

Paper Number **RSC3/INFO 1**
Title **LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

Document No.	Title
RSC3/INFO 1	List of Documents
RSC3/WP 2	Draft Agenda
RSC3/INFO 3	Provisional Programme
RSC3/WP 4	Annual Reports – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft UNDP/GEF Annual Project Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR) • GEF IW Results Framework Report
RSC3/INFO 5	National Reports
RSC3/WP 6	Financial Report
RSC3/WP 7	Mid-Term Project Review of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project – Process and Terms of Reference

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

- a. **Opening of Meeting**
 - Introductory Remarks
 - Opening Remarks
 - Procedural Issues
- b. **Apologies**
- c. **Adoption of Agenda**
 1. **Annual Reports**
 - Draft UNDP/GEF Annual Project Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR)
 - GEF IW Results Framework Report
 2. **National Project Reports**
 3. **Financial Reporting, Work Plans and Budgets**
 4. **Mid-Term Project Review (Process and Terms of Reference)**
 5. **Other Matters**
- d. **Next Meeting**
- e. **Adoption of the Summary Record of Proceedings**
- f. **Close of the Meeting**

PROVISIONAL PROGRAMME

		Presenter
0900	Opening	<i>FFA/ OFM Project Coordinator</i>
	Introductory Remarks	<i>UNDP Representative – Mr. Toily Kurbanov</i>
	Opening Remarks	<i>Mr. Tanielu Su'a Director General Forum Fisheries Agency</i>
	Procedural issues, Apologies Adoption of the Agenda	<i>RSC Co- Chairs – Mr. Toily Kurbanov for UNDP and Lt Cdr. Sanaila Naqali for Fiji</i>
1000	Morning Tea	
1020	Annual Reports UNDP/GEF Annual Project Report (APR)/Project Implementation Report (PIR) GEF IW Results Framework & Executing Agency Presentations	<i>Lead – RSC2 Co-Chairs Presenters: SPC - Dr John Hampton FFA - Mr. Moses Amos (FM & Legal) Mr. Michael Ferris (Compliance) Barbara Hanchard IUCN – Taholo Kami</i>
1230	Lunch	
1330	National Project Reports	<i>National Project Focal Points</i>
1430	Financial Reporting - Work Plans and Budgets	<i>Mr. Royden Gholomo Project Finance and Administration Officer Barbara Hanchard, Project Coordinator</i>
1530	Afternoon Tea	
1545	Mid-Term Project Review (Process and Terms of Reference)	<i>UNDP – Mr. Toily Kurbanov</i>
1630	Other Matters Next Meeting Summary Record of Proceedings	<i>RSC3 Co-Chairs</i>
1700	Close	
1830	Function	<i>TBA</i>

Paper Number RSC3/WP 4
Title **PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES
MANAGEMENT PROJECT ANNUAL REPORTS**

Summary

This paper presents the annual reports for the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) prepared by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU). The reports are in formats required by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The reports are the '*UNDP/GEF Annual Performance Review/Performance Implementation Review*' and the '*GEF International Waters Annual Project Performance Results Framework*' in 2007.

The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) has been operational for 2 years at the end of September 2007. Contributions to the reports compiled and coordinated by the Project Coordination Unit are from the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) who are responsible for the executing project activities, and in collaboration with UNDP as the implementing agency for the project. The reporting period of the '*UNDP/GEF Annual Performance Review/Performance Implementation Review 2007*' and the '*GEF International Waters Annual Project Performance Results Framework 2007*' is from **1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007**.

The reports are presented on this occasion to the OFM project Regional Steering Committee as the body responsible for oversight of the project implementation and progress.

Recommendation

The Regional Steering Committee is invited to consider:

- i) the project annual reports prepared by the PCU in collaboration with the FFA, SPC, IUCN and UNDP; and
- ii) provide comment on the reports noting their onward submission to UNDP and GEF.

PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT ANNUAL REPORTS

Introduction

1. The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) has been operational for two years (1 October 2005 – 30 September 2007). The Regional Steering Committee (RSC) for the OFM Project has a role as the primary policy making body for the project.
2. This paper presents the annual reports for the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project prepared by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU). The reports are in formats required by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The reports are the '*UNDP/GEF Annual Performance Review/Performance Implementation Review 2007*' and the '*GEF International Waters Annual Project Performance Results Framework 2007*'.
3. Contributions to the reports compiled and coordinated by the Project Coordination Unit are from the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC) and the World Conservation Union (IUCN) who are responsible for the executing project activities, and in collaboration with UNDP as the implementing agency for the project. The reporting period of the '*UNDP/GEF Annual Performance Review/Performance Implementation Review*' and the '*GEF International Waters Annual Project Performance Results Framework*' is from **1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007**.

Project Evaluation and Reporting

4. The OFM Project objectives, outputs and emerging issues are to be regularly reviewed and evaluated on an annually by the RSC. Reporting (annual and quarterly) is undertaken by the PCU based at the FFA consistent with GEF and UNDP rules and regulations. Quarterly financial and narrative reports for third and fourth quarters in 2006 and the first two quarters of 2007 have been submitted to UNDP and to GEF.
5. The annual reports were required to be completed and submitted to UNDP/GEF no later than the 31 July 2007. While some latitude was permitted last year for the submission of these reports to UNDP/GEF to allow for consideration of the reports by the RSC (which was not scheduled to meet until October 2006), the same arrangement has not occurred this year. The reports were completed and submitted to UNDP/GEF by the imposed deadline and before the scheduled meeting of RSC.
6. Copies of the reports are appended at **Attachment A**. The Regional Steering Committee also acts as a Multipartite Review body and is expected to review and discuss the report.
7. To support the annual reports, presentations (at an activity level) will be made at RSC3 by representatives of the executing agencies on the activities in the respective components of the project for which they are responsible for implementing.

8. The Regional Steering Committee is invited to consider:
- i) the project annual reports prepared by the PCU in collaboration with the FFA, SPC, IUCN and UNDP; and
 - ii) provide comment on the reports noting their onward submission to UNDP and GEF.

ATTACHMENT A

UNDP GEF APR/PIR 2007 – INTERNATIONAL WATERS

(1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007)

I. Basic Project Data

Official Title:	PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
------------------------	---

Country/ies:	Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tokelau, Tuvalu and Vanuatu	PIMS Number	2992
		Atlas Project Number	00039704/00044655

Focal Area	International Waters	Project Type (FSP/MSP)	Full-sized project
Strategic Priority	IW1 – Catalyse financial resource mobilization for implementation of reforms and stress reduction measures agreed through TDA-SAP or equivalent processes for particular transboundary systems; IW2 – Expand global coverage of foundational capacity building addressing the two key programme gaps and support for target learning, specifically the fisheries programme gap.	Operational Programme	OP 9, Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area, SIDS Component

Date of Entry into Work Programme	GEF Council endorsement – March 2005 GEF CEO endorsement – 24 May 2005	Planned Project Duration	Five (5) years
ProDoc Signature Date	See Attachment A	Original Planned Closing Date	2010
Date of First Disbursement	28 October 2005 (USD628,676)	Revised Planned Closing Date	None currently proposed
Is this the Terminal APR/PIR?	No	Date Project Operationally Closed (if applicable)	2010

Date Mid Term Evaluation carried out (if applicable)	Not applicable	Date Final Evaluation carried out (if applicable)	Not applicable
---	----------------	--	----------------

Dates of visits to project by UNDP country office	8 February 2007 (UNDP Suva Deputy RR, Toily Kurbanov)	Date of last TPR Meeting	22 October 2006
Date of last visit to project by UNDP-GEF RTA	22 October 2006 (RSC/TPR)		

Project Contacts:

Title	Name	E-mail	Date	Signature
National Project Manager / Coordinator	N.Barbara HANCHARD	barbara.hanchard@ffa.int		
Government GEF OFP ¹ (optional)				
UNDP Country Office Programme Manager	Asenaca RAVUVU	asenaca.ravuvu@undp.org		
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	Anna TENGBERG	anna.tengberg@undp.org		

Key: Ratings used through out this report:

HS - Highly Satisfactory

S – Satisfactory

MS – Marginally Satisfactory

MU - Marginally Unsatisfactory

U – Unsatisfactory

HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

¹ In the case of a project involving more than 1 country, it is suggested that for simplicity only the OFP (optional) and Country Office Programme Manager from the lead country sign-off. If representatives from more than 1 country sign off, please add additional rows as necessary, clearly indicating the country name for each signature.

Project Summary (as in PIMS and ProDoc)

ProDoc Summary

Small Island Developing States (SIDS) have special conditions and needs that were identified for international attention in the **Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States** and in the **World Summit for Sustainable Development's Johannesburg Plan of Implementation**. Throughout these instruments, the importance of coastal and marine resources and the coastal and marine environment to sustainable development of SIDS is emphasised, with the Plan of Implementation specifically calling for support for the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention (the WCPF Convention).

The Global Environmental Facility (GEF) identifies sustainable management of regional fish stocks as one of the major environmental issues SIDS have in common and as a target for activities under the SIDS component of OP 9, the Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Programme.

In addition, the GEF promotes the adoption of an ecosystem-based approach to addressing environmental problems in Large Marine Ecosystems is through activities under the Large Marine Ecosystem Component of OP 8, the Waterbody-Based Operational Program.

Consistent with this framework, GEF financing for the International Waters (IW) South Pacific Strategic Action Programme (SAP) Project from 2000 supported the implementation of an IW Pacific Islands SAP, including a pilot phase of support for the Oceanic Fisheries Management (OFM) Component, which underpinned successful efforts to conclude and bring into force the WCPF Convention. Now, GEF assistance is sought for a new Pacific Islands OFM Project to support Pacific SIDS efforts as they participate in the setting up and initial period of operation of the new Commission that is at the centre of the WCPF Convention, and as they reform, realign, restructure and strengthen their national fisheries laws, policies, institutions and programmes to take up the new opportunities which the WCPF Convention creates and discharge the new responsibilities which the Convention requires.

The goals of the Project combine the interests of the global community in the conservation of a marine ecosystem covering a huge area of the surface of the globe, with the interests of some of the world's smallest nations in the responsible and sustainable management of resources that are crucial for their sustainable development.

The **global environmental goal** of the Project is to achieve global environmental benefits by enhanced conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources in the Pacific Islands region and the protection of the biodiversity of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool Large Marine Ecosystem.

The **broad development goal** of the Project is to assist the Pacific Island States to improve the contribution to their sustainable development from improved management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources and from the conservation of oceanic marine biodiversity generally.

The IW Pacific Islands SAP identified the ultimate root cause underlying the concerns about, and threats to, International Waters in the region as deficiencies in management and grouped the deficiencies into two linked subsets – lack of understanding and weaknesses in governance. In response, the Project will have two major technical components.

Component 1, the Scientific Assessment and Monitoring Enhancement Component, is aimed at providing improved scientific information and knowledge on the oceanic transboundary fish stocks and related ecosystem aspects of the Western Tropical Pacific Warm Pool Large Marine Ecosystem (WTP LME) and at strengthening the national capacities of Pacific SIDS in these areas. This work will include a particular focus on the ecology of seamounts in relation to pelagic fisheries and the fishing impacts upon them.

