NBSAP Working Group Meeting



Alotau, PNG

20th -22nd of July 2005

Summary

This meeting was a meeting of the NBSAP Working Group of the Roundtable for Nature Conservation. As such the meeting was able to prepare NBSAP Coordinators to take an active role in the Roundtable meeting

It enabled the group to discuss a number of key issues in relation to the development and implementation of NBSAPs, to look at monitoring and evaluation of NBSAPs, specifically using experience from the International Waters Project and with assistance from Mr Dave Butler who facilitated the monitoring and evaluation session.

There were a number of key achievements:

1. Commitment from Working Group members to holding a 1 day national meeting with a member of the Roundtable Management Group to promote the Action Strategy and NBSAPs to national stakeholders.
2. Commitment from Working Group members to being the focal point of contact for the Roundtable for Nature Conservation members nationally for Action Strategy related issues.
3. A charter for the Working Group which clearly defines the Action Strategy objectives the group will be working on.
4. A meeting statement which highlights key issues coming out of the meeting.
5. Commitment from WG members to each joining another RT Working Group and offering a national perspective on behalf of the whole group to those Working Groups.
6. Commitment to working with the Roundtable's Monitoring and Evaluation Consultant – Mr Philip Tortell during his consultancy.
7. Suggestions on how to build the profile of NBSAPs nationally and regionally with NBSAP coordinators as primary focal point.
8. The need to develop a regional status report on NBSAP implementation and to link regional strategy targets to the national NBSAP.
9. Guidance as to what is needed to strengthen NBSAP M&E.
10. Recognition of the significance of the new Island Biodiversity Programme of Work to the implementation of NBSAPs.

Table of contents

1	Registration, opening and introductions	1
1.1	Participants.....	1
1.2	Expectations of participants.....	1
	Discussion.....	2
2	Adoption of agenda, objectives and outputs	2
3	Reports on progress since previous meeting.....	2
3.1	Palau (Joel Miles)	2
3.2	Samoa (F. S. V. Pati Liu).....	3
	Discussion.....	4
3.3	PNG (John Genolagani).....	4
3.4	Solomon Islands (Joe Horokou).....	4
	Discussion.....	5
3.5	Cook Islands (Elizabeth Munro).....	5
	Discussion.....	5
3.5	Tonga (Kulaea Kilisimasi).....	5
3.6	Tuvalu (Enate Evi).....	6
3.7	Vanuatu (Leah Nimoho)	6
	Discussion.....	7
3.7	Kiribati (Bwere Eretaia).....	8
4	Issues to take to the Round Table	9
4.1	Group 1 results.....	9
4.2	Group 2 results.....	9
5	Day 1 feedback	10
6	Education Milne Bay presentation.....	11
7	Monitoring and evaluation.....	11
8	National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA).....	18
8.1	Break out groups	19
9	Update on the preparation of third national reports	19
10	Status of clearing house mechanisms (CHMs)	20
11	Other opportunities	21
11.1	Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum (PBIF).....	21
11.2	Coastal and marine opportunities at SPREP.....	22
	Coral Reef Initiative for the South Pacific (CRISP), CMS, MOU	22
	Management of migratory species	22
	Protection of wetlands under the RAMSAR Convention.....	23
11.3	Birdlife Alliance.....	23
11.4	PPCII, Pacific Invasive Learning Network (PILN).....	23
12	Preparation for Roundtable Meeting.....	23
	Developing a Charter for the NBSAP WG	23
	Reports from Working Groups:	23

Documents/presentations available
BIODIVERSITY PROJECTS IN PALAU (Joel Miles)

Day 1

1 Registration, opening and introductions

- As Chair for NBSAP working group, Tapa welcomed everyone. Reminded people of the NBSAP objectives to conserve natural systems while ensuring what is best for people and countries.
- Acknowledged contributions of the supporting regional organisations for the meeting, such as SPREP (Kate and team in arranging travel etc.) and CI (Peter MacKay (in hosting the meeting).
- Invited participants to introduce themselves and identify their expectations of the meeting.

1.1 Participants

SPREP participants

- Dominique Benzaken, CMA SPREP
- Kate Brown, Action Strategy for Nature Conservation, SPREP
- Paula Holland, NRE, IWP SPREP
- Liz Dovey (from day 3)

Consultant

- Dave Butler, facilitator on monitoring and evaluation

Country participants

- Bwere Eretaia, NBSAP Coordinator, Kiribati (from day 3)
- Enate Evi, Biodiversity Officer, Tuvalu DoE
- John Genolagani, Acting Secretary and coordinator for NBSAP PNG
- Joe Horokou, Principal Environment Officer, Environment, Solomon Islands
- Kulaea Kilisimasi, Tonga
- Pati Liu, MNREM Samoa
- Joel Miles, OERC Palau (involved in development of NBSAP Palau)
- Elizabeth Munro, NBSAP Add On Coordinator, Cook Islands
- Leah Nimoho, NC IWP Vanuatu
- Tapa Suaesi, Principal Terrestrial Conservation Officer, Samoa
- Tony Torea, National Programme Officer – Environment, UNDP PNG

NGO participants

- Allen Allison, Vice President Science, Bishop Museum/ Science Biodiversity Information Forum
- Mark Fornwall, Coordinator, Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum/ US Geological Survey
- Peter MacKay, CI Chief Technical Adviser for Milne Bay project
- David Mitchell, Conservation International

1.2 Expectations of participants

- Hear from other countries
- Share experiences

- Identify how to work together/cooperate on work
- Learn from other countries
- Establish how NBSAPs fit with regional strategies and vice-versa
- Establish the impact of the NBSAP
- Identify who can help with NBSAP implementation
- Identify where to from here
- Provide feedback and share information on the Islands biodiversity Programme of Work
- Identify how to advance the NBSAPs
- Identify how the scientific or information community can assist with NBSAP implementation

Discussion

- Kate noted Working Groups will be officially opened next week. Acknowledged the distances people had traveled and stated that this was an indicator of perceived importance of the meeting.
- Thanked CI for hosting the meeting. Welcomed everyone. Thanked Tapa for Chairing the NBSAP Working Group and providing the link between the NBSAP and the Roundtable for Nature Conservation.
- Requested that, over the next three days, participants focus on how to move forward and how to progress NBSAPs rather than focusing on obstacles – focus instead on how to get on despite them.

2 Adoption of agenda, objectives and outputs

Accepted

3 Reports on progress since previous meeting

3.1 Palau (Joel Miles)

- Thanked Tapa for Chairing the meeting. Observed that, in preparation for the meeting, he had tried to list biodiversity related projects in Palau, asking for 1-3 paragraphs per project. Although he received an apparently low response rates, he still ends up with 12 pages of information on projects. His is therefore evidence that there is a lot going on and it is a challenge to coordinate everything.
- Observed that Palau have not yet officially started to implement the NBSAP. However, it is still already doing a lot of related activities.
- Noted the development of a national protected areas network which started one year ago. Network not yet formed but the process to establish the network is underway. Establishment is more complicated that they had envisaged: addressing questions such as what should be a protected area, what should the application process be, etc.
- Palau recently conducted a workshop to develop a sustainable financing mechanism (about a week ago). Subsequently sent someone to a donors meeting to seek out support for the protected areas network. Identified streams of money and what they need.

- Work on awareness and public info includes work on a German website sending in photos of Palauan plants and animals (breadfruit, taro etc).
- The clearing house mechanism (website) is up and running
- Recapped on the NBSAP process adopted in Palau: Started with a national workshop and consultations with each of the 16 states – brainstorming, prioritisation etc. so have a state by state, community by community set of priorities. Then had a drafting group to draft strategy. Actions under 8 different themes, providing a broad timeframe for actions.
- Observed the draft strategy has been sitting in legislature for 5 months (followed national elections, new national legislature, review of national Constitution etc.) so no one was interested in it at time. But should get it endorsed by August
- Keen to hear how other countries have been implementing NBSAP so keen to incorporate their experiences to our process (where will NBSAP be located in government structure etc., eg., OERC or other place, National Environment Protection Council (multi stakeholder council) was steering committee for NBSAP and will make the decision etc.)
- Lessons learned:
 - NBSAP has been a good capacity building exercise although did not work well with the person who was initially given the job so the position was replaced (by Joel). The big challenge was to bring everything together into a coherent report.
 - observed the need to catalogue all that is going on so that we all know what is going on and can learn from those things.
- Main constraints: lack of human resources (not enough people). On other hand, used as a capacity building exercise and used all national consultants to fill gaps so we can use them again in future. Note that other community consultations going on at the same time so there was a need for us to prove that there were to be tangible benefits from giving their time (in terms of real actions)
- Work on Island Biodiversity Programme of Work of interest to us. Formerly has been a piecemeal approach and has been difficult to see how things fitted together so hopefully the programme will allow integrated management of biodiversity
- Have just implemented GEF small grant scheme for Micronesia (Palau, FSM, RMI). Looking for proposals to progress that.

