



PROJECT DESIGN CONSULTATION OF THE SECOND PHASE OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT

SUMMARY RECORD OF DISCUSSION

Noumea, New Caledonia

8 March 2013

Opening

1. The Project Design Stakeholder Consultation (the Consultation) for the second phase of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFMP II) was convened at the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) headquarters in Noumea, New Caledonia on the 8 March 2013.
2. Participants included representatives from small-island developing States (SIDS), the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO). Observers at the meeting included representatives from AusAID, French Polynesia and Tokelau. Apologies were received from Palau, the Marshall Islands and the Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA). The OFMP II Lead Design Consultant facilitated the Consultation. A list of participants is appended as **Attachment A**.

Opening Remarks

3. The Deputy Director General (DDG) of FFA welcomed all participants to the Consultations, He outlined the history of the project's development, noting that this was the third time that consultations have been held for the proposed OFMP II project. In explaining the purpose of the meeting, the FFA DDG stated that the current aim is to have a Project Document fully developed for formal submission to GEF by June with an anticipated rollout to participating member countries by the fourth quarter of 2013. He noted that the OFMP I had made important contributions to the enhancement of SIDS' fisheries management capacity and thereby advanced the goals of GEF. The FFA DDG encouraged participants to actively engage in this design consultation so that the final project document would reflect accurately the desired outputs for countries.
4. The meeting agreed to the draft work schedule appended as **Attachment B** as presented by the Facilitator, who also introduced the Project Design Team.

PIF and Progress to Date

5. The Facilitator provided the Consultation with an update on the progress, noting that the GEF Council had approved the Project Identification Form (PIF) for the Project in June 2012 with UNDP and FAO as Implementing Agencies, the FFA as the lead Executing Agency and a budget of US\$10 million for the 4-year project cycle.

Update on GEF by UNDP

6. The Regional Technical Advisor from UNDP Bangkok emphasised that one of the corner stones of the GEF is that the project should be country driven and noted that the bulk of work of

identifying country needs for OFMP II has been completed and would be reflected in the Project Document. He urged countries to participate actively in the project as they have done in the past. He further stated that as the Implementing Agencies for OFMP II the FAO/UNDP partnership would support the project based on their respective advantages and that both agencies will be available through the day for any consultations that may be needed

7. The Regional Technical Advisor reiterated the next steps as being a target date for Project Document submission to GEF no later than June 2013, approval and set up processes in August and project start up during the last quarter of 2013 or the first quarter in 2014.

8. He also noted that while Tokelau had benefitted in the past in GEF 5, the GEF considered that territories of developed countries would not be financed from GEF sources, although this does not prevent them from project participation so long as funding is from another source. The FFA advised that to ensure that Tokelau does enjoy the benefits of OFMP II activities, separate funding would be sourced.

The Role of FAO and UNDP

9. The representative for FAO briefly described the roles of the Implementing Agencies as essentially one that will review of expenditure, conduct supervision missions, evaluation, review of implementation and the provision of financial reports to GEF. The costs of these activities will be covered by a fee that GEF provides and will not come out of the Project budget.

10. He explained how the two agencies will operate with FAO working through Samoa regional office with back-stopping from Rome and UNDP from its offices in Bangkok, Fiji and New York.

11. In response to a query from the representative from the Federated States of Micronesia on possible duplication of work between the two Implementing Agencies it was explained that the partnership between FAO and UNDP is expected to strengthen support to the project and their specific roles would be come clearer as the Consultation considered the project in more detail.

Proposed Project Structure

12. The OFMP II Project Design Team Technical Consultant provided an overview of the project stating the aims as being, 'to support Pacific SIDS in meeting their obligations to implement and effectively enforce global, regional and sub-regional arrangements for the conservation and management of trans-boundary oceanic fisheries thereby increasing sustainable benefits derived from these fisheries'.

13. The 4-year project design with a budget of \$10 million is spread across four technical components: Regional Actions for Eco-system based Management; Sub-regional Actions for Eco-system based Management; National Actions for Eco-system based Management; and Coordination and Knowledge Management. In addition to the two Implementing Agencies and the lead Executing Agency, other project partnerships include principal support by SPC, Office of the Parties to the Nauru Agreement (OPNA) Secretariat for the Te Vaka Moana (TVM), Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA) and the Pacific Programme of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF Pac).

Country Reports

14. The OFMP II National Technical Consultant presented a summary of the country report outcomes relating to the potential contribution that OFMP II might make to enhancing fisheries management in each country. These covered six main areas: law and policy; monitoring control and surveillance, observer program enhancement, support to scientific activities, assistance with boundary delimitation resolution and technical support to participation in the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organisation (SPRFMO). It was noted that there were two cross-

cutting elements: the need for support in the enhancement of fisheries information management systems and the ongoing need for support to participate in the various WCPFC associated meetings and capacity development activities.