Component 2, the Law, Policy and Institutional Reform, Realignment and Strengthening Component, is aimed at assisting Pacific Island States as they participate in the earliest stages of the work of the new WCPF Commission and at the same time reform, realign and strengthen their national laws, policies, institutions and programmes relating to management of transboundary oceanic fisheries and protection of marine biodiversity.

Component 3, the Coordination, Participation and Information Services Component, is aimed at effective project management, complemented by mechanisms to increase participation and raise awareness of the conservation and management of oceanic resources and the oceanic environment.

The design of the Project has involved a substantial consultative process, which has been warmly supported throughout the region. Reflecting outcomes of this process, the Project seeks to apply a regional approach in a way that recognises national needs; to strike a balance between technical and capacity-building outputs by twinning technical and capacity building activities in every area; and to open participation in all project activities to governmental and non-governmental stakeholders.

The structure for implementation and execution of the Project builds on a record of successful collaboration between the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), regional organisations and Pacific SIDS in past activities in oceanic environmental management and conservation, strengthened by planned new partnerships with The World Conservation Union (IUCN), a regional environmental non-governmental organisation (ENGO) and a regional industry non-governmental organisation (INGO).

II. Progress towards achieving project objectives

Project Strategy (Objectives & Outcomes)	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
<p>Information & Knowledge Objective To improve understanding of the transboundary oceanic fish resources & related features of the Western & Central Pacific Warm Pool Large Marine Ecosystem.</p>	<p>Improved information on the biology & ecology of target fish stocks, including their exploitation characteristics & fishery impacts, the fishery impacts on non-target, dependent & associated species & on the pelagic ecosystem as a whole.</p> <p>Substantially improved understanding of Seamount ecosystems, especially their relation to migratory pelagic fisheries.</p>	<p>SCTB17 (2004) summarized major information/knowledge gaps and needs as follows: (a) better estimates of catch, effort and catch composition, particularly in Indonesia, Philippines & Vietnam, and in the purse seine fishery (b) better indices of abundance from CPUE data (c) information on the environmental impacts on recruitment, including regime shifts (d) fishery-independent (tagging) data on exploitation rates and population dynamics (e) ecosystem impacts of fishing (f) better estimates of size/species composition and by-catch estimates from enhanced observer data Little knowledge of confirmed seamount occurrence in the region or their significance to the pelagic ecosystem</p>	<p>(a) assessments utilize improved fishery information available from all sources and new tagging data (b) assessments incorporate information on environmental impacts on stock productivity (c) comprehensive and reliable by-catch estimates available (d) ecosystem impacts of fishing are characterized</p> <p>(a) seamount occurrence documented using available data sources (b) Impacts of seamounts on physical/biological oceanography and pelagic fisheries better understood</p>	<p>The project has resulted in: (a) improved flow and quality of fisheries data from beneficiary countries, which are progressively incorporated into stock assessments (b) new tagging data generated from 6 months of field operations in PNG (Phase 1 of a proposed regional programme) (c) new analyses of environmental impacts on yellowfin and bigeye recruitment completed (d) comprehensive estimates of by-catch levels and uncertainty now routinely reported to WCPFC SC</p> <p>The occurrence of seamounts has been documented using available data, but further work is required</p>
<p>Governance Objective To create new regional institutional arrangements, & reform, realign & strengthen national arrangements for conservation & management of</p>	<p>The WCPFC established & functioning.</p>	<p>WCPFC had preliminary meeting in December 2004 to adopt some Rules & Regs, establish the SC & TCC & elect officers of commission & subsidiary bodies.</p>	<p>WCPFC structure & programmes functioning by 2010 as described under Outcome 2 a) below</p>	<p>See progress reported under Outcome 2 a) below</p>

Project Strategy (Objectives & Outcomes)	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
transboundary oceanic fishery resources	<p>WCPFC beginning to adopt conservation & management measures for target stocks & the WTP LME²</p> <p>PacSIDS amend their domestic laws & policies & strengthen their national fisheries institutions & programmes, especially in the areas of monitoring & compliance, to implement the WCPF Convention & apply the principles of responsible & sustainable fisheries management more generally.</p>	<p>No binding regional regional stock conservation & management measures in place</p> <p>See Outcome 2 c) below</p>	<p>WCPFC has begun to adopt & apply measures to</p> <p>a) limit all major sources of fishing mortality on heavily fished target species, including bigeye & yellowfin tunas & swordfish</p> <p>b) mitigate mortality from fishing on non-target species, including sharks, seabirds & turtles</p>	<p>WCPFC has applied:</p> <p>a) a mix of catch & effort limits to fisheries for bigeye & yellowfin, north & south Pacific albacore & swordfish</p> <p>b) measures to mitigate mortality from fishing on sharks (including a finning ban) & seabirds</p>

² Not in the original logframe, inserted as Stress Reduction Indicator to meet GEF IW reporting requirements

Project Strategy (Objectives & Outcomes)	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
<p>OUTCOME 1: a) Improved quality, compatibility & availability of scientific information & knowledge on the oceanic transboundary fish stocks & related ecosystem aspects of the WTP warm pool LME, with a particular focus on the ecology of seamounts in relation to pelagic fisheries, & the fishing impacts upon them.</p> <p>b) This information being used by the WCPFC & PacSIDS to assess measures for the conservation & management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources & protection of the WTP LME.</p>	<p>Substantial, relevant & reliable information collected & shared between stakeholders with respect to transboundary oceanic fish stocks & related ecosystem aspects, (particularly for seamounts).</p> <p>The WCPFC using this information as the basis for discussions & policy decisions on WCPF management.</p>	<p>Scientific information & knowledge is shared among countries voluntarily, primarily through SPC/OFP & the SCTB. Regional scientific work carried out by SPC with donor funding No WCPFC science staff, experts or programmes, but plan agreed for interim scientific structure and other arrangements.</p> <p>Little knowledge of confirmed seamount occurrence in the region or their significance to the pelagic ecosystem</p> <p>Annual meetings of the SCTB provide a forum to discuss scientific issues related to data, research & stock assessment including providing statements on stock status & opinions on scientific issues.</p>	<p>Establishment of SC & subsidiary bodies including bodies for statistics & Ecosystem/Bycatch work (by Dec 2007)</p> <p>Binding agreement on protocols for fisheries data collection & provision, including catch & effort logs, & port & onboard sampling (by Dec 2007)</p> <p>Establishment of Commission data management structure and, databases (by Dec 2007)</p> <p>Appointment of science staff and/or contracting of experts for the provision of scientific services (by Dec 2007)</p> <p>Agreement on scientific work programme, including forms of stock assessment analysis (by Dec 2007)</p> <p>(a) seamount occurrence documented using available data b) Impacts of seamounts on physical/biological oceanography and pelagic fisheries better understood</p> <p>Measures of target stock status in relation to agreed management reference points available</p> <p>Measures of status of ecosystem including trophic status & status of key non-target species</p>	<p>Achieved 2005</p> <p>Catch & Effort Protocol in place.</p> <p>Port & onboard sampling protocols still under consideration</p> <p>Interim arrangements in place</p> <p>Staff appointed, interim arrangements agreed for scientific experts, subject to review in 2007</p> <p>Achieved</p> <p>The occurrence of seamounts has been documented using available data, but further work is required</p> <p>Stock status measures available, but no agreed reference points</p> <p>Proposal under consideration</p>

Project Strategy (Objectives & Outcomes)	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
			<p>Provision of scientific advice to the Commission including information & recommendations on TACs & other management measures from the Scientific Committee to the Commission</p> <p>Measures of the impact of environmental variability on target species abundance & distribution</p> <p>Assessments available of the impact of fishing on target & non-target species</p> <p>Analysis made of impact of possible conservation measures</p>	<p>Achieved, ongoing</p> <p>Achieved, ongoing</p> <p>Achieved & ongoing for target species, less progress for non-target species</p> <p>Achieved & ongoing</p>
<p>c) National capacities in oceanic fishery monitoring & assessment strengthened, with PacSIDS meeting their national & WCPFC-related responsibilities in these areas.</p>	<p>Relevant national technical capacities & knowledge greatly improved</p>	<p>SPC assessment shows that no PacSIDS have the capacity to fully meet WCPFC-related responsibilities in fishery monitoring & data provision</p>	<p>Programme in SPC to train SIDS national data and science personnel</p> <p>Arrangements in place for financing of SIDS participation in Commission activities</p> <p>Arrangements in place for recognition of special requirements of SIDS in science and other technical areas</p> <p>High level of participation by PacSIDS in SC meetings (80%)</p> <p>Level of resources and pattern of Commission programmes, and of other agencies for building capacity of SIDS to participate in Commission scientific activities</p>	<p>Achieved & ongoing through attachments and workshops</p> <p>Financial Regs provide funding for PacSIDS to participate in all WCPFC-related meetings</p> <p>Items for Special reqts in standing agendas of SC since 2005</p> <p>Achieved (2006- 13 of 15)</p> <p>Japan has committed US\$2m for WCPFC special reqts, partially for science-related capacity-building</p>

Project Strategy (Objectives & Outcomes)	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
OUTCOME 2: a) The WCPFC established & beginning to function effectively.	WCPFC operating with a formally adopted framework of rules & regulations.	Rules of Procedure & Financial Regs adopted at WCPFC1 following inputs from SAPI Project. Staff regs, subsidiary bodies rules needed.	WCPFC & subsidiary bodies operating with a complete set of Rules & Regulations & a Secretariat, with sustainable financial arrangements (by Dec 2007)	Draft Rules for subsidiary bodies being considered by SC & TCC
	WCPFC Secretariat has been established & the core science & compliance programmes & Committee structures are operational.	No appointments to the secretariat, no WCPFC staff regs, no WCPFC compliance, data or science programmes operational.	Staff Regs adopted & Secretariat posts all filled. (by Dec 2007) TCC operational (by Dec 2007)	Staff Regs adopted. Secretariat posts being filled with some difficulty. Achieved 2005
b) Pacific Island nations playing a full role in the functioning & management of the WCPFC, & in the related management of the fisheries & the globally-important LME.	Adoption & Implementation of Compliance Measures ³	Authorisation/Notification/Vessel Marking adopted in Dec 2004	Complete package of compliance programmes implemented, including: III. Authorisation IV. Notification Vessel marking Observers VMS High Seas Boarding & Inspection Transshipment regulation Port State Controls IUU List Dealing With Infringements Application of Sanctions	Implemented: Authorisation, Notification, Vessel Marking Adopted: High Seas Boarding & Inspection, VMS, IUU List
	PacSIDS are participating effectively in provision of information & in decision-making & policy adoption process for WCPF fisheries management.	13 of 15 PacSIDS ratified or been authorised to participate as territories ?? At WCPFC1 in December 2004, PACSIDS participated	All PacSIDS are Commission Members (by Dec2007) All PacSIDS are Parties to the UN Fish Stocks Agreement PACSIDS collective participation is effective on issues	Achieved Nov 2005 Tuvalu, Palau, Vanuatu (non-Parties to 1995 UN FSA - current official list maintained by UN DOALOS dated 4 June 2007). Palau recently ratified but yet to inform when deposited with UN