3.2 Samoa (F. S. V. Pati Liu)

- Have been submitting Biological Protection Bill to Cabinet. Has been approved. Is currently with Attorney General's to be fine tuned for process in Parliament.
- Work on Biosafety policy
- Policy on Forest Management and SD have been refined and are ready for Cabinet approval. Feel Samoa has been doing well on implementation of legal issues provided it has government support which is crucial.
- Observed that many other related conservation activities are underway eg., marine conservation– seeking support from donors (IFOR, NZAid) to look at marine species conservation, IWC for whale conservation
- Need to bring together all stakeholders to get things agreed/common ground?
- Capacity has been a constraint but has improved and now have 20 staff in Environment compared with two when started. Forestry have been transferred to MNRE, as has Meteorology as these are both related to environment

- Donor related activities: working with JICA for some activities. Working on IWP and Biological Diversity project
- Hoped to be able to continue to link NBSAP activities to the Regional Strategy – hope SPREP will come up with some opportunities there to support national work.
- Noted Dave Butler’s assistance in developing the rat eradication project (raising funds etc.) on one of the small islands. If successful, would replicate it elsewhere

Discussion

- In response to a question from Kate regarding whether Samoa feels it has the political support it sees as critical to NBSAP implementation, Pati noted that the MNRE has 3 sections that effectively implement the NBSAP in MNRE – terrestrial, marine and other (?). They want to see the link between the national and regional strategy. Need political support to do this.

3.3 PNG (John Genolagani)

- First time at a RT and NBSAP. Welcomed everyone to PNG.
- Observed that PNG has a lot of complex issues.
- Described the foundations of NBSAP – 1992 signed CBD. Thence used a pilot country for some work. PNG only country to make a round of UNDP, UNEP and world Bank
- Did conservation needs assessment reports (inc by Dr Allison) in 1992.
- Following this, got UNEP/GEF support to PNG to do a country study – provided an economic context.
- PNG involved in project in biodiversity management.
- Observed therefore that a lot of field work had already been done by the time the NBSAP was to start and the main challenge was just to put things together.
- Environment and Forestry became part of structural adjustment packages
- World Bank cancelled some projects - NBSAP, clearing house mechanism and country report affected (country report never submitted)
- Ag, Forestry and Fisheries are mainstay of economic input for PNG.
- ADB interested in mainstreaming environment issues into policies – staff need to be re-educated into what is biodiversity and how to incorporate it into policies
- Approached CI for help to bring everything together into one framework/document. Should be finished later this year. Have put out a tender for the work and will then have a stakeholder workshop.

3.4 Solomon Islands (Joe Horokou)

- Has not attended an NBSAP Meeting before so a first time to report on this
- Received funding from GEF to do NBSAP. Formed a national committee to oversee process. Formed sectoral working groups to discuss issues. Each developed their own report. Some have submitted their reports to the NC.
- Some confusion as to who would develop the NBSAP document itself. The person selected to do it did not finish it so the process stalled. Some of the contributing factors were:
 - lack of a full time person

- lack of proper project management (director of environment had many other things to oversee at same time)
- lack of proper financial management
- Observed the need to source new funding to continue the process otherwise will continue to stall.

Discussion

- Joel noted that the problem of stalling faced by SI is similar to that previously faced by Palau – ie., the process was not completed because someone started the work and has done the ground work but not everything was brought together. Therefore if it is given to one person it may be possible to bring it together fairly quickly.

3.5 Cook Islands (Elizabeth Munro)

- At the ‘add on’ stage
- Have changed their approach to NBSAP.
- Have a number of pilot projects underway
- Some of the recommendations from the pilot projects affect NBSAP, eg., one project on invasive species showed the need to eradicate certain invasive species on islands because they affect biodiversity.
- Have other pilot projects underway re native, historical and other significant plants that will contribute to the NBSAP objectives. Aim to protect these significant species especially in time for the next set of cyclones
- Project on one of the islands - Suvarrow – wait for stakeholders to come over and will then hold consultations on the Swarrow National Park Act
- Other pilot projects that identify species of fish, beetles, fungus etc. Will be posted on CHM Website. These reports will eventually go onto government web site.
- Workshop on an action framework and some of the NBSAP actions are priorities on this. Are waiting for final report which will soon be on the web site
- Lessons learned: Re outer islands – need incentives for people to continue pilot projects and there is a need for regular monitoring
- Hard to communicate with some outer islands so not much awareness out there

Discussion

- Dave Butler noted the importance of the pilot projects having generated lessons.

3.5 Tonga (Kulaea Kilisimasi)

- First time presenting to this meeting. Doing so because the current coordinator is not available as she is on maternity leave.
- Nearing the end of the contract. Finishing in Dec this year
- Two main outputs are
 - NBSAP
 - First national report of the CBD
- Process for NBSAP: first activity was a stock take of biodiversity, done by local consultants. Have now completed the NBSAP – very large
- Found that it will take longer than expected to get people to understand what NBSAP is.

- Preparation of NBSAP – hired national consultants, also conducted consultations, discussed NBSAP draft with stakeholders, finalised the NBSAP by incorporating comments. At the moment are prioritising actions. Now only remain consultations with outer islands
- Still need to prepare first national report. Will use a consultant for this.
- Awaiting approval from PM to launch database

3.6 Tuvalu (Enate Evi)

- Thanked PNG for hosting the meeting.
- Observed that Tuvalu became party to the convention 2002
- Stated Tuvalu has started Biosafety project but not the NBSAP project
- Had some difficulties in the beginning in identifying an implementing agency. Thanks SPREP especially Kate to push the implementing agency to assist us with the NBSAP
- Observed that the proposal was submitted to UNDP Suva and status was to be discussed during this meeting but the person has not yet appeared at the meeting (!)
- Stated that 6 out of 8 islands in Tuvalu have established protected areas.
- Future plans for addressing the NBSAP include:
 - will establish a steering committee and planning team and will recruit national and international consultants as well as a national coordinator
 - will conduct a familiarisation workshop for the steering committee afterwards as well as for the islands and the stakeholders

3.7 Vanuatu (Leah Nimoho)

- Noted coordinator unavailable so Leah standing in as she was working with the NBSAP coordinator prior to joining the IWP three years ago. However, she was not given any preparatory work or briefing. She will therefore share her personal understanding of Vanuatu's status.
- Observed that progress on NBSAP has not been well documented since commencement in 2000
- Observed that NBSAP started in 2000. Environment unit has a lot of work because its remit is so wide ranging. So there was a need to support the Environment Unit to do the NBSAP. The NBSAP unit effectively has to become a coordinating unit for all the work underway
- Observed that the NBSAP has been instrumental for getting the Environment Act endorsed and for the Environment Unit to be made the NBSAP Department. This will also cover registration of conservation areas and coverage of bio-prospecting
- Within the Environment Act there have been relevant activities to manage bio-prospecting – for instance, to establish a council to oversee and vet bio researchers and decide on who can do what as well as to ensure that government has information to make decisions for Vanuatu.
- Also a Biodiversity Council has been approved by government but still not clear how it will work and how it will complement the work of other areas such as CC and POPs etc. Therefore looking to establish a sustainable development committee.

- Locally managed protected areas have been established but not clear how many or what such initiatives should be called.
- Have established a database of areas but details of area progress not yet known.
- Environment Unit has supported other related activities eg., NCSA is coordinated through there, POPs, CC
- NCSA work focusing on stock taking.
- NBSAP has been instrumental in getting GEF funding for an medium sized project. Will focus on management of endemic threatened species on three islands
- UNEP support to document environmental status for Vanuatu (first ever environment status report). A lot of work has already been done (eg. through IWP) that will contribute to this.
- Are working with NGOs to establish conservation areas, marine species conservation and aquaculture (eg., FSP, Peace Corps, JICA)
- Biosafety project is underway through the Quarantine office. This has developed a framework for management of introduced species and Quarantine will be the major agency to oversee the framework
- Forestry Unit collects information to support EIA work and to endorse sustainable logging in Vanuatu.
- Noted that the Fisheries Department is establishing tuna management plan and community based work
- Re education and awareness, observed that lots of material has been produced. In fact the Environment Unit has been rapidly running out of material. Noted that all posters have been taken up. NGOs such as Wan Smol Bag have been supporting awareness work (eg., on turtles, trochus)
- NBSAP was working on a web site – but not sure of status. (CHM?)