Law, Policy & Compliance Component

Policy & Management Elements

15. The FFA Deputy Director General¹ provided an overview of the proposed policy and management outputs of the proposed Project Design which would be delivered by the Integrated Fisheries Management Team at the FFA and how these fit into the current work plan. Support is to be provided at all levels including: regional WCPFC and SPRFMO activities, the sub-regional groups TVM, PNA and the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG), as well national requirements in accordance with the national Service Level Agreements (SLA).

16. Fisheries management related activities supported through OFMPII will cover regional, sub-regional and national activities including the development and analysis of conservation and management measures (CMM), policy and management capacity building as well as the mainstreaming of bycatch management into the broader fisheries management regimes of member countries.

Monitoring Control and Surveillance (MCS) Elements

17. The FFA Director of Fisheries Operations presented an overview of the integration of MCS elements of the proposed OFMPII project into the work of the Fisheries Operations Division. He noted that the MCS elements of the project provided a good fit with the Regional MCS Strategy, particularly with respect to Goal 1 of the strategy relating to enhanced MCS, integrated with fisheries management and planning. Particular activities envisaged include support for the annual FFA MCS Working Group meeting, dockside boarding and prosecution job aids and workshops as well as attachments at the FFA Regional Fisheries Surveillance Centre (RFSC) and between members.

18. In response to a request for information from Papua New Guinea, on the proposed MCS Officer Certification course, the FFA Director of Fisheries Operations advised that course information would be made available and noted that there was a need to standardise training in this area particularly in light of PNG's National Fisheries Administration (NFA) 6-week training course and FFA's 3-week observer training course.

17. The representative from FSM requested more information on the MCS Observer component with respect to the compliance activities of observers. The Director advised that NZ Aid provided support to FFA to allow Observer report analysis of compliance and this activity included use of VMS and logsheet information for verification purposes. He further advised, that the Pacific Islands Regional Fisheries Observer Officer (PIRFO) curriculum was also enhancing compliance components of the training. A manual for de-briefers is being developed to assist national de-briefers deal with instances of reported non-compliance identified by observers.

18. The representative from Niue requested additional training for national VMS officers as countries were now able to monitor Commission registered vessels. The Director advised that the Commission is supporting additional training and countries can also utilise FFA MCS attachments for MCS officer training that should include VMS activities.

19. In response to a request for national IMS support from the representative of Vanuatu, the Director advised that this is being funded under FFA core budget and is of high priority.

¹ Formerly held the position of Director of Fisheries Management at the FFA.

Legal Elements

20. The FFA Legal Counsel, provided an overview of the FFA Legal Programme and proposed outputs from the legal components of the OFMPIO work activities. The focus of OFMPIO funding would be on national work. There will be an emphasis on the use of national legal consultants and stakeholder consultations. Particular activities will include national legislative reviews, seminars and fellowships as well as the provision of legal advice to support proper management and the eradication of IUU fishing. In relation to the assessment of climate change impacts on fisheries jurisdictions, it was noted that attention would need to be paid to the finalisation of PICs' maritime boundaries and that the FFA was working with SPC (SOPAC) on this matter.

21. The representative from FSM advised FFA that it would be seeking support from the FFA to assist with settlement of its maritime boundary with the United States.

22. In relation to the impacts on climate change to maritime boundary claims, the FAO Legal Officer outlined the FAO Technical Cooperation Programme (TCP) project proposal on 'Addressing Climate Change Impacts on Pacific SIDS Jurisdictional Claims' that is an integral part of the OFMPIO Project design. This component does not draw down on GEF funds and will require Pacific SIDS FAO members to endorse their TCP submission through the FFA as a recognised regional entity by the FAO.

Science Component

23. The SPC Oceanic Fisheries Programme (OFP) Manager advised the Consultation that the OFP work programme comprised stock assessment, data management, fishery monitoring and ecosystem monitoring and analysis with delivery occurring at all levels (regional, sub-regional and national). It is expected that OFMPIO activities would integrate into this structure to provide the outputs from the relevant sub-components.

24. With Climate Change forecasts it is intended that SEAPODYM modeling will integrate climate models to predict responses of tuna stocks to climate change at multiple time scales, with emphasis on short to medium term time scales relevant to fisheries management needs. SEAPODYM offered the possibility of analysis at the sub-regional or national scale with tuna diet analysis included in the modeling.