³ Not in the original logframe, inserted as Stress Reduction Indicator to meet GEF IW reporting requirements

Project Strategy (Objectives & Outcomes)	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
c) National laws, policies, institutions & programmes relating to management of transboundary oceanic fisheries reformed, realigned & strengthened to implement the WCPF Convention & other applicable global & regional instruments.		effectively on WCPFC administrative issues, but did not participate effectively on compliance, science & technical issues.	of importance to them. Most PACSIDS are able to participate effectively individually on issues of importance to them	No independent assessment made, but in 2007, the WCPFC adopted 5 stock measures, all based on FFA Members proposals, and 4 compliance measures all supported by FFA Members No independent assessment made
	National institutions & supportive laws & policies have been reformed effectively to support national roles in WCPFC & to meet national commitments both to WCPF Convention, & to other relevant MEAs, & global treaties & conventions.	To be assessed by a baseline study	PacSIDS are implementing WCPFC measures & national conservation & management measures	Assessment yet to be completed
d) National capacities in oceanic fisheries law, fisheries management & compliance strengthened	Relevant national technical capacities & knowledge greatly improved	Project design work identified lack of capacities in fisheries law and compliance and especially fisheries management as important constraints to achieving Project objectives	Expanded programmes in FFA to train SIDS national law, fisheries management & personnel Arrangements in place for financing of SIDS participation in Commission activities Arrangements in place for recognition of special requirements of SIDS in fisheries & management and compliance However, as noted in the ProDoc (p.81) there are limits to progress that can be made in capacity building in 15 countries within the Project life	Achieved & ongoing through attachments and workshops Financial Regs provide funding for PacSIDS to participate in all WCPFC-related meetings Items for Special reqts in standing agendas of SC since 2005 Most PacSIDS are still struggling to develop the necessary capacities

Project Strategy (Objectives & Outcomes)	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
<p>OUTCOME 3: a) Effective project management at the national & regional level.</p>	Project achieving its objectives.	Not applicable	<p>PCU established by Dec 2005</p> <p>National and regional Project committees established by Dec 2006</p> <p>Procedures for NGO participation adopted by the WCPFC</p> <p>National consultative mechanisms in SIDS include NGO and broad governmental participation</p>	<p>Achieved 2005</p> <p>RSC established 2005 (National committees – see comment below)</p> <p>Achieved</p> <p>National consultative mechanisms typically in the form of Tuna Management Committees. These are not always inclusive.</p>
b) Major governmental & non-governmental stakeholders participating in project activities & consultative mechanisms at national & regional levels.	Extent to which Project implementation & management is participatory with appropriate involvement of stakeholders at all levels.	Phase I terminal evaluation noted lack of NGO involvement as a major weakness in Phase I	Project Evaluations indicate that project implementation & management is fully participatory	No evaluations conducted yet
c) Information on the project & the WCPF process contributing to increased awareness of oceanic fishery resource & ecosystem management.	<p>Transparency & simplicity of information access</p> <p>Relevance & significance of available information</p> <p>Public awareness raising at national & regional policy level is effective.</p>	Design process identifies lack of simple, clear information on the WCPF preparatory process as a problem	<p>Project Evaluations indicate that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information access is transparent & simple - Information available is relevant & significant. - Public awareness raising at national & regional policy level is effective. 	No evaluations conducted yet
d) Project evaluations reflecting successful & sustainable project objectives.	Project evaluation ratings.	Not applicable	Positive project evaluation ratings.	No evaluations conducted yet

Rating of Project Progress towards Meeting Objective

	2006 Rating	2007 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator	S	S	Considerable and steady progress has been achieved towards project objectives (2) as detailed in the report above against indicators. The progress towards of functioning of the WCPFC continues to evolve and challenge the resources and capabilities of the Pacific SIDS. The WCPF Commission is operating formally with a number of conservation and management measures adopted of which Pacific SIDs have been actively involved. Implications for the implementation of those measures both regionally and at national levels is assisted greatly by the project but continues to channel the resources and capacity of Pacific SIDs.
Government GEF OFP (optional)			
UNDP Country Office	S	S	The complexity of working at regional level to initiate change, interest and support for fisheries management is both challenging and time-consuming. It is noted that the project is employing approaches that exhibit inclusiveness and good information strategies at international, regional level and national levels, which will be the key towards meeting project objectives. Interventions in creating an enabling environment and strengthening existing capacity for fisheries management has been highlighted through various in-country training, policy reform and scientific analytical activities. Hence it is recommended that the project continues to increase scientific and technical collaboration, including integrated assessment at the SIDS regional/national levels for the conservation and management of living and non-living marine resources and expanding ocean-observing capabilities for the timely prediction and assessment of the state of marine environment. In line with WSSD plan of implementation and the WCPF, UNDP will support collaboration between the multi-stakeholders to develop capacity in marine science, information and management, through, inter alia, promoting establishment of regional/national monitoring systems, and the use ecosystem models to assess management options and training of policy makers.
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	XX	XX	XXX

Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

Action to be Taken	By Whom?	By When?

V. Progress in Project implementation

List the 4 key outputs delivered so far for each project Outcome:

Project Outcomes	Key Outputs
<p>Outcome 1: Scientific Assessment and Monitoring Enhancement:</p> <p>a) Improved quality, compatibility & availability of scientific information & knowledge on the oceanic transboundary fish stocks & related ecosystem aspects of the WTP warm pool LME, with a particular focus on the ecology of seamounts in relation to pelagic fisheries, & the fishing impacts upon them.</p> <p>b) This information being used by the WCPFC & PacSIDS to assess measures for the conservation & management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources & protection of the WTP LME.</p> <p>c) National capacities in oceanic fishery monitoring & assessment strengthened, with PacSIDS meeting their national & WCPFC-related responsibilities in these areas.</p>	
<p>Sub-component 1.1 Fishery Monitoring, Coordination and Enhancement</p> <p>Outcome: Integrated and economically sustainable national monitoring programmes in place including catch and effort, observer, port sampling and landing data; Pacific SIDS providing data to the Commission in the form required; national capacities to process and analyse data for national monitoring needs enhanced; improved information on fishing in national waters and by national fleets being used for national policy making and to inform national positions at the Commission. Enhanced quality and accessibility of fisheries information and data leading to more effective development and improvement of the Commission's policy and decision-making process.</p>	<p>A template for national integrated monitoring programmes including logsheet, observer, port sampling and landing data collection and management; and provision of data to the Commission Regional Tuna Database template available on SPC website www.spc.int/oceanfish/ . TUFMAN database review, development and updating roll out – including, port sampling and unloading totals modules, reconciliation reports, mapping module, inclusion of form for WCPFC Vessel Record data. Video and training manual initiated. Support for the preparation of data summaries and catch estimates for national reports to WCPFC SC. Report on the WCPFC Ad hoc Task Group posted.</p> <p>National monitoring systems based on the regional template for integrated monitoring, customised to meet national needs TUFMAN in-country development and training (RMI, FSM, Palau, Tonga). Review and support of national monitoring capacity (Niue, Tuvalu, RMI, PNG and Vanuatu). National Tuna Data Procedures document initiated in all countries. Identified funding support needs furnished (Palau, FSM, Nauru, Vanuatu). In-country support to National observer and port sampling programmes (Palau, FSM, RMI, PNG, Fiji).</p> <p>A regional monitoring coordination capacity, to develop regional standards such as data formats, and to provide a clearing house for information on fishery monitoring Industry and sampling data forms distributed. Longline logbook trial underway. Longline Observer Guide and Marine species identification manual completed and distributed. First Tuna Data Workshop concluded, report and material distributed on CD. WCPFC Regional Observer Programme document and strategic plan.</p> <p>Training of national monitoring staff, particularly monitoring coordinators, observers and port samplers Monitoring attachments (PNG, Tonga, Vanuatu, PNG, Solomons, Nauru). Observer and tag seeding training (PNG, Palau, RMI), port sampling training (RMI) debriefing training (PNG, sub-regional in RMI) debriefing support (Fiji, Tonga, Palau, FSM), senior observer training workshop (PNG).</p>
<p>Sub-component 1.2 Stock Assessment</p> <p>Outcome: Detailed information available on the status of national tuna fisheries, including the implications of regional stock</p>	<p>National oceanic fisheries status reports prepared collaboratively with national scientific staff National Tuna Fishery Status Reports (Cook Is, FSM, Vanuatu, Palau, Nauru, Tonga) In-country stakeholder workshops for NTFSRs (FSM, Vanuatu, Palau, Tonga, Nauru)</p> <p>Advice to Pacific SIDS on scientific issues in the work of the Commission Scientific presentations at regional SWG, MOW and contributions to Pacific SIDS brief for WCPFC SC, advice to WCPFC SC</p>

<p>assessments and the impacts of local fisheries and oceanographic variability on local stocks and fishing performance; strengthened national capacities to use and interpret regional stock assessments, fisheries data and oceanographic information at the national level, to participate in Commission scientific work, and to understand the implications of Commission stock assessments.</p>	<p>Training of national technical and scientific staff to understand regional stock assessment methods, and interpret and apply the results; and to use oceanographic data Regional Stock Assessment workshop Attachments (Samoa, FSM, Vanuatu, Nauru and Palau) Contribution to regional eNGO workshop on WCPFC In-country training on interpretation of fisheries and stock assessment (FSM)</p>
<p>Sub-component 1.3 Ecosystem Analysis</p> <p>Outcome: Enhanced understanding of the dynamics of the WTP warm pool pelagic ecosystem, with particular focus on trophic relationships; enhanced understanding of the ecology of seamounts, in particular their impacts on aggregation and movement of pelagic species and the fisheries impacts thereon; provision of ecosystem-based scientific advice to the Commission and to Pacific SIDS; enhanced information on the magnitude of by-catch in WCPO oceanic fisheries.</p>	<p>Observer sampling and analysis of commercial fishery catches to determine trophic relationships of pelagic species in the WTP LME Sampling strategy & work plan report for observer programmes (info paper to WCPFC SC2) Biological sampling and land based analysis (stomach content & tissue sampling) – Solomon Is, FSM, Samoa, Cook Islands, Fiji & RMI (newsletter)</p> <p>Collection and analysis of information on seamounts in the WTP LME Seamount activity planning workshop, validation of seamounts in the Pacific (report), database reviewed Examination of satellite oceanographic data in relation to seamounts (report) Co-funded Tagging campaign (PNG) Benthic biodiversity survey – under discussion with IRD (limited progress with IUCN survey)</p> <p>Model-based analysis of ecosystem-based management options Ecological Risk Assessment – indicators of species susceptibility and productivity to evaluate ecosystem-based management options Ecosystem modeling workshop (balance ecopath models to WCP and comparison with existing models)</p> <p>Estimate Levels of By catch in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean fisheries WCPFC SC working papers on status of stocks (historical observer data and estimates of levels of by-catch) Ecosystem Risk Assessment (WCPFC SC) – co-financing from Commission to progress work in 2007/2008 Ecosystem analysis for Pacific SIDs (at FFC) Updated analysis of estimates of levels of by-catch for Statistics Specialist Working Group</p> <p>Results of ecosystem analysis and proposals for long-term ecosystem monitoring and operationalisation of the ecosystem-based approach for use by the Commission’s Scientific Committee, especially its Ecosystems & Bycatch Working Group, and by Pacific SIDS Preliminary Ecological Risk Assessment – WCPFC SC Training incorporated in Stock Assessment Workshop, briefings on ecosystem analysis (Pacific SIDs pre SC)</p>