Discussion

- David Butler questioned whether any reports had been received yet from Niue on the progress of the NBSAP there? He reported that the country had been mainly focused on rehabilitation following Cyclone Heta. Re NBSAP, UNDP had agreed to review the situation and organise expeditions from NZ to look at invasive plants and species following the cyclone. So he understands that the NBSAP is being reviewed to see if it is still appropriate and or if the priorities have at all changed following the cyclone.
- Also noted that other work still underway on the web site for NBSAP Niue.
- Peter MacKay drew the attention of the meeting to the fact that CI Milne Bay project has been working with local communities. They use three teams to support community entry, training and awareness raising. They are currently in-house so welcome to meet with them casually. The team leader has recently won an award to outstanding contributions to conservation (Modi Pontio)
- Pati noted there is a matrix of tasks given to the NBSAP meeting last year to work on. Any progress report on this? Also any progress report on regional strategy which was approved in 2003 (two years ago) and how it was implemented (if at all) so that we can identify national links to this?
- Kate noted that the regional action strategy has received funding from World Bank, Asian Development Bank and NZAid to get a consultant to assist in how to monitor and assess national progress. Also looking at indicators in the action strategy. We will hear from the consultant next week on his approach to this task. He will probably try to visit most countries and report regularly (including

the next RT). Also note that the RT working groups are supposed to monitor gaps and to identify collaborative work to address them.

- Tepa also noted that there would be a session during the NBSAP re monitoring.
- Kate observed that SPREP had not distributed the action matrix to people up to date on progress. She therefore took the participants through the report on the matrix of actions.
- Some discussion took place on the fact the NBSAP work impacts numerous sectors and or representatives from other government offices and there is therefore a need to coordinate and liaise with a wide variety of stakeholders. Noted the establishment of various committees to coordinate the work and ensure consultation.
- It was observed that the creation of committees did not solve the question of coordination where there are already many committees and people are stretched and have several roles. Leah noted that people may have numerous commitments. In IWP Vanuatu are trying to fit into other national groups. Observes that the key question is whether there are existing committees into which potentially new groups could be fitted to avoid duplication.
- Joel observed that, in a sense, the Palau National Environment Protection Council is supposed to act as an umbrella group to reflect its multiple needs. It still includes various stakeholders and should (theoretically) allow people to share info. But he observes it is still a challenge to get information shared practically across all relevant stakeholders.
- Noted that countries were supposed to be promoting the National Sustainable Development Strategies in order to provide a context for NBSAP work. Palau noted that they are to introduce sustainable financing for some conservation areas, incorporating user fees and the channeling of funds to support these protected areas. (Protected Areas Network)
- Re the development of multi-stakeholder partnerships, Tepa noted that Samoa has been awaiting work on the NCSA as this provides a framework for progressing some higher-level partnerships and collaboration between CEOs, private sector and NGOs.
- Kate observed that she had been unable to fulfill her allotted task of contacting the SPREP focal point to request the nomination of a representative to act as the focal point for Action Strategy and Roundtable work. She asked of the meeting thought this was still relevant. Pati stated MNREM felt that it was still relevant to have a clear point of contact on this to speed up the processes of NBSAP implementation. It is not realistic for Heads of Departments to be involved in NBSAP from the start and to stay up to date on progress. Therefore he would still like to see this task pursued.

3.7 Kiribati (Bwere Eretaia)

(This presentation was actually given on Friday 22 July due to the late arrival of Bwere Eretaia.)

- Started in 1998 and implementation started in 2003.
- Received US\$ 198000 of add on funds. Government of Kiribati contributes A\$60000 in-kind in return. The add on funds are used to target public awareness and to assist in capacity.

- This is the last month of the NBSAP project. Still feels like they have a long way to go. 25 per cent behind schedule. This is partly because the main activity conducted was data collection. Because the islands are scattered, the travel between them to ensure accurate data is not easy so there was a delay. The add on now is almost finished. The data has been mostly compiled and analysed. Now are focusing on returning information to the community for approval.
- Conducted a workshop in April to discuss findings of data collection. About 100 people attended from 20 different island councils. Around 75 per cent of findings were accepted and approved. The working committee have worked through the information again and anticipate completion of work next month (August).
- The working committee is considering applying for an extension of time to complete the NBSAP (mainly the writing), at no extra cost. The extension will be requested for an additional four or five months with a view to finishing at the end of the year.
- Christmas Island consultations are currently underway.
- Once all issues incorporated from consultation, the work will be done. They will get someone to help them write up everything.
- Phoenix Island conservation projects are being undertaken with the New England aquarium. The MoU has been developed and is with Cabinet.
- World Heritage consideration is being given to 6 sites (including marine) in Kiribati.

4 Issues to take to the Round Table

The meeting was divided into two groups to consider:

- Key issues to take to the Round Table to consider
- Guidance for the Round Table and Working Groups to provide.

4.1 Group 1 results

- Issues not limited to the NBSAP but also to the other two conventions. So issue 1 is how to implement all the conventions together
- The need to ensure that people are better off and that we therefore consider economic considerations and livelihoods
- Demonstrating that looking after biodiversity makes people better off. Roundtable should have a role in doing this

4.2 Group 2 results

The group recognised that the different stages that countries are at in doing their NBSAPs determine what the key issues are for them. Therefore:

- For countries about to start on their NBSAPs, key issues are:
 - lack of staffing, all of whom have to implement all conventions
 - lack of expertise, especially at the country level
 - lack of baseline information upon which to base NBSAPs (lack of national ecological surveys etc.)

- Therefore guidance to the Round Table on issues to address are:
 - guidelines on implementation of the NBSAP (dealing with lack of resources, whether NBSAP funding can be used to pay for baseline studies etc.)
 - training for NBSAP coordinators who are newly on board (or where NBSAP work is about to start)
 - register of local expertise (rather than just overseas expertise)
 - need for research to underpin planning and decision making
 - the need for a common information storage system
- For countries who have completed their NBSAPs, key issue is access to resources to implement NBSAPs
- Therefore guidance to roundtable on issues to address are:
 - guidance on how to coordinate implementation of the NBSAP after the document has been written (what is the next step? Continuity of networking, maintaining committees, ensuring reporting, monitoring etc.)
 - guidelines on how to mainstream NBSAP
 - how to conduct awareness and ensure NBSAP work is reflected in daily life (mainstreaming at the community level).
- Joel Miles (Palau OERC) provided an update on the Island Biodiversity Programme of Work following this, Kate Brown updated the group on preparations for COP 8 and the IB POW.
- Feedback was presented by the Dominique of SPREP in the afternoon on key issues in the findings of the morning.

5 Day 1 feedback

<i>Positive issues</i>	<i>Change issues</i>
Venue	location of speaker
Good progress	Local banking system!
Materials well presented	
Great to hear where countries are at	
Food excellent	

Day 2

- Tapa welcomed everyone to the second day of the workshop. He outlined that the day ahead would focus on the use of monitoring and evaluation as a means to support the development and implementation of NBSAPs. He therefore welcomed consultant, Dave Butler to the meeting as Dave would be leading discussions on monitoring and evaluation for NBSAP work.
- Before starting on monitoring, he invited Simon Ellis to present the work of Education Milne Bay.

6 Education Milne Bay presentation

Simon Ellis presented the work of the Education Milne Bay in Alotau. Notes that communities in Alotau had limited understanding of how to run tourism etc. so assisted communities by guiding them and subsequently providing training.

Also provide training in finance and management as well as facilitating workshops for different organisations. Staff are locals who are either skilled or who were unemployed all materials used to build the centre are locally sourced and construction of the centre has been conducted using local carpenters and architects.

Collaborate with UNDP and Conservation International in supporting training for local communities.

In long term are hoping to get course work accredited internationally and to have the centre recognised as a model for community development.

7 Monitoring and evaluation

Dave Butler introduced the issue of monitoring by considering what the NBSAP development process had so far generated (awareness, partnerships, a common focus, information, agreement on a way ahead, capacity building etc.).

The following text is from Dave Butler's report of this session of the meeting and includes a number of activities that need to be followed up:

Dave discussed the development and implementation of NBSAP's as parts of a continuous process of biodiversity conservation in countries – in particular implementation is not an activity which will begin at a certain point with a major influx of donor funds. A range of conservation actions were occurring prior to NBSAP's. Strategy development will have endorsed many of these to continue, added a further large list of actions, and made significant achievements during the process.

NBSAP Coordinators identified these last as follows:

- Raising awareness of biodiversity conservation
- Obtaining endorsement by Government and other agencies of the importance of the issue
- Increasing capacity
- Providing a focus for donors
- Providing a common focus
- Facilitating cost sharing

- Assembling baseline information.

The challenge is to address the large number of actions identified in NBSAP's. He later discussed the value of prioritising actions, assigning time frames and clear responsibilities to them, and identifying resources required (see 4 below) as a useful prerequisite for effective monitoring and evaluation.

2. International Waters Programme (IWP) Experiences of Monitoring and Evaluation

Presentation 1: Paula Holland, IWP, SPREP - 'Designing monitoring plans in the Pacific Islands International Waters Project'

Some of the lessons learned

- This was the first time to articulate project goals, objectives, outcomes and activities – assumption that all activities 'linked' and heading towards the same outcome
- Projects with multiple goals are difficult to articulate
- When to identify project goals? Ideally at beginning.
- Identification of too many monitoring indicators – the need to limit numbers
- Some indicators vague
- Need for baseline work to support monitoring.