25. At the national level, SPC will seek to continue to support national port sampling and observer programme activities including observer training, as well as training of trainers and debriefers, from other project or programme funding. In the longer term, it is likely that the role of SPC in this area will be focused on audit and quality control responsibilities. Areas of national support that could be supported by OFMPIO include: further TUFMAN development, capacity building in stock assessment and ecosystem analysis; country specific analysis on request in support of Tuna Management Plans; national assessments of regional and sub-regional management issues (FAD closure impacts environmental impacts on the albacore fisheries).

26. A growth area in the immediate future is likely to be data management and associated capacity building (data audits, TUFMAN support, data processing support). Support for national Integrated Fisheries Information Management Systems (IFIMS) including the integration of SPC products (managing data used for science) in collaboration with FFA to develop/support national data warehouses and consolidation of national scientific data into regional databases will need attention.

Executing Partners

27. The Project Design Technical Consultant presented an overview of the activities indicated for the other project implementing partners; Parties to the Nauru Group (PNA), Te

Vaka Moana (TVM), Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA) and the World Wildlife Fund Pacific Programme (WWF).

28. The representative from Papua New Guinea noted that WWF was active in PNG and was involved in mitigation activities including the hook replacement program for longliners. He further enquired whether the Executing Agency had veto powers over publications that Executing Partners may develop and was advised that this is indeed the case.

29. The representative from Vanuatu queried the extent of the Melanesian Spearhead Group (MSG) involvement in the project and in particular how the proposed budget of \$100,000 was going to assist the Technical Advisory Council. He noted that MSG had an important role to play in fisheries management as was shown in recent Albacore management initiatives. The FFA Deputy Director advised the meeting that to date it has been very difficult to engage fully with the MSG and that there was a need to find a better way to link the work of MSG with FFC. He noted however that there was a lot of flexibility in the sub-regional component of the project and that there will be follow-up actions to find ways to enhance interaction with MSG.

30. The representative from Tuvalu requested information on the nature of the assistance to national fishermen's associations and was advised that this would be through support activities at the national level in line with WCPFC, or other regional/international and associated issues. The representative from Federated States of Micronesia noted that in terms of PNA activities, the list of priorities looked in order and he noted that the Vessel Day Scheme (VDS) was high priority for both purse seine and longline management.

Project Management

31. A brief overview of the design of the Project Management structure was presented noting that OFMPIO mirrored that which governed OFMPI but with two Implementing Agencies and excluded IUCN as a Executing Partner.

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)

32. The M&E Consultant described the Monitoring and Evaluation aspects of the project noting that this aspect had more to do with the internal processes rather and less visible to countries but which contributes to successful implementation. He pointed out that the aim of the M&E process was to ensure that all elements of the project were accessible for monitoring to ensure effectiveness and delivery of the project. He noted as the Terminal Evaluator of OFMPI that some significant monitoring events such as the mid term review and baseline study were delivered too late to give full effective to project oversight although this did not have detrimental effect. The FFA DDG advised that the national reports provided important information for project design and were also useful for baseline study purposes.

Issues Arising

33. The Lead Technical Consultant presented for discussion a list of issues that SIDS had raised during the Consultation to ensure that these had been adequately addressed. These issues included: FAO involvement, in-country delivery, maritime boundary delimitation, climate change & jurisdictional claims, standard MCS training, observers – national capacity building, national VMS training, national IMS, SPRFMO support, Stock Assessment and sub-regional component (MSG). Issues raised at this point included:

- The need for assistance in delimitation, including of the continental shelf
- Support in prosecutions
- The importance of addressing the needs of the MSG members
- Assistance for Fishers associations; and

- The priority that should be attached to the longline VDS

34. Following further discussion the meeting concluded that all issues had been adequately addressed. It was agreed that if these were not covered adequately in the OFMP II project, they would be addressed in other areas of the FFA/SPC/WCPFC work programs. As for the issue of involvement by the MSG, it was noted that the budget line for partner Executing Agencies was flexible and that further discussions will be held with MSG on the matter.

35. The representative from the Cook Islands stated that climate change and jurisdictional claims is high priority for the Cook Islands particularly for low-lying atolls in the northern Cook Islands. Integrated Management Systems (IMS) was also a priority and would look for developments to be integrated with what is happening nationally.