<p>Outcome 2: Law, Policy and Institutional, Reform, Realignment and Strengthening:</p> <p>a) The WCPFC established & beginning to function effectively.</p> <p>b) Pacific Island nations playing a full role in the functioning & management of the WCPFC, & in the related management of the fisheries & the globally-important LME.</p> <p>c) National laws, policies, institutions & programmes relating to management of transboundary oceanic fisheries reformed, realigned & strengthened to implement the WCPF Convention & other applicable global & regional instruments.</p> <p>d) National capacities in oceanic fisheries law, fisheries management & compliance strengthened</p>	
<p>Sub-component 2.1 Legal Reform</p> <p>Outcome: Major Commission legal arrangements and mechanisms in place, including provisions relating to non-Parties and sanctions for non-compliance; national laws, regulations, license conditions reformed to implement the WCPF Convention and other relevant international legal instruments; enhanced national legal capacity to apply the Convention and national management regimes, including domestic legal processes for dealing with infringements.</p>	<p>A strategy and workplan for activities on regional and national legal issues Role out of the strategy and workplan to address regional and legal issues related to the Commission and other related international legal instruments on schedule; including the completion of draft guidelines for fisheries legislation to assist Pacific SIDS review their national legislations and regulations. A number of countries have completed legislative reviews. Enhancement of legal capacity in the Convention and domestic laws and prosecutions procedures – Judicial Seminar and Sub-regional WCPFC workshops</p> <p>New draft laws, regulations, agreements & license conditions in line with WCPF Convention prepared and shared with PacSIDS Legislative reviews identify the gaps in national legislations and regulations and draft legislation and regulations are amended accordingly for processing through individual national legislative repeal systems.</p> <p>Proposals for the Commission from Pacific SIDS for legal arrangements to implement the Convention Briefs are prepared for Pacific SIDS prior to Commission meetings and subsidiary meetings (WCPFC3, TTC2 & SC2)</p> <p>Training of policy makers and legal personnel in oceanic fisheries management legal issues Port State Enforcement workshop, WCPFC Sub-regional workshops (Cooks, PNG and Vanuatu), Prosecutions, Dockside Boarding and Inspection workshops (Tuvalu), legal fellowships and Law of the Sea & Maritime Law short course (Uni of Wollongong)</p>
<p>Sub-component 2.2 Policy Reform</p> <p>Outcome: Commission Secretariat and technical programmes established and conservation and management measures beginning to be adopted; national oceanic fisheries management plans, policies and strategies prepared, implemented and reviewed; adoption of a more integrated and cross-sectoral approach and, improved coordination between government departments (Fisheries, Environment, Development, Economy, etc); enhanced understanding by policy makers and enhanced national capacities in regional and</p>	<p>National oceanic fisheries management plans, policies and strategies Roll out of EAFM (Vanuatu, Tonga, Palau and Nauru) and regional strategy to determine framework and processes to deliver tuna and oceanic fisheries management plans based on EAFM.</p> <p>Strategies and specific proposals for the overall development of the Commission, including its Secretariat and technical programmes, and for Commission conservation and management measures Studies on by-catch mitigation options for seabirds, issues associated with shark finning and harvest, turtles, charter vessel control and purse seine closures, management options for albacore and swordfish, implementation of a catch documentation scheme, catch retention, FAD Management and capacity management options. Information incorporated into Pacific SIDS FM policies and strategies for proposals to the Commission (WCPFC3). Briefs for Pacific SIDS and used at Commission meeting on full range of scientific (stock specific and ecosystem wide) technical and compliance and institutional (establishment of the Commission) issues at Commission and subsidiary meetings & ad-hoc Data Task group. Proposals to Commission on catch and effort limits for target species, by-catch mitigation measures, VMS & Observer programme. 10 draft measures proposed in 2006 to the Commission by Pacific SIDS. Informal consultation on albacore management, Pre-Commission FFC caucus, MOW workshops Advice on purse seine effort limitation (VDS), longline management, purse seine fisheries closures and overcapacity.</p>

<p>national policy analysis for sustainable and responsible fisheries; enhanced stakeholder understanding of Commission and national policy issues, especially the private sector.</p>	<p>Identification of possible management options for seamounts, including compliance options Limited progress on activities related to this output</p> <p>Training of policy makers, technical personnel and other Pacific SIDS stakeholders to increase understanding of sustainable and responsible fisheries Management Options workshops, WCPFC workshops & workshop on regional fisheries management arrangements and implications for Tuvalu, Pre Commission FFC (Ministerial), Pacific SIDS attendance at other regional RFMO – IATTC . Train Sea Coast preparations (reviewing & updated modules) delivered through USP.</p>
<p>Sub-component 2.3 Institutional Reform</p> <p>Outcome: Public sector fisheries administrations reformed, realigned and strengthened; capacities of national non-governmental organisations to participate in oceanic fisheries management enhanced; consultative processes enhanced to promote a more integrated approach to fisheries management and administration that encourages coordination and participation between diverse government and non-government stakeholders.</p>	<p>Strategies, plans and proposals for the reform, realignment and strengthening of national oceanic fisheries management administrations Scoping review Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority - consultations and workshops included NGOs</p> <p>Processes for national consultation between stakeholders in oceanic fisheries management No activity to date</p>
<p>Sub-component 2.4 Compliance Strengthening</p> <p>Outcome: Realigned and strengthened national compliance programs; improved regional MCS coordination; strategies for Commission compliance programs; enhanced national compliance capacities (inspection, observation, patrol, VMS, investigation).</p>	<p>Strategies, plans and proposals for realigning and strengthening national oceanic fisheries compliance programmes MCS country workshops review the status of existing laws governing compliance and implications of WCPFC outcomes for Pacific SIDS 9th & 10th Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Working Group Meetings (MCS review, data harmonization and preparations for Pacific SIDS at TCC) Development of IPOA for the prevention of IUU (Cook Islands)</p> <p>Arrangements for regional coordination of monitoring, control and surveillance activities Planning and coordination of regional operations and data harmonization and integration tests of display tools. Niue Treaty implementation and development of subsidiary agreements, including the promoting the concept of multilateral surveillance cooperation agreements as opposed to bilateral. Development of E-operations</p> <p>Strategies and proposals for regional compliance measures and programmes MCS Working Group Meetings and preparations for TCC2 and WCPFC3 IUU Prosecutions workshop – review cases, legislation and experience for prosecuting IUU cases. Development of a regional MCS Strategy</p> <p>Training of national compliance staff, especially in inspection and VMS In-country training (PNG & Vanuatu) – legal aspects, Dockside Boarding, Inspection and Prosecutions, FAO Port State measures, MCS attachments</p>

<p>Outcome 3: Coordination, Participation and Information Services:</p> <p>a) Effective project management at the national & regional level.</p> <p>b) Major governmental & non-governmental stakeholders participating in project activities & consultative mechanisms at national & regional levels.</p> <p>c) Information on the project & the WCPF process contributing to increased awareness of oceanic fishery resource & ecosystem management.</p> <p>d) Project evaluations reflecting successful & sustainable project objectives.</p>	
<p>Sub-component 3.1 Project information System</p> <p>Outcome: Enhancement of awareness about the Project and understanding of its objectives and progress; establishment of a Clearing House for lessons and best practices within the Pacific SIDS, as well as through linkages to other global fisheries and their issues; capture of up-to-date information and advice on related ecosystem management and innovative fisheries management approaches; transfer of lessons and replication of best practices through an active mechanism linked to the Commission; active participation with IW:LEARN</p>	<p>Project Information System for capture, storage and dissemination of project data, lessons and best practices, and provision of information products Project identifies designed and in use Interaction with GEF IWLEARN – IWLEARN Experience Note, communication on website management WCPF Convention publication</p> <hr/> <p>Knowledge management process identifying innovative, best practice and replicable ideas within the Project and relevant to the Project Draft Knowledge Management Strategy prepared</p>
<p>Sub-component 3.2 Monitoring and Evaluation</p> <p>Outcome: Effective monitoring and evaluation of progress and performance, including monitoring of process, stress reduction and environmental status indicators; monitoring and evaluation outputs used in project management and in assessing the effectiveness of Commission measures.</p>	<p>Measures of, and reports on, overall project performance and delivery, including independent evaluations of the Project Quarterly reporting (Q3 & 4 2006 and Q1 & 2 2007), GEF IW Results Framework and PIR/APR (also serves as annual report to RSC) Completed audit</p> <hr/> <p>Analysis of process, stress-reduction, and environmental status indicators as per the GEF International Waters Operational Strategy GEF IW Results Framework Gaps in baseline information addressed with the exception of some information required on national indicators.</p>

<p>Sub-component 3.3 Stakeholder Participation and Awareness Raising</p> <p>Outcome: Non-governmental stakeholder participation in national and regional oceanic fisheries management processes, including the Commission, enhanced; awareness of oceanic fisheries management issues and the WCPF Convention improved. Specific forums developed for NGO participation and discussion process; promotion of awareness of national and regional development and economic priorities and how these relate to sustainable fisheries management.</p>	<p>ENGO participation and awareness raising in Convention-related processes LOA (and co-financing agreement) with WWF Pacific concluded. Successful workshop for regional ENGOs and civil society on WCPF Convention and oceanic fisheries management. WWF participation at regional MOW sessions and WCPFC and subsidiary bodies meetings</p> <p>Support industry participation and awareness raising in Convention-related processes INGO participation at MOW, WCPFC3, inaugural meeting of PITIA (presentations on WCPFC) PITIA participation at WCPFC meetings</p>
<p>Sub-component 3.4 Project Management and Coordination</p> <p>Outcome: Project effectively managed and coordinated between implementing and executing agencies and other participants in the Project; effective participation in Project management and coordination by stakeholders; reports on Project progress and performance flowing between Project participants and being used to manage the Project.</p>	<p>Project Coordination Unit staffing and office Completed</p>

Rating of Project Implementation

	2006 Rating	2007 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator	S	S	<p>Project implementation, the roll out of activities supporting the overall project objectives continues to professionally executed by the FFA and SPC.</p> <p>A significant activity that will not be implemented in accordance with the approved work plan, is the work in relation to research activities on benthic communities of seamounts. This sub-component of Ecosystems Analysis is to be performed by IUCN and circumstances beyond their control have hampered implementation. Communication with IUCN is on-going on the matter. These events will be taken into account in revised work plans and budgets that will reviewed by the Regional Steering Committee.</p>
Government GEF OFP <i>(optional)</i>			
UNDP Country Office	X	X	<p>Project implementation is satisfactory. Discussions continue on the approach to sea mount component analysis and a possibility of 'non ship-based research' activities as well other options of supporting SPC seamount research. The precise timing of this activity is not critical to current project results, and hence there is flexibility of accommodating the activity within the PIOFPM goals and objectives. Other project based activities has been implemented in accordance with its work plans.</p> <p>As the work of the WCPF convention picks up momentum, the project provides every possible opportunity within its framework to assist Pacific SIDS meet their obligations. It is highly recommended that the PCU continues strong communications on the implementation as well as developing national capacity for undertaking institutional and policy reforms, with partners to attract national/regional support for OFM initiatives.</p>

UNDP Regional Technical Advisor	X	X	X
---------------------------------	---	---	---

Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

Action to be Taken	By Whom?	By When?