Presentation 2: Leah Nimoho, IWP, Vanuatu - 'The Vanuatu International Waters Project *Strengthening the Management of Vanuatu's Coastal Fisheries.*

Key findings: The process of developing monitoring and evaluation proved very useful in clarifying project goals. The development of suitable indicators of the three categories used by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) (below) did not prove too difficult.

Key Indicators – Process

- # of National Committee and village meetings
- # of local facilitators trained in participatory processes
- Increasing # of project participants - including women crab collectors, council of chiefs, and youth
- Increase # of women participating in decision making for resource management
- Increasing # of resource management "champions" or advocates in villages

Key Indicators – Environmental Stress Reduction

- Increase # of number of tabu erias initiated by the villagers
- Decreasing # of tabu eria breaches
- Decreasing # of quota breaches at the market
- % changes in awareness/ attitudes/behaviour

Key Indicators – Environmental Status

- Changes against ecological baseline

3. Introduction to Monitoring and Indicators

All participants were asked two questions:

- 1/ What is the most important thing that you wish to achieve in conservation in the next two years?
- 2/ How would you measure what progress you are making on this after one year?

This served to clarify the three different types of indicators presented in the IWP talks and to show that if you had a priority, time-frame and an action that you could have an impact on, then monitoring was quite easy. The challenge was to apply this to hundreds of actions.

4. The value of effective planning and identification of monitoring indicators

Monitoring can be defined as: ‘assessing progress towards the project goals and objectives contained in the NBSAP’s’.

In order to do this effectively those goals and objectives need to be well-defined and ‘SMART’.

A Powerpoint presentation (Butler – Alotau Presentation) (copy available) was used to run through what an ideal NBSAP might look like to make its implementation, monitoring and evaluation as simple as possible.

The group was then split into three to develop indicators for three actions taken from actual NBSAP’s. They were also encouraged to assess the action and whether it was clearly enough defined. The results were:

Action 1: Ensure the objectives of the NBSAP are integrated into changes in legislation being done by relevant departments.

Indicators developed:

Process Indicators

- ID legislation content
- No. of NBSAP objectives reflected in legislation
- No. of legislation with objective consideration
- Inter-departmental mechanisms impacting into legislative review
- No. of departments with NBSAP provisions in their corporate mandate and plans
- % in increase in understanding of NBSAP objectives
- No. of opportunities for NBSAP objective promotion at the high level of legislative processes
- No. of politicians with good understanding of NBSAPs
- No. of occurrences of NBSAP objectives in media.
- No. of political jokes/cartoons on NBSAP objectives
- No. of stakeholder opportunities for input into legislative review
- No. of bumper stickers, t-shirts, etc. with NBSAP slogans

The group concluded that the end result would then be legislation with substantial consideration of NBSAP objectives.

Action 2: Conserve the rarer plants used in herbal medicine (vai rakau)

Discussion of action:

The group identified that ‘conserve’ and ‘rarer’ were too vague and needed further definition.

Indicators developed:

Process Indicators

- Identification of plants - product = list of rare plants.
- Stock-taking – where? Abundance?
- Analysis of uses & impacts/threats (e.g. over use, habitat loss)
- Development of plan – codes of practice – endorsement

Stress Reduction indicators

- Reduction of breaches of code/plan

Environmental Status Indicator

- Stable/increasing populations of rare plants.

Action 3: Strengthen border control to detect and destroy invasive species entering the country.

Detailed response not obtained from group. A series of indicators were developed including measures of training processes and awareness programmes. Baseline figures on detections were need and key indicators would record changes in these. There was debate about whether an increase or decrease of detections would be a positive indication of progress.

Discussion:

The first group developed more than the suggested number of indicators (*1 to 5 process indicators, 1 to 5 stress reduction indicators per outcome and 2 to 3 environmental status indicators per project*) (Holland, P., Mahanty, S, Stacey, N., Wright, D. and Menzies, S. 2005. *Designing monitoring plans in the Pacific Islands International Waters Project. IWP Report, SPREP, Apia*). Of those identified, several monitor the wider objective from which the action was derived, i.e. ‘Mainstreaming Biodiversity’, rather than the action related to legislation itself. The other two actions allowed indicators of all three types to be developed.

The second and third groups both found the actions given to be too general and developed more specific ones.

5. The value of monitoring process.

Monitoring actions with ‘process’ indicators is valuable because there are a number of responses available. You begin by asking:

Has an action that should have happened by now happened? Has it been started and/or completed?

If not, the reason might be one or a combination of the following:

- Wrong agency assigned the lead responsibility
- The agency that was assigned lead responsibility never really agreed to this
- There is not enough capacity or there are other priorities
- Necessary outside funds were not obtained
- Priorities have changed
- The time-frame was unrealistic

Responses may then be:

- Re-confirm the action in a new plan and ensure that resources are available for it – or list it as ‘subject to funding’
- Drop the action
- Modify the action – change responsibilities, time-frame, etc.
- Delay the action – priority has lessened – other actions may be needed first

One person could coordinate the first part of this monitoring, collecting information on actions that have happened or not, and why. But then the different agencies and individuals involved in developing the NBSAP need to come back together to review this information and agree on the responses.

6. Discussion and recommendations.

6.1 For countries still developing their NBSAP’s

Monitoring and evaluating implementation would be much easier if the plans had ‘SMART’ objectives and clear specific, measurable actions that listed a lead agency, others responsible for helping implementation and the resources required. It is also important to identify time-frames and priorities: i.e. these objectives are what we wish to achieve in 30 or 50 years, and these actions are the priority for the next five years. It may be worth identifying which actions the different agencies are committed to undertaking within their own resources and which ones are dependent on securing new resources.

It would be valuable to link actions in the NBSAPs to targets in the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation.

6.2 For countries who have recently completed their NBSAP’s

Joel Miles (Palau) suggested the holding of a national workshop once the NBSAP was endorsed by Government. This would be framed as ‘OK, now is the time to get on with it. Who is going to do what?’

6.3 Developing indicators

It was agreed that some indicators were country-specific and best developed in country with some technical support. Others would apply to many different NBSAP’s which have very similar actions. These could be developed by NBSAP Coordinators as a group in a workshop situation.

6.4 Samoa's approach – implementing NBSAP in 5-year blocks.

Samoa has put particular effort into M&E following a review of its NBSAP in 2003 and carried out a national monitoring workshop in 2004. Its NBSAP did have a monitoring matrix as a starting point though this needed adding to. For the workshop all agencies were asked to list activities undertaken between 2000-2004 that were of relevance to the different themes and objectives. The next step is to gather more information on these actions to fully analyse their quality and the contribution they are making to the achievement of theme objectives.

Samoa is now prioritising the activities in the NBSAP that have not yet been acted on and seeking to make these happen in the next five years. The Strategy as a whole will thus be implemented and monitored on a 5-year basis. This seems an appropriate time-frame that other countries could adopt.

6.5 An Implementation Plan?

The idea that once countries had developed their NBSAP they then need to develop and Implementation Plan was greeted with some dismay. However some form of action planning over defined periods is needed. Ideally the NBSAP contains a section which represents the first action plan (for 2-5 years?) and it identifies how further plans will be developed and how monitoring will occur. Looking at a few examples:

Niue – NBSAP identifies that implementation will be based on work plans identifying priority actions over a given period. It lists 48 actions which the environment and agricultural agencies have identified as their priorities for the initial work plan.

Vanuatu – NBSAP identifies time-frames with many of the 'priority responses' (actions). This would make it easy to now review progress on these and define new time-frames for actions responses not completed.

Samoa - NBSAP has an implementation and monitoring section. It includes a guide to current priorities, short-term priorities (3-5 years) and long-term priorities (10-15 years) and an Implementation Monitoring Matrix. This provides a useful starting point but it has been identified that more work needs doing on it. Indicators could be better defined and grouped into 'process, environmental stress reduction and environmental status.'

An action plan for a given time period need not be a long document. For each agency has limited resources and will only be able to implement a limited number of actions, largely their existing programme plus one or two new ones. Monitoring these actions and developing indicators for them should similarly not be a large task.

6.6 Monitoring an implementation plan, not the whole NBSAP

The approach recommended is to develop a detailed monitoring framework around a smallish group of actions that make up the priorities being addressed within a given time-frame (2-5 years). This framework would consist of the three types of indicator as appropriate.

In addition, any new project started should have indicators built into it. For example most NBSAP's identify a range of threatened species and actions required to conserve them. It would be a very lengthy process to go through the plan and develop indicators for each. However indicators should be developed at the point that action on any one starts.