Co-financing

36. The OFMP II Lead Technical Consultant in relation to matters of project co-financing² explained: the GEF approach to co-financing, and the implications in terms of the estimation of co-financing for the Project; the nature of country endorsement required; and reporting on co-financing. For OFMP II, the requirement is that the co-financing/GEF grant ratio should be 3:1. Towards meeting this ratio co-financing for OFMP II includes: participation in WCPFC meetings; relevant established posts in countries, of which there are 73 since the WCPFC was established; the costs of onboard observer programmes; financial contributions to the WCPFC; and a few other specific relevant programmes for some countries. The total level of co-finance costs has been assessed at \$86,660,179 with \$33,152,980 identified in Pacific SIDS national budgets. It was noted that while this level of co-financing exceeds the GEF ratio it is in fact conservative and that other costs could have been included such as contributions by SIDS to other fisheries bodies and observer training costs.

37. As part of the Project Document fisheries agencies will be required to submit a co-financing letter by mid-April (addressed to the Implementing and Executing agencies). A template of the co-financing letter is appended as **Attachment C**.

38. The representative of Nauru enquired whether the updating of national reports had an implication on co-financing, while the Kiribati delegate enquired whether members' contribution to FFA could be counted as co-financing. The Lead Technical Consultant explained that any further amendments to national reports and in particular co-financing information should be done as soon as possible and that members contributions to the FFA were inclusive of the co-financing calculations at the regional level.

Other Issues:

39. In response to a query from the AusAid representative concerning the estimate of funds that could be freed up should OFMP II be successful, the FFA DDG indicated that the current estimate was \$300,000.

40. The UNDP reiterated that as the PIF was already approved the required funds have been set aside in the GEF work programme and the final submission of the Project Document will release those funds. He advised that from his perspective it was clear that Pacific SIDS were clearly giving their full support to the project and the last step from the countries would be the co-financing letters as a formal commitment to the project.

Next Steps

41. A draft record for comment would be circulated within the coming week.

² Proportional level of relevant investment by countries from sources other than GEF that contribute to countries meeting their fisheries management responsibilities.

42. It is expected that a draft of the full Project Document would be available in April and before the May Forum Fisheries Committee meeting to be held at Honiara. Submission of the Project Document is dependent receipt of the co-financing letters of commitment (to be signed by heads of fisheries administrations) for inclusion and countries were urged to present these as soon as possible. A document for GEF CEO endorsement also needs to be completed to accompany the Project Document and the co-financing endorsement letters.

Closing Remarks

43. In closing the OFMP II Project Design Consultation, the FFA DDG thanked all participants for their valuable input and noted that past OFMP projects had complemented the work of SPC and the FFA extremely well. He looked forward to Pacific SIDS assisting with any outstanding information requirements in particular co-financing letters from fisheries administrations.

ATTACHMENT A

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Country	Organisation	Name/Title	Email
Cook Islands	Ministry of Marine Resources	Kori Romea Director, Inshore Fisheries	k.romea@mmr.gov.ck
Federated States of Micronesia	National Oceanic Resource Management Authority	Eugene R Pangelinan Deputy Director	Eugene.pangelinan@norma.fm
	Department of Resources and Development	Valentin A. Martin Deputy Assistant Secretary	fsmmrd@mail.fm
Fiji	Ministry of Fisheries, Forest & Agriculture	Sanaila Naqali Deputy Director	nagali@gmail.com
			snagali@hotmail.com
Kiribati	Fisheries Division, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources Development	Raikon Tumoa Director	raikont@mfmrd.gov.ki
Nauru	Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources Authority	Monte Depaune Manager	monstartuna@gmail.com
Niue	Fisheries Division, Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	James Tafatu Principal Fisheries Officer	James.tafatu@mail.gov.nu
PNG	National Fisheries College, National Fisheries Authority	Jeff Kinch Principle	jkinch@fisheries.gov.pg
			kinch.jeff@gmail.com
Samoa	Ministry of Agriculture & Fisheries,	Sealiitu Fonoiva Sesega Chief Executive Officer	fono@maf.gov.ws
Solomon Islands	Ministry of Fisheries & Marine Resources	James Teri Director of Fisheries	jteri@fisheries.gov.sb
	Ministry of Fisheries & Marine Resources	Francis Tofuakalo Deputy Director (Provincial)	ftofukalo@fisheries.gov.sb
	Ministry of Fisheries & Marine Resources	Ronnelle Panda Principal Fisheries Officer	panda@fisheries.gov.sb
Tonga	Ministry of Agriculture & Food, Forestry & Fisheries	Sione Vailala Matoto Director	vailala@kalianet.to
Tuvalu	Fisheries Department, Ministry of Natural Resources	Samisoni Finikaso Director Fisheries	sfinikaso@gov.tv