VI. Risks

1. Please annex to this report a print out of the corresponding Atlas Risk Tab (please use landscape format and only print the frame).

The screenshot displays the Atlas Finance web application interface. The browser window title is "Award Summary - Microsoft Internet Explorer". The address bar shows the URL: https://finance.partneragencies.org/psp/UNDPP1FS/EMPLOYEE/ERP/c/ESTABLISH_AWARDS.UNDP_GM_AWARD_SUMM_GBL?PORTALPARAM_PTCNAV=UNDP_GM_AWARD_SUMM_GBL&EOPP. The application header includes the "Atlas Finance" logo and navigation links: Home, Worklist, Add to Favorites, and Sign out.

The main content area features a navigation menu with tabs for "Award Overview", "Risks", "Issues", and "Monitoring". The "Risks" tab is active. Below the navigation menu, the following award details are displayed:

- Unit:** FJ110
- Award ID:** 00041230 PIMS 2992 IW FSP: Pacific Islands Ocean Fisheries Mngt
- Institution:** 01224 National Execution **Institution Type:** Gov Counterpart Institution
- Award PI:** 263462 RAVUVU,ASENACA V **Sponsor:** 10003 Global Environment Fund Trustee

Below the details, there is a table of risks. The table has the following columns: Risk Type, Date Identified, Risk Description, Risk Management, and Critical. The table shows 11 records, with the first 10 visible. The first 10 records are categorized by Risk Type: ENVIRONMENTAL, FINANCIAL, OPERATIONAL, and X_OTHER. The last record is categorized as X_OTHER. The Risk Description column contains detailed text for each risk. The Risk Management column contains a "View Details" link for each risk. The Critical column contains a checkbox for each risk.

Risk Type	Date Identified	Risk Description	Risk Management	Critical
ENVIRONMENTAL	01/12/2006	Exceeding catch and effort levels for bigeye, yellow fin tuna and other fisheries beyond its sustainable limits as produced by WCPF Commission highlights that Pacific SIDS lack necessary awareness and commitment to take the hard decisions involved in I	View Details	<input type="checkbox"/>
FINANCIAL	01/12/2006	Under spending of GEF resources by PCU as per annual allocations. This may reflect weak delivery of project activities.	View Details	<input type="checkbox"/>
OPERATIONAL	19/09/2006	Capacity to implement activities at national level	View Details	<input type="checkbox"/>
	01/12/2006	Commission becoming ineffective during the project lifetime (which in turn may affect the sustainability of the project).	View Details	<input type="checkbox"/>
	30/07/2007	Implementation and progress of sea mount analysis component further delayed by IUCN	View Details	<input type="checkbox"/>
ORGANIZATIONAL		No Record		
POLITICAL		No Record		
REGULATORY		No Record		
SECURITY		No Record		
STRATEGIC		No Record		
X_OTHER	01/12/2006	Difficult policy decisions on management of the fisheries and difficult management proposals for the ecosystems may be proposed as per scientific findings and statistical evidence of the commission.	View Details	<input type="checkbox"/>

The bottom of the screenshot shows the Windows taskbar with the Start button and several open applications: "Inbox - Microsof...", "UNDP GEF IW P...", "Document3 - ML...", "Award Summar...", and "2006 Audit". The system clock shows "2:30 PM".

2. For any risks identified as “critical” please copy the following information from Atlas:

Risk Type	Date Identified	Risk Description	Risk Management Response

VII.

VIII. Adjustments to Project Strategy

Please report any adjustments made to the project strategy, as reflected in the logical framework matrix, since the Project Document signature:

Change Made to:	Yes/No	Reason for Change
Project Objective	No	
Project Outcomes	No	
Project Outputs/ Activities / Inputs	Yes	Benthic survey on seamounts postponed due to factors beyond the control of IUCN. Further funding is required to undertake the original work plan as a result of non-event of vessel charter. Intentions to secure additional co-financing and review survey schedule are being pursued by IUCN.

Adjustments to Project Time Frame

If the duration of the project, the project work schedule, or the timing of any key events such as project start up, evaluations or closing date, have been adjusted since project approval please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes.

Change	Reason for Change
N/A	N/A

IX. Financial Information

Please present all financial values in US\$ millions to 2 decimal places only (e.g. \$3,502,000 should be written as \$3.50m)

Name of Partner or Contributor (including the Private Sector)	Nature of Contributor ⁴	Amount used in Project Preparation (PDF A, B)	Amount committed in Project Document ⁵	Additional amounts committed after Project Document finalization ¹¹	Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2007	Expected Total Disbursement by end of project
GEF Contribution	GEF	\$0.69 m	\$10.94 m	\$Nil	\$4.00 m	
Cash Cofinancing – UNDP Managed						
UNDP (TRAC)	UN Agency					
<i>(add rows as necessary)</i>						
Cash Cofinancing – Partner Managed						
<i>NZAID</i>			\$0.40 m	\$0.40 m		
<i>PNG PFA</i>				\$0.10 m		
<i>Fr Pacific Fund</i>				\$0.06 m		
<i>ACIAR</i>				\$0.30 m		
<i>Uni of Hawaii</i>				\$0.10 m		
<i>WWF Pacific</i>				\$0.10 m		
Under Consideration						
<i>EC</i>				\$1.90 m		
<i>US dept of State (OESI)</i>				\$0.20 m		
<i>Japan (JFT)</i>				\$2.00 m		
<i>PITIA</i>				\$0.55 m		
In-Kind Cofinancing						
<i>Participating Governments (In cash and kind):</i>			\$17.28 m			
<i>Regional Organisation</i>						

⁴ Specify if: UN Agency, other Multilateral, Bilateral Donor, Regional Development Bank (RDB), National Government, Local Government, NGO, Private Sector, Other.

⁵ Committed amounts are those shown in the approved Project Document. These may be zero in the case of new leveraged project partners.

<i>(In cash and Kind):</i>			\$14.46 m			
<i>NGOs (In cash and Kind):</i>			\$0.61 m			
<i>NGOs (In cash and Kind):</i>			\$0.40 m			
<i>Othere WCPFC members (Commission Contributions):</i>			\$6.49 m			
Other Estimates Co-Financing						
Fishing States (In King regulation costs):			\$32.25 m			
Survellance Partners (In Kind):			\$7.20 m			
Total Cofinancing			\$79.09			
Total for Project		\$0.69	\$90.03	\$5.71		

Comments

Please explain any significant changes in project financing since Project Document signature, or differences between the anticipated and actual rates of disbursement:

Anticipated and actual rates of disbursement are relatively aligned.

X. Additional Financial Instruments used in the Project

This section only needs to be completed if the project provides funds to any Financial Instruments such as: Trust Funds, Sinking Funds, Revolving Funds, Partial Credit Risk Guarantees, Microfinance services, Leasing or Insurance mechanisms.

If this project does not use any Additional Financial Instruments skip this and go to Section VIII.

Financial Instrument	Financial Institution Responsible for Management	Basis for Selection of Financial Institution
N/A	N/A	N/A

For Each Financial Instrument please complete the following two tables:

Name of Financial Instrument:

Source of Funds (add rows for each source)	Funds Committed in Project Document	Amount Disbursed to Date	Issues or Comments
GEF	N/A	N/A	N/A

Rating of Performance of Financial Instrument

	2006 Rating	2007 Rating	Comments
National Project Manager/Coordinator	N/A	N/A	N/A
Government GEF OFP			
UNDP Country Office			
UNDP Regional Technical Advisor			
Overall Rating			

Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating

Where a project has received a rating of MU, U or HU describe the actions to be taken to address this:

Action to be Taken	By Whom?	By When?
N/A		

End of Project Situation

What is to happen to any funds remaining in the Financial Instrument at the end of the project?

XI. Lessons

Are there any lessons from this project that could benefit the design and implementation of other GEF-funded projects? Please list up to three and indicate which one/s could be worth developing into case studies of good/bad practice.

i) In the design phase of the full project, a strategic decision to recruit regional fisheries experts to work along side international experts to consult with stakeholders proved to be exceptionally beneficial in the final design of the project document. Notably, in designing the project emphasis is directed not only to the regional aspects of project assistance but a clear direction to address national level interventions to address the root causes and threats to international waters in the region, specifically deficiencies in management relating to governance and lack of understanding. A well executed terminal review of the first phase with clear recommendations also provided noteworthy guidance in the formation of the full Oceanic Fisheries Management project for the Pacific region.

ii) The Pacific region has a long history of regional cooperation on oceanic fisheries management matters and this is supported by the evolution of regional organizations whose technical and management competence have worked for the benefit of the small island developing States in this area. In the case of the Pacific, these recognized and established mechanisms serve positively for addressing transboundary international waters concerns, particularly for migratory resources.

iii) A set of guidelines detailing the processes, including timeframes, involved from project concept to the official start date of projects might have prevented the delayed roll out of the PI OFM Project. While some delays by their nature of needing scheduled committee type approval are unavoidable, others concerning communication, preparation work and roles of responsibility could have reasonably been avoided with clear guidelines for all organizations involved. In the course of addressing the accessibility of GEF assistance to the Pacific region any advice provided should be inclusive of clear process guidelines with timeframes.

XII. Project Contribution to GEF Strategic Targets in International Waters

The International Waters Results Template is designed to be cumulative and updated on an annual basis (using a new color each year). Based on the results from the FY 07 reporting year, please update last year's results template using **red color font** to highlight new and revised sections.

SEE ATTACHED TABLE ONE AND THE 2007 GEF INTERNATIONAL WATERS ANNUAL PERFORMANCE RESULTS (GEF RESULTS FRAMEWORK)

Note: The PI OFM Project 2006 UNDP GEF APR/PIR for International Waters reported this section (IX) as a narrative. In a separate report format the OFM Project completed the "*GEF International Waters Annual Project Performance Report (GEF IW Results Framework)*" which reported against Process outcomes and indicators, Stress reduction Outcomes and Environmental & Socioeconomic Status Outcomes as well as linkages & support by the project for achievement of the MDGS and project support to the WSSD Plan of Implementation. The following table provides updated results against Process, Stress reduction and Environmental indicators, is linked to and should be read in conjunction with Section II (Progress towards achieving project objectives) of this report.