6.7 Combining monitoring of NBSAP and other plans

The National Capacity Self-Assessment Process (NCSA) provides an opportunity to look at combining monitoring of actions on biodiversity conservation, climate change and land degradation as it works across the three Conventions involved.

Over time it will be important to having targets, actions and indicators that match across regional and national programmes, e.g. NBSAPs, Action Strategy for Nature Conservation, Island Programme of Work. The recently appointed 'Monitoring and Evaluation Consultant' (for the Roundtable for Nature Conservation) clearly has a role here. The TOR includes a statement: The workshop session served to introduce the issue of monitoring and evaluation and how this was made easier by NBSAP's containing well defined objectives and actions. Countries still developing NBSAPs have the opportunity to bring the two together in their documents. Others are encouraged to develop specific short-term action plans, covering an interval between two and five years, and develop detailed monitoring of these.

The process of developing the indicators required for effective monitoring was best done by working both at the national and regional level.

NBSAP Coordinators present agreed that monitoring and evaluation was one of the critical issues facing NBSAP development and implementation. While there are clearly common issues that could use common solutions, it seems that discussions are needed on an individual country basis on the best way for each to proceed, and what role a combined workshop might have. The following action point was thus agreed. The responses can be used to identify the support coordinators will need to develop their M&E system.

Action point: *It was agreed that all NBSAP Coordinators would write to Kate Brown and identify how they wished to proceed with monitoring and evaluation following what they had heard at the workshop.*

8. Additional Comment

The future of the national NBSAP coordinators is a key issue. Many have been funded as contract positions during the strategy development and 'add-on' phases and countries are then accommodating them as a new position, or adding their responsibilities to an existing position, within the Governmental environment agency. The coordinator role seems an important, ongoing one, and some countries may need ongoing assistance to ensure that there is enough time available to devote to it. Key activities for coordinators would be promoting their strategies, coordinating monitoring and evaluation, and reporting. Clearly there are opportunities for combining such work on the three strategies covered by NCSA within the one position.

There also seems strong benefit in coordinators continuing to operate as a group, with resources available to bring them together periodically and to foster communication between meetings. Just as they were able to share experiences to improve strategy development, so they can equally do the same in the vital work of implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Day 3

- Tepa welcomed everyone to the final day of the workshop. He also welcomed Liz Dovey and Bwere Eretaia to the meeting.
- He conducted a quick recap of the previous day's work (monitoring and valuation as a tool to assist in developing and implementing NBSAP processes).
- He outlined the work for the day ahead including the work on National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA). He observed that this was an approach to support countries implement the three Rio conventions CBD, Climate Change and Desertification.

8 National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA)

- Kate observed that this GEF process should provide a valuable opportunity for countries to understand their obligations under the three Rio conventions (CBD, Desertification and Climate Change) as well as to develop capacity to implement those obligations, including the opportunity to prioritise capacity issues.
- Observed that there is a Pacific support mechanism to support the NCSA process. The overall NCSA process will produce reports and actions plans to guide the work of the GEF in building capacity in the future and these will be developed by individual countries.
- Work to be conducted includes:
 - preparation of a situation analysis;
 - selection of priority issues; and
 - identify of capacity constraints.
- In relation to the CBD, NCSA will involve consideration of NBSAPs and other relevant information/work. SPREP has produced a matrix to assist countries understand their obligations under the CBD.
- Kate stated that she wanted to introduce the matrix during the meeting and support discussion as needed.
- Re NBSAP, Kate stated that the NBSAP has to be included in the NCSA if countries are to implement their NBSAPs effectively. Accordingly, a critical issue for countries should be to identify what the priorities are for them to incorporate to their NCSA that relate to the CBD. They would also need to consider how to prioritise these.
- Tepa brought the delegates up to date on the status of Samoa in conducting the NCSA. He observed that Samoa was keen to implement the three conventions themselves. Therefore, the NCSA was important to facilitate that.
- Kate observed that the completion of the NCSA can increase scope for future GEF funding. She observed that this was a chance to support in-country capacity priority issues (provided they are in line with the conventions).

- She observed that the Pacific is probably one of the slowest regions globally to join the NCSA process. Tepa observed that, by considering the priorities in capacity for each of the three conventions, then identifying which areas are common to the three, it is easier to fulfil the NCSA.
- Dominique observed that the identification of national capacity needs is also helpful to build capacity in other areas outside the conventions.

8.1 Break out groups

- Kate invited delegates to break into two groups, led by Liz Dovey and Tepa Suaesi to discuss how the NCSA process could work for their countries. Delegates were provided with a list of questions to address and to provide feedback after discussion.
- On behalf of Group 1, Kulaea Kilisimasi reported on Tonga's prioritisation process for the NCSA. Kulaea started by introducing her stock take report that was conducted to support the development of the NBSAP. She advised that Tonga subsequently developed a matrix to assist stakeholders consider which of the items on the stock take were most important to them. That way, they could identify the NBSAP priority areas. This can be used to assist in the NCSA. She observed that the matrix might yet be revised as consultations were only conducted with two communities so far but it has provided a good start.
- Joel Miles noted that, in Palau, workshops had been conducted to ensure that NBSAPs included all stakeholder issues. However, several communities felt that the resulting draft strategy did not reflect their community's priorities and expectations. Joel explained that this was because the final draft reports had synthesised the priorities of individual villages. Although the text was intended to reflect the synthesis of these issues, the explicit working was lost or hidden in the process. Now the reports include the findings of the different villages and note in the text that those issues are included in the general strategy.

9 Update on the preparation of third national reports

- Tony Torea of UNDP reported on the issue of third national reports, observing that each country has US\$20000 to prepare their third national report. Any money left over following the preparation of the report can be used for training.
- He observed some of the requirements of the UNDP that countries must observe.
- He observed that UNDP is the executing agency. National agencies are required to explain where the money is to be deposited (eg., biodiversity trust fund). Observed that UNDP may be requested to provide 'support services' in which case UNDP can spend the money on behalf of the country (especially useful where consultants are used).
- Tony observed that countries worry about the beaurocracy and delays associated with UNDP. However, he observed that, providing countries provide UNDP with the correct documentation, payments should be fast tracked and there should be little need for delays. He advised countries to work on completing their documentation and on working together with the UNDP to meet everyone's needs ASAP.
- Kate added the guidelines for the preparation of third national reports will be contained on the CD to be distributed to delegates at the end of the meeting. She

added that SPREP has incorporated CBD targets into the SPREP action plan. She also highlighted that country profiles aligned to the SPREP Action Plan were being developed and that someone at SPREP is working on indicators that can be used for this. This would hopefully enable collective reporting.

10 Status of clearing house mechanisms (CHMs)

- Tepa asked about opportunities to assist in completing NBSAPs. He observed that clearing house mechanisms may form one of them. He therefore invited delegates to share their views on the issue of clearing house mechanisms.
- **Elizabeth Munro from the Cook Islands** reported that the Cook Islands have tried to develop a web site where all environmental issues are accessible. It is linked to the biodiversity database (established by Gerald McCormack). The web site notes all the projects that contribute to the environment, eg., IWP, Biodiversity etc. See www.environment.org.ck
- More information is still required for the website. It is intended that NGOs and other environmental groups will also be linked to the web site.
- **Joel Miles of Palau** reported that Palau previously received assistance from a Netherlands project to establish a web site (www.palau.biodiv-chm.org)
- The web site includes the strategic plans for invasive weeds management, etc.
- This web site is still to be completed and this necessitates a dedicated person to work on this but that may take some time.
- **Bwere Eretaia of Kiribati** reported that they are still trying to get the information lodged on the web. They are using a person from Canada to do this since it is too expensive to get someone into Kiribati to do this locally. Kiribati needs to flesh out the information so this awaits the finalisation of work from NBSAP consultations. The information will then be lodged.
- **John Genolagani of PNG** observed that the country already had an environmental web site established under a previous project but that this web site has been abandoned when the project finished and this meant that the database had been lost (together with the NBSAP report). He observed that land use information is held by the Department of Agriculture and that the National Statistics Office has some good information (including consumer price index and village information) tied to the national electoral roll. DoE only holds some of this information. He stated that PNG is trying to prepare an inventory on databases and then facilitate coordination of these databases. David Mitchell observed that a lot of relevant PNG information is held overseas (eg., types of plant species and their locations). This information will also need to be considered. Mark Fornwall added that PNG is the only country which is part of the Global Biodiversity Information Forum (GBIF).
- **Kulaea Kilisimasi of Tonga** observed that each environmental project is to be added to the DoE web site. The information is to be added to the NBSAP database. The information should be accessible by the end of the year?
- **Enate Evi of Tuvalu** stated that work on their web is about to start.
- **Jo Horokou of the Solomon Islands** observed that no CHM yet exists.
- **Leah Nimoho from Vanuatu** commented that they attempted to establish a web site, through the NBSAP, using a consultant. A web site is up and running but she did not have the address with her. The DoE will be requesting the NBSAP CHM consultant to provide training for local stakeholders to be able to update the web site. She also observed that, because of the cost, the DoE are

considering linking to other agencies such as SPC, SPREP and so on. She added that databases exist in DoE for different sectors (biodiversity, forestry and so on). They are looking to see how the databases can be shared. There are some challenges. For instance, some stakeholders have less ability to share data than others while different databases involve the use of different software.