			sfinikaso@yahoo.com
		Garry Preston	gpreston@canl.nc
Vanuatu	Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture	Moses Amos Director	mjatinapua@gmail.com
	Department of Fisheries, Vanuatu	Sompert Rena Principal Fisheries Biologist	sgereva@gmail.com
	Organisation		
	FFA	Wez Norris Deputy Director General Manu Tupou-Roosen Director, Legal Mark Young Director, Fisheries Operations Hugh Walton DevFish Project Team Leader	wez.norris@ffa.int manu.tupou-roosen@ffa.int mark.young@ffa.int hugh.walton@ffa.int
	SPC	John Hampton OFP Manager Peter Williams Principle Fisheries Scientist (Data Management) Shelton Harley Principal Fisheries Scientist (stock assessment; scientific advice) Simon Nicol Principal Fisheries Scientist – (tuna tagging; bigeye tuna biology)	johnh@spc.int peterw@spc.int sheltonH@spc.int simonN@spc.int
Fiji	UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre	Joe Padilla Regional Technical Adviser for Marine, Coastal and Island Ecosystems with GEF/Reg Coordination Unit	jose.padilla@undp.org
	UNDP Fiji Multi-Country Office	Emma Mario Programme Analyst, Environment & Financial Management Services	emma.mario@undp.org
Italy	FAO Rome	Janne Fogelgren Project Coordination Officer Blaise Kuemlangan Chief, Development Land Service	janne.fogelgren@fao.org blaise.kuemlangan@fao.org
	Consultants		
		Barbara Hanchard	barbara@hanchard.net
		Les Clark	les@rayfishresearch.com

Colin Brown

cibn@oyster.net.ck

Crick Carlton

crick@nautilus-consultants.co.uk

Observers

Australia	AusAID	Perry Head	
French Polynesia	Direction des Ressources Marines (DRM)	Stephen Yen Kai Sun Director	Stephen.yenkaisun@drm.gov.pf
	Ministere des Ressources Marines (MRM)	Christophe Misselis Conseiller Technique	Christophe.misselis@marines.min.gov.pf
Timor-Leste	National Directorate of Fisheries & Aquaculture	Julio da Cruz Chief	Dacruz.julio@yahoo.com
Tokelau	Department of Economic Development, Natural Resources and Environment (EDNRE)	Feleti Tulafono Offshore Fisheries Officer	tpfeleti@yahoo.com.nz

ATTACHMENT B

**Oceanic Fisheries Management Project II - Project Design Consultation
SPC Headquarters, Noumea, New Caledonia
Friday 8 March 2013**

Adopted Programme

Time	Agenda	Document	Presenter
0800	Opening Remarks		FFA
0815	Introductions/Purpose/Programme	1. Draft programme	Barbara Hanchard
0820	Progress to date	2. PIF	Barbara Hanchard
0900	Update on the GEF		UNDP BKK
0930	The Roles of UNDP and FAO		UNDP BKK/FAO
0945	Proposed Project Structure <i>(Objectives/Components/Incremental Costs & Actions/Budget Detail)</i>	3. Project Structure 4. Detailed Budget	Les Clark
1000	MORNING BREAK		
1030	Proposed Project Structure...continued		
1100	Outcomes of the National Missions/Country Responses	5. National Mission Reports* ³	Colin Brown
1130	Law, Policy & Compliance Component - FFA		FFA
1200	Science Component - SPC		SPC
1230	LUNCH		
1330	NGO s		WWF/PITIA
	Sub-Regional Participants		PNA/TVM
1430	Project Management	6. Project Management	Barbara Hanchard
1445	Monitoring & Evaluation		Crick Carlton
1500	AFTERNOON BREAK		
1515	Issues, Priorities and Budget		Les Clark
1545	Co-financing	7. Co-financing Analysis	Les Clark
1630	Other Issues		
1645	Next Steps		
1700	Consultation concludes		

³ Further revised draft National Mission Reports provided to countries 17 February

SAMPLE LETTER OF COFINANCING COMMITMENT

[on official letterhead]

Date

To: Ms. Barbara Cooney
FAO GEF Coordinator
Investment Centre Division
Technical Cooperation Department
FAO
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy

From: [Name and organization]

Dear Ms. Cooney:

This is to indicate our commitment to collaborating in the “xxxx” project.

We are pleased to confirm our commitment to provide co-financing in the amount of USD xxxx towards the realization of the objectives of the project over the xxx-year life of the project. This amount will be comprised of US\$ xxxxx in-kind and US\$ xxxx in cash. (some organizations might provide more detail on the nature of their co-financing – this would be good!)

We appreciate very much the support that GEF and FAO are providing in addressing this important issue area.

With very best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Name and signature