Table 1

Outcomes as Specified in GEF IW PPR	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
PROCESS INDICATORS				
Effective national inter-ministry coordination	Existence of inter-ministry coordination mechanisms. Nos. of meetings/contacts of inter-Ministry coordination	Establish by baseline study	Improvements in most PACSIDS	Contacts at the national between relevant national government institutions dealing with fisheries management issues have been enhanced particularly on the WCPFC issues relating to compliance of the Conservation and Management Measures
Stakeholder involvement in SAP implementation	PacSIDS involvement in WCPFC, SC & TCC meetings NGO involvement in Project activities	Not applicable Phase I terminal evaluation noted lack of NGO involvement as a major weakness in Phase I	High level of participation by PacSIDS in WCPFC (100%), SC & TCC meetings (80%) ENGOs & INGOs involved in Project execution	Effective participation of the FFA members at the Northern Group and Eastern Group WCPFC Sub regional workshops in preparation for the SC3, TCC3 and the WCPFC4. The Western Group WCPFC sub regional workshop is scheduled to be in first week of September 2007.
Newly established and/or strengthened transboundary waters institutions The WCPFC established & beginning to function effectively;	See Outcome 2 a) in Section A above			Outcome 2 a) Level of first 3 elements only
Adoption of national & regional legal, policy & institutional reforms that address priority transboundary concerns The WCPFC Convention being implemented	Status of WCPFC Convention	Convention entered into force in June 2004, with 12 of the 13 Convention ratifications to bring the Convention into force from	All major coastal & fishing states party to the Convention	WCPFC Convention ratified for 33 of 34 States & Territories participating in WCPFC process. This includes all major coastal &

Outcomes as Specified in GEF IW PPR	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
		PACSIDS , following PDF-B support. 21 Members or participating territories at June 2005		fishing states except Indonesia (Depends on US ratifying as announced by June)
National laws, policies, institutions & programmes relating to management of transboundary oceanic fisheries reformed, realigned & strengthened to implement the WCPF Convention & other applicable global & regional instruments	See Outcome 2 c) in Section A above			See Outcome 2 c) in Section A above
Financial sustainability of joint transboundary waters institutions	WCPFC Financial Regulations & Budgets.	WCPFC adopted Financial Regulations & schedule of financial contributions at its First Session in December 2004, based largely upon the principle of "those who fish should pay" (70% of contributions based on catches with discount for developing countries)	Satisfactory level of payment of CCM financial contributions WCPFC core programmes not blocked by lack of funding	Satisfactory payment of membership contributions by FFA members and all other CCMs and by donor agencies Effective delivery of service and reports by the WCPFC Secretariat in regards to SC3 and TCC3 and meeting targets for its core programmes
Other Process Indicators Improved quality, compatibility & availability of scientific information & knowledge on the oceanic transboundary fish stocks & related ecosystem aspects of the WTP warm pool LME, with a particular focus on the ecology of seamounts in relation to pelagic fisheries, & the fishing impacts upon them.	See Outcome 1 a) in Section A			See Outcome 1 a) in Section A
STRESS REDUCTION OUTCOMES				
Information on the WTP Warm Pool fish stocks & LME being used by the WCPFC to assess &	See Outcome 1 b) of Section A			See Outcome 1 b) of Section A

Outcomes as Specified in GEF IW PPR	Description of Indicator:	Baseline Level	Target (by June 2010 unless otherwise indicated)	Level at June 2007
adopt conservation & management measures for transboundary fish stocks & the LME.				
The WCPFC established & beginning to function effectively	See Governance objective, 2 nd element			See Governance objective, 2 nd element
ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OUTCOMES ⁶				
Improved information & knowledge on the oceanic transboundary fish stocks & related ecosystem aspects of the WTP warm pool LME being used by the WCPFC & Pacific SIDS to adopt & apply measures to enhance the conservation & management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources & protection of the biodiversity of the WTP LME	<p>Status of target stocks</p> <p>Impacts of fishing on non-target species</p> <p>Broader ecosystem impacts</p> <p>Improvements in the contribution to PACSIDS sustainable development from improved management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources & from the conservation of oceanic marine biodiversity generally.</p>		<p>Target stocks within limits agreed by the WCPFC</p> <p>Significant reductions in mortality from fishing on non-target species</p> <p>Positive results for broader ecosystem indicators (yet to be identified)</p> <p>Sustainable gains in PACSIDS benefits including jobs, access fees, exports etc</p>	<p>Limits yet to be agreed</p> <p>High priority being given to improving data on mortality. Impacts not yet measurable</p> <p>Proposal for monitoring ecosystem indicators presented. Impacts not yet measurable</p> <p>First report on economic indicators presented to FFC. Impacts not yet measurable</p>

⁶ Since the Project is largely aimed at Process Outcomes, focused on the establishment & functioning of the WCPFCP, it will take time before impacts can be measured at the environmental & socioeconomic status level, & they may not be measurable by the planned end of project at 2010. Project activity at this level is currently focused on establishing baseline data & reference points. Price data can indicate that limits being applied to fishing are increasing the socioeconomic value of stocks in a way that should be measurable within the term of the Project.

ATTACHMENT A

**Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project Beneficiary Country Endorsements,
Confirmations and Signatures on the Project Document (as at July 2007)**

GEF Operational Points (at November 2004)	Dates of Endorsement/ Confirmation	Project Document Signatures ⁷
Cook Islands Mr Vaitoti Tupa, Director, Environment Service	Endorsed: 13 October 2003 Confirmed: 24 December 2004	
Federated States of Micronesia Mr John Mooteb, Deputy Assistant Secretary Sustainable Development Unit	Endorsed: 6 November 2003 Confirmed: 29 December 2004	
Fiji Mr Cama Tuiloma, Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Local Government, Housing, Squatter Settlement & Environment	Endorsed: 1 March 2004 Confirmed 1 February 2005	Endorsed: 29 August 2005
Kiribati Mr Tererei Abete-Reema, Deputy Director, Environment and Conservation Division	Endorsed: 28 November 2003	
Republic of Marshall Islands Ms Yumiko Crisostomo, Director, Office of Environmental Planning and Policy Coordination	Endorsed: 16 September 2003 Confirmed 4 February 2005	
Nauru Mr Joseph Caim, The Secretary, Department of Industry & Economic Development	Endorsed: 20 October 2003 Confirmed 14 December 2004	
Niue Mr Crossley Tatui, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs Office	Endorsed: 9 February 2004 Confirmed: 24 December 2004	Endorsed: 27 July 2005
Palau Ms Youlsau Bells, National Environment Planner, Office of Environmental and Response Coordination	Endorsed: 22 October 2003 Confirmed: 17 December 2004	
Papua New Guinea Mr Wari Iamo, Director, Department of Environment and Conservation	Endorsed: 19 February 2004 Confirmed 2 February 2005	Endorsed: 10 August 2005
Samoa Mr Aiono Mose Pouvi Sua Chief Executive Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	Endorsed: 17 October 2003 Confirmed: 23 December 2004	
Solomon Islands Mr Steve Likaveke, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Forests, Environment & Conservation	Endorsed: 11 October 2003 Confirmed: 20 December 2004	
Tonga Mr Uilou Samani, Director, Department of Environment	Endorsed: 26 January 2004 Confirmed: 3 January 2005	
Tokelau Mr Falani Aukuso, Director, Office of the Council of Faipule	Endorsed: 27 February 2004 Confirmed: 13 December 2004	Endorsed: 18 July 2007
Tuvalu Mr Nelesone Panapasi, Secretary to Government, Office of the Prime Minister	Endorsed: 7 November 2003 Confirmed 1 February 2005	Endorsed: August 2005 (Mr. En GEF Focal Point)
Vanuatu	Endorsed: 17 March 2004	Endorsed: 24 August 2005

⁷ Status – UNDP Suva.

GEF Operational Points (at November 2004)	Dates of Endorsement/ Confirmation	Project Document Signatures ⁷
Mr Ernest Bani, The Head, Environment Unit		
Other Project Document Signatures		
<i>Implementing Agency</i> United Nations Development Programme		
Suva Mr. Hans de Graff Deputy Resident Representative		Endorsed: 30 September 2005
Papua New Guinea Ms. Jacqui Badcock Resident Representative		Endorsed: 4 August 2005
<i>Executing Agency</i> Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency Mr. Feleti.P.Teo Director General		Endorsed: 13 July 2005



Global Environment Facility

GEF INTERNATIONAL WATERS ANNUAL PROJECT PERFORMANCE RESULTS

I. Project Identifiers:

Reporting Year	2007
Project Title	Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project.
Implementing Agency/ies	Implementing Agency: UNDP Executing Agencies: FFA, SPC, IUCN
International Waters Operational Programme (8, 9, or 10)	OP 8 the Waterbody-Based Operational Program - Large Marine Ecosystem Component; and OP 9 - the Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Programme, SIDS programme
International Waters Strategic Priority (1, 2, or 3)	IW1 - Catalyse financial resource mobilisation for implementation of reforms and stress reduction measures agreed through TDA-SAP or equivalent processes for particular transboundary systems; and IW2 - Expand global coverage of foundational capacity building addressing the two key programme gaps and support for targeted learning, specifically the fisheries programme gap.
Priority Transboundary Concerns (Project Types A-C only)	Unsustainable use of transboundary oceanic fish stocks in the Pacific region. Specifically : the impact on target transboundary oceanic fish stocks; the impact on non-target fish stocks; the impact on other species of interest (such as marine mammals, seabirds and turtles); the impact of fishing around seamounts; the impact on foodwebs; and the impact on biodiversity

II. Project Type:

A. Foundational/Capacity Building Project	Go to III.A	p. 2
B. SAP Implementation – Regional Project	Go to III.B	p. 4
C. SAP Implementation - Strategic Partnership – Investment Fund	Go to III.C	p. 6
D. Global/Regional/National Demonstration project	Go to III.D	p. 8
E. Technical Support and Portfolio Learning Project	Go to III.E	p. 10

III. B. International Waters Results Template – SAP Implementation Projects

PROCESS OUTCOMES AND INDICATORS

Process OUTCOMES			Process INDICATORS
Project	Rating	Catalytic	Project
Effective national inter-ministry coordination	MU		Information on this issue from the 15 Pacific SIDS not yet available to the Project Existence of inter-ministry coordination mechanisms. Nos. of meetings/contacts of inter-Ministry coordination. Data yet to be collected Contacts at the national between relevant national government institutions dealing with fisheries management issues have been enhanced particularly on the WCPFC issues relating to compliance of the Conservation and Management Measures
Stakeholder involvement in SAP implementation	S	Eight NGOs accorded observer status and participated in the WCPF Commission (WCPFC) meetings in the reporting period	All Pacific SIDS participated in the meetings of the WCPFC, and its Scientific Committee (SC) and Technical & Compliance Committee (TCC), with 1 participant each financed from the WCPFC budget, additional participants nationally funded – also supported by technical advice from the Project. ENGO & INGO representatives have participated in most national and regional Project activities including pre-WCPFC, SC & TCC meetings and Project National Consultative Committees High level of participation by PacSIDS in WCPFC (100%), SC & TCC meetings (80%) maintained ENGOs (WWF) & INGOs (PITIA) involved are involved in Project execution
Newly established and/or strengthened transboundary waters institutions The WCPFC established and beginning to function effectively;	HS	WCPFC established and adopted Rules of Procedure and organizational structure at its First Session in December 2004.	SC established & first regular session held in August 2005. The SC <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • established specialist WGs in Fishing Technology, Methods, Statistics, Biology, Stock Assessment and Ecosystem and Bycatch; • agreed on the future work programme for the SC and • provided advice to the WCPFC on the status of major stocks and impacts of conservation and management measures TCC established & first regular session held in Dec 2005. The TCC began establishment of:

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a compliance programme including observer, boarding & inspection, VMS schemes and • a process for identifying infringements and applying sanctions <p>Executive Director and other key WCPFC staff appointed by December 2005</p> <p>WCPFC & subsidiary bodies operating with a complete set of Rules & Regulations & a Secretariat, with sustainable financial arrangements (by Dec 2007) - Draft Rules for subsidiary bodies being considered by SC & TCC</p> <p>Staff Regs adopted & Secretariat posts all filled. (by Dec 2007) - Staff Regs adopted. Secretariat posts being filled with some difficulty.</p> <p>TCC operational (by Dec 2007) - Achieved 2005</p>
<p>Adoption of national and regional legal, policy and institutional reforms that address priority transboundary concerns The WCPFC Convention being implemented</p> <p>Regional institutional arrangements for oceanic fisheries management strengthened</p> <p>National laws, policies, institutions and programmes relating to management of transboundary oceanic fisheries reformed, realigned and strengthened to implement the WCPFC Convention and other applicable global and regional instruments</p>	<p>HS</p> <p>HS</p> <p>S</p>	<p>All major fishing states except the US have ratified the Convention at June 2006</p> <p>Pacific Island Forum Heads of State established a Ministerial committee to oversee regional fisheries affairs which met in May 2004 and May 2005</p>	<p>WCPFC Convention entered into force in June 2004, with 12 of the 13 Convention ratifications to bring the Convention into force from Pacific SIDS, following PDF-B support.</p> <p>WCPFC Convention ratified for 33 of 34 States & Territories participating in WCPFC process. This includes all major coastal & fishing states except Indonesia (Depends on US ratifying as announced by June)</p> <p>WCPFC-related legal, policy and institutional reviews under way in many Pacific SIDS, supported from the Project by national fishery status reports (2 in 2005-06) legal reviews (4 in 2005-06) and reviews of management plans based on EAFM, and by regional scientific, legal, compliance and policy workshops and consultations.</p> <p>PacSIDS are implementing WCPFC measures & national conservation & management measures – Assessment yet to be completed.</p>
<p>Financial sustainability of joint transboundary waters institutions</p>	<p>HS</p>	<p>WCPFC has begun to finance oceanic SPC fisheries</p>	<p>WCPFC adopted Financial Regulations and schedule of financial contributions at its First Session in December 2004, based largely upon</p>

		<p>monitoring and science activities previously funded by donors</p> <p>Japan pledged \$2m over 5 years to the WCPFC for technical assistance (implementation to be coordinated with the GEF PIOFMP). Voluntary extra-budgetary assistance for specific WCPFC activities provided by other Commission Members.</p>	<p>the principle of “those who fish should pay” (70% of contributions based on catches with discount for developing countries)</p> <p>Satisfactory level of payment of CCM financial contributions – The failure to pay three consecutive annual contributions results in the withdrawal of voting privileges. Some instances of arrears to date</p> <p>Financial Regulations include provision for a Special Requirements Fund for SIDS. Permanent HQ jointly donated by FSM and China.</p> <p>WCPFC core programmes not blocked by lack of funding - To date there are no programme implementation demands attributed to lack of funding.</p>
<p>Improved information and knowledge on the oceanic transboundary fish stocks and related ecosystem aspects of the WTP warm pool LME being used by the WCPFC and Pacific SIDS to adopt and apply measures to enhance the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources and protection of the biodiversity of the WTP LME</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>WCPFC has established arrangements with ISC or data services and scientific services related to northern WCPO stocks and with IATTC relating to WCPO/EPO cooperation</p>	<p>MOU between SPC and the WCPFC provides the basis for provision of data management and scientific services by SPC to the WCPFC.</p> <p>WCPFC adopted standards for provision of WCPFC data</p> <p>SPC oceanic fisheries data and scientific programmes, including SIDS capacity building, strengthened by resources from the Project, the EU and the WCPFC</p> <p>Tuna Fishery Data Management System installed & operation in 7 Pacific SIDS, national Observer Programmes established in 10 of the 15 Pacific SIDS,</p> <p>Establishment of SC & subsidiary bodies including bodies for statistics & Ecosystem/Bycatch work (by Dec 2007) - achieved 2005</p> <p>Binding agreement on protocols for fisheries data collection & provision, including catch & effort logs, & port & onboard sampling (by Dec 2007) - catch & Effort Protocol in place.</p> <p>Establishment of Commission data management structure and, databases (by Dec 2007) - Port & onboard sampling protocols still under consideration</p> <p>Appointment of science staff and/or contracting of experts for the provision of scientific services (by Dec 2007) - Interim arrangements in place</p> <p>Agreement on scientific work programme, including forms of stock assessment analysis (by Dec 2007) – Staff appointed, interim arrangements agreed for scientific experts, subject to review in 2007</p> <p>(a) seamount occurrence documented using available data</p> <p>b) Impacts of seamounts on physical/biological oceanography and pelagic fisheries better understood - The occurrence of seamounts has been documented using available data, but further work is required</p>

			The occurrence of seamounts has been documented using available data, but further work is required.
Information on the Project and the WCPF process contributing to increased awareness of oceanic fishery resource and ecosystem management;	S		OFM Project webpage established April 2006 IWLEARN participation, publications

STRESS REDUCTION OUTCOMES AND INDICATORS

Stress Reduction OUTCOMES			Stress Reduction INDICATORS (report vs. baseline if possible)
Project	Rating	Catalytic	Project
Improved information and knowledge on the oceanic transboundary fish stocks and related ecosystem aspects of the WTP warm pool LME being used by the WCPFC and Pacific SIDS to adopt and apply measures to enhance the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources and protection of the biodiversity of the WTP LME	HS		<p>SPC and the SC provided advice to WCPFC1 and 3 identifying stocks requiring management attention and assessing the projected impacts of a range of conservation and management measures.</p> <p>WCPFC1 (Dec 2004) adopted conservation and management measures barring vessels of states that were not WCPFC Members or cooperating non-Members (CCMs) from operating in the region and establishing a record of vessels authorised to operate in the WCPO</p> <p>WCPFC2 (Dec 2005) adopted conservation and management measures requiring Members to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not increase fishing effort for bigeye & yellowfin beyond current levels; • cap purse seine effort at 2004 levels or an average of 2001 to 2004; • limit the longline catch of bigeye generally to 2001-04 average levels • not increase numbers of fishing vessels targeting South Pacific albacore; • keep fishing effort for North Pacific albacore north of the equator not greater than current levels. <p>WCPFC2 also adopted resolutions to apply the FAO International Plan of Action to Reduce the Incidental Catch of Seabirds, and the FAO Guidelines to Reduce Turtle Mortality , reduce incidental catches of other non-fish species and avoid vessel transfers that contribute to over-capacity.</p>

			<p>Measures of target stock status in relation to agreed management reference points available Stock status measures available, but no agreed reference points</p> <p>Measures of status of ecosystem including trophic status & status of key non-target species Proposal under consideration</p> <p>Provision of scientific advice to the Commission including information & recommendations on TACs & other management measures from the Scientific Committee to the Commission - Achieved, ongoing</p> <p>Measures of the impact of environmental variability on target species abundance & distribution - Achieved, ongoing</p> <p>Assessments available of the impact of fishing on target & non-target species - Achieved & ongoing for target species, less progress for non-target species</p> <p>Analysis made of impact of possible conservation measures -Achieved & ongoing</p>
--	--	--	--

ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS OUTCOMES AND INDICATORS

Environmental & Socioeconomic Status OUTCOMES			Environmental & Socioeconomic Status INDICATORS (1)
Project	Rating	Catalytic	Project
Pacific SIDS improve the contribution to their sustainable development from improved management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources and from the conservation of oceanic marine biodiversity generally.	S		FFA produced a first report to measure indicators of socio-economic contributions of oceanic fisheries Target stocks within limits agreed by the WCPFC. Limits yet to be agreed Significant reductions in mortality from fishing on non-target species. High priority being given to improving data on mortality. Impacts not yet measurable
Improved information and knowledge on the oceanic transboundary fish stocks and related ecosystem aspects of the WTP warm pool LME being used by the WCPFC and Pacific SIDS to adopt and apply measures to enhance the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources and protection of the biodiversity of the WTP LME	S		SPC and the SC provided estimates to the Commission of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • key indicators of status of four major tuna stocks • estimates of mortalities of non-target species from fishing (including sharks, seabirds and turtles) and, inter alia, a proposal for ecosystem monitoring, measuring of ecosystem indicators and ecosystem reference points and ecosystem model development Positive results for broader ecosystem indicators (yet to be identified). Proposal for monitoring ecosystem indicators presented. Impacts not yet measurable

(1) It will take time before impacts can be measured at the environmental and socioeconomic status level, and Project activity at this level is currently focused on establishing baseline data. Impacts on resources and stocks may take several years to measure reliably, but there are already preliminary indications from price data that the limits being applied to fishing are increasing the socioeconomic value of stocks in a way that should be measurable within the term of the Project.

Ratings:

Highly Satisfactory	HS	The outcome is likely to be achieved or exceeded, efficiently with no significant shortcomings
Satisfactory	S	The outcome is likely to be achieved, efficiently with only minor shortcomings
Moderately Satisfactory	MS	The outcome is likely to be achieved, efficiently with moderate shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory	MU	The outcome has moderate shortcomings that limit or jeopardize its achievement, but resolution is likely.
Unsatisfactory	U	The outcome has significant shortcomings that limit or jeopardize its achievement, and resolution is uncertain.
Highly Unsatisfactory	HU	The outcome has major shortcomings that limit or jeopardize its achievement, and resolution is unlikely.

IV. Linkages and support to achievement of MDGs

Millenium Development Goals: Briefly summarize how the project is helping to achieve the relevant MDGs below.