- **Tepa Suaesi of Samoa** advised that Samoa has a web site up and running covering a number of environmental sectors. The MoE also has a number of internal databases. They also have an internet network which links different Departments and thus enables fast sharing of information. Some Departments are more expensive to involve in this (eg., Forestry) but they are considering how to streamline links. There may be scope to draw on the Meteorology section of MoE to support information sharing. The MoE also has a GIS user group which helps the different departments (Forestry, Biodiversity) to support their information management.
- Dave Butler noted that a bibliography of reports had been published for some countries such as Samoa and Niue and that this keeps people abreast of information.
- Tony Torea of PNG observed that data is often used by other external stakeholders in overseas forums. The government of PNG is therefore considering the need to manage use and to ensure that external stakeholders gain permission before using information.
- Dominique Benzaken asked what the mechanisms were to ensure that researchers share the information they generate in-country with the government. Elizabeth Munroe of the Cook Islands stated that external projects used to have to be cleared through a government research committee with the Prime Minister's Department but that this committee has recently stalled. Approval is now mainly conducted through the relevant departments. If approved, researchers are given a permit. Permits must report on the findings of their work. Reports are held with, among other departments, the Prime Minister's department as well as the government library.
- Tepa Suaesi added that a similar process applies for Samoa and that researchers must apply and pay for a permit before conducting research. They must also make the results available to the government. However, enforcing this process takes some effort.

11 Other opportunities

11.1 Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum (PBIF)

- Mark Fornwall of the US Geological Survey presented on the Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum. This is a project that has been on going for three years. Started in 2002, initiated under the Pacific Science Association, and aimed at sharing information in the Pacific. Have an organising committee including SPREP, USP and SPC. Started two different projects to establish the system.
- Aim is to support informed decision making in the Pacific. Have identified one goal – establish a comprehensive electronic knowledge base that is accessible to all.
- Aim is to link to existing information, develop bibliographies that cover information in the region. This will help understand what information already

exists. Seek to provide access via the network but also other forms of technology as required (since not all countries have good internet access), such as CDs.

- They will provide outreach activities.
- Will partner with Pacinet.
- Seek to establish a PBIF web site to access the information.
- The Pacific Disaster Centre has recently joined the PBIF and will be able to provide some mapping.
- Working with partners to establish a checklist of flora in Polynesia.
- Mark invited delegates to advise how the PBIF can assist the NBSAP process in the future.
- Tepa advised that countries would need training in how to properly document and analyse specimens. Mark observed that, in the US, they are aiming to help link different databases from different states to compare across them.
- Dave Butler observed the need to keep databases up to date. Mark agreed and stated that this meant that it is important to keep the databases in the hands of those who start them off so they are maintained properly.
- Allen Allison observed that there is a need to integrate lists of species across the region as different countries use different names for the same species.

11.2 Coastal and marine opportunities at SPREP

- Dominique Benzaken, Coastal Management Adviser of SPREP, advised a number of initiatives at SPREP that can contribute to NBSAP development and implementation:
 - Coral Reef Initiative for the South Pacific (CRISP), CMS, MOU;
 - Management of migratory species; and
 - Protection of wetlands under the RAMSAR Convention.

Coral Reef Initiative for the South Pacific (CRISP), CMS, MOU

- Dominique observed that the CRISP is funded by France and covers:
 - MPA and watershed management (managed by Conservation International in collaboration with other NGOs);
 - Coral reef ecosystems, functions, rehabilitation and use (IRD in New Caledonia); and
 - Dissemination and adoption of outcomes (managed by SPREP).
- The SPREP element will reflect:
 - institutional strengthening for integrated coastal management (legislation, mechanisms for streamlining coastal issues into decision making)
 - management;
 - capacity building.
- Plan to build on the work of other projects (eg., IWP, World Fish) as well as working closely with countries.
- The project will develop databases and provide training to countries in the use of databases and management issues.

Management of migratory species

- Noted that SPREP has a Regional Marine Species Conservation Programme which had recently stalled due to lack of staff, However, new staff soon due on board so efforts on this will soon be stepped up.

- Are developing MoUs to support implementation of the Convention on Migratory Species in relation to cetaceans and marine turtles. The establishment of a database on turtles is also underway at SPREP.

Protection of wetlands under the RAMSAR Convention

- Provide support and assistance to participating countries, including communications and awareness activities and policy development.

11.3 Birdlife Alliance

Liz Dovey of SPREP gave a brief introduction to the Birdlife Alliance which is a partnership of local NGOs in the Pacific region aligned to an international NGO. This alliance is seen as one of the region's key players in bird conservation.

11.4 PPCII, Pacific Invasive Learning Network (PILN)

Liz also introduced participants to the Pacific Partnership for the Cooperative Islands Initiative which is an invasives project based out of NZ which undertakes demonstration projects in Pacific island countries.

PILN is the Pacific Invasive Learning Network has developed to empower effective invasive species management through a participant driven network that meets priority needs, rapidly shares skills and resources, provides links to technical expertise, increases information exchange and accelerates on the ground action.

12 Preparation for Roundtable Meeting

Developing a Charter for the NBSAP WG

Two working groups formed to discuss the development of a charter for the NBSAP Working Group and what they thought was critical to take to the Roundtable meeting in the following week.

Reports from Working Groups:

- Want to have another column in the Action Strategy to reflect national progress.
- They believe it is important for government to be involved in the Roundtable due to where NBSAPs are in terms of implementation.
- Suggest to have a checklist to check that things are done against the AS objectives.
- Good to get high level political support by making it a competition between countries.
- Wanted to separate what will be a national and what will be a regional issue.
- Want to report on the success of the whole NBSAP.
- Want countries to work together with other countries that are on the same level with their NBSAP. Believe the current situation is very important in order to help people.
- Regional strategies pull us together and there is a need for people to attend the meeting, to participate, to report in order to enable others to help and let us know what is really needed to implement.
- Useful process to focus on the targets for the long run as it gives a clear goal.
- Communications – for NBSAP coordinators – email network, what do they need?, suggestion to move on to phone conference.
- NBSAP people help each other complete NBSAP.
- Is Pacific being forgotten in terms of resource allocation?

- How to build support for environment at all levels.
 - The regional strategy targets must be linked to the national NBSAP. Because what is happening on the national level should be reflected and their needs to be a link.
 - Reflects on the implementation of national NBSAPs and SPREP should have a regional status report. This gives RT partners some ideas of where support is required and reflects the national level situation. Packaged countries at the last RT – countries not started, etc. Where should we be focusing the discussion on a country level?
 - Do we have measures of having offers of support based on the performance of the country – those that haven't started etc..
 - SPREP will do a lot of work to ensure that the regional tasks are clearly linked to the national level. A lot of the regional tasks have been done and needs to be reflected in the reporting system. Then can be shared between each other and then report nationally to government and political leaders and decision makers. Focus on commitment – if RT people make commitments they need real work to be carried out.
 - Support secured but nothing really happening. For countries are doing well how can they be involved – regionalism argument. Bottom line is that politicians can see this is how we are now working with the regional institutions that were set up and provide advice to countries. Need to ensure that leaders know what we are doing and what assistance CROP agencies are providing.
 - If you know each stage of each NBSAP then there can be mentoring between countries.
 - Core targets of the NBSAP WG from the Action Strategy 2.2.1, 2.2.2
 - Role of coordinators is to concentrate on coordinating things so that the NBSAP can be maintained in country – promoter, lobbyist, negotiator, facilitator, monitoring, implementation, point of contact.
- Instead of doing everything work out those people that have roles in the NBSAP and enable them to actually play their role.

Actions:

Will host a ½ or 1 day workshop for orienting the agencies with roles in the NBSAP and the Action Strategy to familiarize with the NBSAP with RTMG and or members of the group. Think it is very important right now. Timeframe: between now and June 2006. Have at least one member of the RTMG and copresent the Action Strategy and relate it to the different things happening in country. NBSAP person could be the person organizing the workshop.

Target every country by the next conference. This could develop the matrix that Pati is talking about.

Would be the key contact point for the other RT Working Groups to get access nationally.

NBSAP WORKING GROUP CHARTER

1. Scope and Purpose

Understanding that the NBSAP is a critical framework to address priority biodiversity issues in Pacific island countries and to implement the regional Action Strategy.

We will therefore focus on implementation of NBSAPs in objectives 2.2, especially targets 2.2.1 and 2.2.2

2.2.1 Implement NBSAPS or their equivalent through a national co-ordination mechanism in all PICTs

2.2.2 Integrate NBSAPs into the development plans of at least 5 PICTs
Recognising that NBSAP implementation will facilitate attachments of all Action Strategy Objectives.

The Working Group exists for the purpose above and also to promote NBSAPs to Roundtable members and to facilitate cooperation between various national efforts

Desired outcomes:

Mainstream and get high-level political support to develop and implement the NBSAP.

Emphasizes that NBSAPs should be at their core result in people being better off in terms of livelihoods and wellbeing of communities.

Commitments:

Work with other Roundtable members to address the following key issues:

- Baseline assessments and information for decision making
- Community support and ownership
- Whole of government endorsement
- Having sufficient administrative capacity and staff member dedicated to implementation
- Adequate financing for implementation

Ensure that NBSAP implementation issues are considered in the development of the National Capacity South Assessment.

NBSAP coordinators to be points of contact and national focal points for the promotion and implementation of the Nature Conservation Action Strategy at the national and local levels.

Will continue to work with the Clearing House Mechanism and the Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum as means to enable sound decision-making.

Will encourage support and advocacy for the Island Biodiversity Program of Work at COP 8, GEF Council Meetings and other opportunities and urges attention to its eventual implementation.

Will work closely with the Roundtable for Nature Conservation to enable assistance to governments for NBSAP implementation.

Will work on developing a project to improve monitoring and evaluation.

[statement 25.07.05]

Will work on improving monitoring and evaluation of NBSAPs as a means to track and "ground-truthing" implementation of the Nature Conservation Action Strategy Monitoring and evaluation should both strengthen the link between the NBSAP and the Nature Conservation Action Strategy and further clarify regional and national ongoing and potential actions for nature conservation in the region.

Expected products

Updated PPAD.

Quarterly reports to RT members

Website

Membership and contact details

All current NBSAP Coordinators

Annex 2

STATEMENT OF THE NBSAP WORKING GROUP MEETING, ALOTAU, PNG, 20-22 JULY 2005

The 2nd Meeting of the NBSAP Working Group of the Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation, in Alotau, Papua New Guinea.

Reaffirms that the NBSAP and similar national biodiversity strategies are critical frameworks for addressing priority biodiversity issues in Pacific island countries and other territories

Highlights the need for mainstreaming and high level political support to develop and implement the NBSAP.

Emphasizes that NBSAPs should at their core result in people being better off in terms of livelihoods and wellbeing of communities.

Identifies the critical issues facing NBSAP development and implementation in the Pacific region to be:

- Baseline assessments and information for decision making
- Community support and ownership
- Whole of government endorsement
- Having sufficient capacity and staff member dedicated to development and implementation
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Adequate financing for implementation

Recognizes the value of the NCSA as a process to integrate national sustainable development priorities with biodiversity priorities and to address key capacity issues across the Rio conventions (CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD) synergistically.

Recognizes the key role NBSAP coordinators play as points of contacts and national focal points for promoting and coordinating the implementation of the Nature Conservation Action Strategy at the national and local levels.

Acknowledges work undertaken in the Pacific in relation to the Clearing House Mechanism (CHM) and the Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum (PBIF) as means to enable sound decision-making but requests consideration of means of access for communities and other stakeholders.

Requests the consideration of a more streamlined and simple reporting system for conventions to lessen the reporting burden on countries.

Encourages support and advocacy at all levels to support the Island Biodiversity Program of Work at COP 8, GEF Council Meetings and other opportunities and urges attention to its eventual implementation.

Asks the Roundtable for Nature Conservation to continue to assist governments with NBSAP implementation.

Urges the international community to actively address, during the 4th GEF replenishment round, the financial requirements for the implementation of a Program of Work on Island Biodiversity.

Requests the GEF and its implementing agencies to make island biodiversity a priority particularly the implementation of NBSAP in small islands developing states.

Requests that monitoring and evaluation of NBSAP be addressed both regionally and nationally – that the monitoring of NBSAP be seen as the tracking of the ground truthing implementation of the Nature Conservation Action Strategy, and that monitoring and evaluation should both strengthen the link between the NBSAP and the Nature Conservation Action Strategy and further clarify regional and national ongoing and potential actions for nature conservation in the region.

PRESENTATION ON THE MEETING RESULTS

The meeting was attended by NBSAP coordinators or representatives from:

1. Cook Islands (Elizabeth)
2. Kiribati (Bwere)
3. Nauru (Tyrone)
4. Palau (Joel)
5. Papua New Guinea (John)
6. Samoa (Pati)
7. Solomon Islands (Joe)
8. Tonga (Kulaea)
9. Tuvalu (Enate)
10. Vanuatu (Leah)

and staff from following seven organisations

1. SPREP (Kate, Paula, Dominique, Liz & Theresa)
2. PBIF (Mark)
3. Bishop Museum (Allen)
4. Consultant (David)
5. CI (Dave & Peter)
6. UNDP (Tony)
7. Education Milne Bay (Simon)

Annex 3

Participants List

COOK ISLANDS

Ms. Elizabeth Munro
NBSAP Add On Project Coordinator
Environment Service
PO Box 371
RAROTONGA
Cook Islands

Phone: (682) 21 256
Fax: (682) 22 256
Email: liz@environment.org.ck

KIRIBATI

Mr. Bwere Eretaia
NBSAP Coordinator
Kiribati Government
PO Box 234, Bikenibeu
TARAWA
Kiribati

Phone : (686) 28000
Fax : (686) 28334
Email : bsap.ecd@meland.gov.ki

NAURU

Mr. Tyrone Deiyer
Secretary Island Development & Industry
Main Government Building
Yaren District
Nauru

Phone : (674) 444 3133
Fax : (674) 44 3891
Email : tdeiyer@cenpac.net.nr

NEW ZEALAND

Mr. David Butler
Biodiversity Consultant
588, Brook Street
Nelson
New Zealand

Phone : (643) 545 7127
Fax : (643) 545 7127
Email : d.butler@xtra.co.nz

PALAU

Mr. Joel Miles
Chief Terrestrial Unit
Office of Environmental Response &
Coordination
Office of the President of the Republic of Palau
PO Box 7086
96940 PW Koror
Palau

Phone : (680) 4886950
Fax : (680) 4888638
Email : jmiles@palau-oerc.net

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Mr. John Genolagani
Assistant Secretary
Department of Environment and Conservation
PO Box 6601
Boroko, NCD
Papua New Guinea

Phone : (675) 325 0195
Fax : (675) 325 0182
Email : biodiv@daltron.com.pg

SAMOA

Mr. Faumuina Pati Liu
Assistant Chief Executive Officer
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
APIA
Samoa

Phone: (685) 31197/31198
Fax: (685) 25856/23176
Email: Pati.Liu@mnre.gov.ws

Mr. Tapa Suaesi
Principle Terrestrial Conservation Officer
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Private Mail Bag
APIA
Samoa

Phone: (685) 30100
Fax: (685) 25869
Email: Tapa.Suaesi@mnre.gov.ws

SOLOMON ISLANDS

Mr. Joe Horokou
Deputy Director
Environment and Conservation Division
Department of Forests, Environment & Conservation
P O Box G24
HONIARA
Solomon Islands

Phone : (677) 28802
Fax : (677) 22824
Email : horokoujoe@hotmail.com

TONGA

Ms. Kulaea Kilisimasi
Project Officer (NBSAP)
NBSAP Project - Department of Environment
Department of Environment
PO Box 917
Vuna Road
NUKUALOFA
Kingdom of Tonga

Phone: (676) 27 644
Fax: (676) 25 051
Email: kulaea@hotmail.com

TUVALU

Mr. Enate E. Taua'a
Deputy Director
Office of the Prime Minister
Private Mail Bag
Vaiaku, FUNAFUTI
Tuvalu

Phone: (688) 20 815 ext 180
Fax: (688) 20113
Email: enate_e@yahoo.co.nz
biodiversity@tuvalu.tv
enviro@tuvalu.tv

VANUATU

Ms. Leah Nimoho
IWP National Coordinator - Vanuatu
Environment Unit
Private Mail Bag 9063
Port Vila,
Vanuatu

Phone : (678) 25302
Fax : (678) 25165
Email : iwp-vanuatu@vanuatu.com.vu

BISHOP MUSEUM

Mr. Allen Allison
Vice President Science
Bishop Museum
1525 Bernice Street
Honolulu HI 96817-2704
United States of America

Phone : (808) 8484145
Fax : (808) 8478252
Email : allison@hawaii.edu

PACIFIC SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Mr. Lu Eldredge
Executive Secretary
Pacific Science Association
1525 Bernice Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96817
United States of America

Phone : (808) 848 4139
Fax : (808) 847 8252
Email : psa@bishopmuseum.org

CONSERVATION INTERNATIONAL

Mr. David Mitchell
Conservation International - PNG
Milne Bay Project
PO Box 804, Alotau
Milne Bay Province
Papua New Guinea

Phone : (675) 6410349
Fax : (675) 6410359
Email : dmitchell@conservation.org

Mr Peter Mackay
Project Manager
Conservation International - PNG
Milne Bay Project
PO Box 804, Alotau
Milne Bay Province
Papua New Guinea

Phone : (675) 6410349
Fax : (675) 6410359
Email : pmackay@conservation.org

Mr. Paul Maolai
Communications Officers
Conservation International
PO Box 804 Alotau
Milne Bay Province
Papua New Guinea

Phone : (675) 6410349
Fax : (675) 6410359
Email : pmaolai@yahoo.com.au

PACIFIC BIODIVERSITY INFORMATION FORUM/US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Mr. Mark Fornwall
Coordinator
Pacific Biodiversity Information Forum/ US
Geological Survey

Phone : (808) 9843724
Fax : (808) 2421128
Email : mark_fornwall@usgs.gov

UNDP – PNG

Mr. Tony Torea
National Programme Officer - Environment
UNDP
PO Box 1041
Port Moresby, NCD
Papua New Guinea

Phone : (675) 321 2877
Fax : (675) 321 1224
Email : tony.torea@undp.org

SPREP SECRETARIAT

PO Box 240
Apia
Samoa

Phone: (685) 21 929
Fax: (685) 20 231
Email: sprep@sprep.org

Ms. Dominique Benzaken
Coastal Management Adviser
Email : dominiqueb@sprep.org

Ms. Kate Brown
Action Strategy Adviser
Email : kateb@sprep.org

Ms. Paula Holland
Natural Resources Economist
Email: paulah@sprep.org

Ms Liz Dovey
Bird Conservation and Invasives Officer
Email: lizd@sprep.org

Theresa Fruean
Programme Assistant
Email: theresaf@sprep.org

Rep. of the Marshall Islands
NBSAP Implementation Update to the
NBSAP Working Group Meeting
Alotau, PNG July 2005

Using 3rd CBD reports and other information – are you able to provide an inventory of biodiversity work in your country to date – eg status of established CCAs, completed and ongoing enabling projects, monitoring and general state of biodiversity at this stage. This can be done in conjunction with updating the spreadsheet of Protected Areas in the Pacific. (spreadsheet attached). If available can you report on progress with this.

The RMI is currently working on its 3rd National Report to the CBD COP. General information is currently being compiled on the components of biodiversity deemed important for the RMI:

- *Ecosystems of scientific and cultural significance*
- *Biological resources that are significant in the Marshallese culture, as well as being of scientific interest, such as the cultivars of pandanus in the country*
- *Traditional concepts and practices about conservation of biological diversity (mo)*
- *Traditional knowledge about biological diversity and biological resources, their origin and cultural significance*
- *Traditional knowledge about resource uses*

General information on research being undertaken is to be included particularly in relation to current work in the establishment of protected areas and targeted studies on species deemed important culturally, economically and scientifically.

A lot of the information collected thus far is based on marine assessments undertaken through a multi-agency group spearheaded by the Marshall Islands Marine Resource Authority with assistance from SPC and the National Resource Assessment Survey Team coordinated by the College of the Marshall Islands. Both groups have been an important means for building local capacity in monitoring & identification as student volunteers studying marine science at CMI are utilized for the resource assessments. The assessments started in 2003, for the purpose of assisting communities to develop marine resource management plans (including establishment of mpa's). Currently more than 5 outer islands have completed marine resource assessments. The scientific assessments along with atoll workshops have helped to form a preliminary assessment of the status of marine resources in the Marshall Islands. Further funding assistance is being sought to complete similar assessments for the remaining islands.

For those countries who are implementing their NBSAPs can you use the following guidance:

Relationship with development planning/mainstreaming What were the sources of financing for the development and implementation of the NBSAP?

<i>BSAP development was funded through GEF funding for enabling activities. Implementation is currently carried with funding through regional projects, biodiversity add-on funds for enabling activities, and national government.</i>

To what extent has the process been internalised in the government's budgets and development planning?

<i>Has been incorporated into the Vision 2018: RMI 15 year development plan. Has also been incorporated into the RMI Environmental Protection Authority Strategic Plan 2004-2007 & the draft Ministry of Resources & Development Strategy and Action Plan 2005-2010.</i>
<i>Newly created departments include the establishment of the Biodiversity Conservation Department within the RMI Environmental Protection Authority in 2000 and creation of the Office of Environmental Planning & Policy Coordination to facilitate national implementation of MEAs</i>
Does the NBSAP address biodiversity as a crosscutting theme across different sectors such as agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism, and water resources management?
<i>Yes. There are 5 strategic themes: Conservation of Biodiversity and Biological Resources, Protection of Marine Biodiversity, Traditional Culture and Practices, People and Biodiversity and Biotechnology & Biodiversity</i>
To what extent has the NBSAP been picked up and expressed in the annual and long term development plans of the different government sectors?
<i>Please see response above</i>
Did the NBSAP receive high level political backing?
<i>Yes</i>
How has this been expressed in terms of economic and development policy?
<i>Please see above</i>
Implementation What steps are being taken in your country to implement the provisions in the NBSAP?
<i>As mentioned above, steps taken include integrating key actions into strategic planning process for key ministries & agencies. Further steps are still under discussion.</i>
What have been the country's main biodiversity management achievements?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Previously, biodiversity goals and actions were not expressed other than in the NBSAP. Key management achievements are the initial integration into strategies and action plans.</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>Successful in-country training that is being undertaken by the College of the Marshall Islands Marine Science Department and the practical use of that training for further research in marine biodiversity in the RMI.</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>The identification and integration of mo's (traditional taboos) into the existing community based resource management projects and plans.</i>
To what extent did these achievements stem from the NBSAP process?
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>the NBSAP was the first national strategy for biodiversity in the RMI, it provides a reference to conservation professionals in the RMI</i>

2. <i>Key partnerships were formed initially through the NBSAP process ie. Members of the Biodiversity Planning Group collaborate on other projects such as the community based fisheries management project</i>
What capacity is there in your country to implement the provisions of NBSAPs?
1. <i>Capacity is still highly constrained, however in-country training opportunities for conservation & resource management has improved- human resources are still limited to a handful of individuals covering a huge workload</i>
What are the strengths and limitations in that capacity?
2. <i>Limitations are human resource constraints, strengths include the ability to collaborate more effectively in smaller groups</i>
What measures are being taken to build the needed capacity?
2. <i>Information is currently being compiled on available training opportunities to address some of the gaps identified in Capacity Building Needs Assessment</i>
What are the main obstacles and constraints being faced in implementing the NBSAP?
1. <i>Land tenure issues</i>
What steps are being taken to overcome the constraints?
1. <i>Involvement of traditional leaders is essential, buy-in is key. Awareness workshops with communities are undertaken by the RMI Environmental Protection Authority Education & Awareness division, additional workshops are conducted by Marshall Islands Marine Resource Authority & CMI as part of the community based fisheries management project have also been undertaken</i>
What are the main institutions involved in implementation of the NBSAP? What are the main mechanisms and tools being used for the management of biodiversity (for example, protected areas systems; and maintenance of crop diversity)?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Main institutions involved are: Marshall Islands Marine Resource Authority, RMI Environmental Protection Authority, Office of Environmental Planning & Policy Coordination, Min. of Resources & Development and Min. of Internal Affairs</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Main Tools are currently through establishment of marine protected areas, re-establishment of traditional taboos (mo's), information collection and awareness & education for communities</i>
Monitoring and follow-up
What systems, procedures, responsibilities and indicators have been developed to monitor progress in NBSAP implementation?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>In strategic action plans that have incorporated elements of NBSAP, monitoring is undertaken are part of organizations responsibilities.</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has a major review of the NBSAP and its implementation ever been undertaken? If yes what were the main findings and recommendations?
No
<p>Lessons learnt What are the lessons learnt: during the development of NBSAP and during its implementation? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the NBSAP with respect to the process of development at national and/or local levels; mode of implementation; and sensitivity to your country's special biodiversity resource management needs.</p>
<p><i>The use of western terms ie. "Marine Protected Areas" is significantly different from traditional concepts ie. "Mo". Developing a common understanding between conservation professionals of the approach to take has been identified as an area that needs special attention to avoid further confusion when undertaking awareness programs in the community. Particularly as MPA is a very general term.</i></p>
<p>Summary of key lessons from the NBSAP process <i>Currently we are looking into re-organizing the structure of the project. During the NBSAP development phase the standard structure was to have a "Steering Committee" and "Planning Group". However other options are being considered to better address implementation at the national level ie. linking more with bodies such as the National Commission on Sustainable Development</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>For funding opportunities expedited procedures for proposals which fall under NBSAP</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Features that have worked well is the network of people that has formed nationally, regionally and internationally. For the RMI the NBSAP is a useful reference and justifies support for future projects & programs.</i>