MDG Indicator No.	MDG Descriptor	Check MDGs that apply	Briefly describe how the MDG is being supported
<p>1.1.1</p> <p>1.1.2</p> <p>1.1.3</p> <p>1.2.4</p> <p>1.2.5</p>	<p>Proportion of population below \$1 per day</p> <p>Poverty gap ratio.</p> <p>Share of poorest quintile in national consumption</p> <p>Prevalence of underweight children under-five years of age</p> <p>Proportion of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption</p>	<p>√</p>	<p>The project targets sustainable development of oceanic fisheries. Sustainable development of oceanic fisheries is a major component of the plans for socio-economic development of all SIDS. The scope for benefits from sustainable oceanic fisheries, including food security and incomes, is particularly important in the poorer Pacific SIDS - most of the Pacific SIDS with the lowest levels of development, as measured by the UNDP Human Development Index, are also the countries with the richer oceanic fisheries resources.</p>

V. Project Support to WSSD Plan of Implementation:

WSSD PoI Action Reference Code	WSSD Description	Check WSSD that apply
III.15.c	Collect and disseminate information on cost-effective examples in cleaner production, eco-efficiency and environmental management, and promote the exchange of best practices and know-how on environmentally sound technologies between public and private institutions;	√
III.17.a	Encourage industry to improve social and environmental performance through voluntary initiatives, including environmental management systems, codes of conduct, certification and public reporting on environmental and social issues, taking into account such initiatives as the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standards and Global Reporting Initiative guidelines on sustainability reporting, bearing in mind principle 11 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development;	√
IV.29.b	Promote the implementation of chapter 17 of Agenda 21 which provides the programme of action for achieving the sustainable development of oceans, coastal areas and seas through its programme areas of integrated management and sustainable development of coastal areas, including exclusive economic zones; marine environmental protection; sustainable use and conservation of marine living resources; addressing critical uncertainties for the management of the marine environment and climate change; strengthening international, including regional, cooperation and coordination; and sustainable development of small islands.	√
IV.29.d	Encourage the application by 2010 of the ecosystem approach, noting the Reykjavik Declaration on Responsible Fisheries in the Marine Ecosystem and decision 5/6 of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.	√
IV.29.e	Promote integrated, multidisciplinary and multisectoral coastal and ocean management at the national level, and encourage and assist coastal States in developing ocean policies and mechanisms on integrated coastal management.	√
IV.29.f	Strengthen regional cooperation and coordination between the relevant regional organizations and programmes, the UNEP regional seas programmes, regional fisheries management organizations and other regional science, health and development organizations.	√
IV.29.g	Assist developing countries in coordinating policies and programmes at the regional and subregional levels aimed at the conservation and sustainable management of fishery resources, and implement integrated coastal area management plans, including through the promotion of sustainable coastal and small-scale fishing activities and, where appropriate, the development of related infrastructure.	√
IV.30.a-g	<p>To achieve sustainable fisheries, the following actions are required at all levels:</p> <p>(a) Maintain or restore stocks to levels that can produce the maximum sustainable yield with the aim of achieving these goals for depleted stocks on an urgent basis and where possible not later than 2015;</p> <p>(b) Ratify or accede to and effectively implement the relevant United Nations and, where appropriate, associated regional fisheries agreements or arrangements, noting in particular the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks and the 1993 Agreement to Promote Compliance with International Conservation and Management Measures by Fishing Vessels on the High Seas;</p> <p>(c) Implement the 1995 Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries, taking note of the special requirements of developing countries as noted in its article 5, and the relevant Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) international plans of action and technical guidelines;</p> <p>(d) Urgently develop and implement national and, where appropriate, regional plans of action, to put into effect the FAO international plans of action, in particular the international plan of action for the management of fishing capacity by 2005 and the international plan of action to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing by 2004. Establish effective monitoring, reporting and enforcement, and control of fishing vessels, including by flag States, to further the international plan of action to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing;</p> <p>(e) Encourage relevant regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements to give due consideration to the rights, duties and interests of coastal States and the special requirements of developing States when addressing the issue of the allocation of share of fishery</p>	<p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p>

	<p>resources for straddling stocks and highly migratory fish stocks, mindful of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, on the high seas and within exclusive economic zones;</p> <p>(f) Eliminate subsidies that contribute to illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing and to over-capacity, while completing the efforts undertaken at WTO to clarify and improve its disciplines on fisheries subsidies, taking into account the importance of this sector to developing countries;</p> <p>(g) Strengthen donor coordination and partnerships between international financial institutions, bilateral agencies and other relevant stakeholders to enable developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and small island developing States and countries with economies in transition, to develop their national, regional and sub-regional capacities for infrastructure and integrated management and the sustainable use of fisheries;</p> <p>(h) Support the sustainable development of aquaculture, including small-scale aquaculture, given its growing importance for food security and economic development.</p>	<p>√</p> <p>√</p>
IV.31.a-e	<p>In accordance with chapter 17 of Agenda 21, promote the conservation and management of the oceans through actions at all levels, giving due regard to the relevant international instruments to:</p> <p>(a) Maintain the productivity and biodiversity of important and vulnerable marine and coastal areas, including in areas within and beyond national jurisdiction;</p> <p>(b) Implement the work programme arising from the Jakarta Mandate on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine and Coastal Biological Diversity of the Convention on Biological Diversity, including through the urgent mobilization of financial resources and technological assistance and the development of human and institutional capacity, particularly in developing countries;</p> <p>(c) Develop and facilitate the use of diverse approaches and tools, including the ecosystem approach, the elimination of destructive fishing practices, the establishment of marine protected areas consistent with international law and based on scientific information, including representative networks by 2012 and time/area closures for the protection of nursery grounds and periods, proper coastal land use; and watershed planning and the integration of marine and coastal areas management into key sectors;</p> <p>(d) Develop national, regional and international programmes for halting the loss of marine biodiversity, including in coral reefs and wetlands;</p> <p>(e) Implement the RAMSAR Convention, including its joint work programme with the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the programme of action called for by the International Coral Reef Initiative to strengthen joint management plans and international networking for wetland ecosystems in coastal zones, including coral reefs, mangroves, seaweed beds and tidal mud flats.</p>	<p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p> <p>√</p>
IV.34.a, c	<p>Improve the scientific understanding and assessment of marine and coastal ecosystems as a fundamental basis for sound decision-making, through actions at all levels to:</p> <p>(a) Increase scientific and technical collaboration, including integrated assessment at the global and regional levels, including the appropriate transfer of marine science and marine technologies and techniques for the conservation and management of living and non-living marine resources and expanding ocean-observing capabilities for the timely prediction and assessment of the state of marine environment.</p> <p>(c) Build capacity in marine science, information and management, through, inter alia, promoting the use of environmental impact assessments and environmental evaluation and reporting techniques, for projects or activities that are potentially harmful to the coastal and marine environments and their living and non-living resources.</p>	<p>√</p>

NATIONAL REPORT

NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT TO THE OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)

Reporting Period, October 2006 – June 2007

1. **Country:** Federated States of Micronesia

2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Program of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)

3. **Period Covered:** 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007

4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**

The Federated States of Micronesia is pleased with the overall progress of the project and project activities delivery. As the project document was done sometimes back, some flexibility should be exercised to be able to shift funds to other areas as new challenges arise.

The project activities have been most useful in capacity building at the country level as well as at the regional level. Without the project, most of the small administrations in the region will have been ill-prepared to effectively participate in the meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies and in meeting their various obligations under the Commission. The two components (SPC and FFA) of the project have gone a long way in assisting the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) of the region, not only to participate, but to participate effectively in the work of the Commission and in meeting their obligations under the Commission.

The FSM through NORMA has particularly benefited from both components of the project. Under Component One of the project, the TUFMAN database has been set up in country with some training on its use. This is work in progress and more work is still being carried out to further develop the program to produce the reports that are required. Assistance and support have also been extended to the FSM in data quality improvements and collections through various guides, workshops and attachments. The FSM National Fishery Status Report has also been worked on and a short version has been presented and fuller version will be delivered at the planned EAFM Consultation workshop in November. The Stock Assessment Workshops have also been most useful to the FSM in understanding the scientific concepts involved in stock assessments and comprehend the scientific reports better and participate more in discussing these issues as they come

up at the Scientific Committee and the Commission itself. The scientific papers developed for the Commission have also been very useful for the FSM's effective participation in the Commission.

Project activities under Component Two of the project have been most useful for the FSM in several areas. On the legal side, on-going effort and advice in the review and assistance in drafting fisheries legislation to be compliant with regional and international requirements have been graciously extended and very much appreciated. Assistance has also been extended in port state enforcement through workshops and legal attachments. The regional judicial seminar is another useful legal seminar that assists countries in the region to prosecute fisheries cases more efficiently and successfully in the on-going effort to curtail IUU fishing.

In conservation and management, the FSM has greatly benefited from the WCPFC Workshops, the pre-WCPFC meeting (including TCC and the SC) FFC caucuses. These have helped prepare us for more effective participation at the meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies. The on-going Management Options Workshop is viewed by the FSM as one of the most useful undertakings of the Project in terms of the Region's response to the need to conserve and manage the resources in a sustainable manner for our generation and future generations of our Pacific peoples. This workshop is most useful in getting the region to strategically prepare to take on the *delay* tactics and attempts by the distant water fishing nations to continue fishing as usual despite the scientific advice to cut back effort. The reports on the mitigations of seabirds, turtles, sharks and the use of fish aggregating devices (FADS) in the fisheries assist as well in developing our strategies on these issues as they come in the Commission meetings (including SC and TCC).

Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) workshops and attachments that have been held in the region as well as the annual MCS Working Group meeting funded by the project have also gone a long way in preparing the region in tackling the MCS aspects of the Commission's work.

5. Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):

National level activities

- TUFMAN Database was installed at the NORMA Office with some training
- The National Tuna Fishery Status Report (Short Version) was delivered
- In-country data coordinator support was provided
- A port state enforcement workshop was held in country

Regional level activities

- The FSM participated in the first stock assessment workshop
- Scientific papers provided for the WCPFC benefited the FSM
- The FSM participated in two WCPFC workshops (West and North)
- The FSM participated in the Management Option Workshop last year
- The FSM participated in all FFC caucuses pre-WCPFC (including SC and TCC)
- The FSM was involved in the EAFM Training Workshop
- The FSM participated in the annual MCS Working Group meeting
- The FSM participated in the Regional Judicial Seminar
- The FSM benefited from the draft guideline for fisheries legislation and advice on its on-going activities with Palau and the Marshall Islands on our subsidiary arrangement under the Niue Treaty.

6. Challenges/Issues Encountered

This region is overloaded with meetings and for small administrations as most of the fisheries offices in the region, it is very difficult to keep up with all these meetings. This is not saying that the activities undertaken under the project are of less importance. They are very important for us to meet our obligations under the Commission and we need to have them. We need to make more time for these meetings and workshops so participants can really absorb the materials and concepts and cut down other meetings.

Challenges are an continuing thing. As the Commission develops, new challenges arise; as new measures are taken, new challenges are developed especially for the SIDS with small fisheries administration and limited capacity put the mechanisms in place necessary to implement new decisions by the Commission.

Getting the necessary mechanisms and procedures in place at the Commission so that the Commission can effectively meet its mandates in the

Convention continue to be a challenge. We will continue to talk while the resources are being depleted.

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

The above are regional issues that perhaps should be addressed by the region and not the individual country level. The FSM is keen to discuss these further with others and seek regional solutions to them.

8. Recommendations for Future Action

As a region, which will be impacted most if no agreement is reached at the Commission level on procedures and mechanisms to effectively conserve and manage the tuna resources, we should be greatly concern about the lack of progress on the development and implementation of these procedures and mechanisms. No management measures can be effective without these procedures and mechanism. We should seek ways to make some head-ways on some of these issues.

9. Report Prepared By: Bernard Thoulag, National (OFM Project) Focal Point.

NATIONAL REPORT

NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT TO THE OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)

Reporting Period – 1 Oct 2006 – 30 June 2007

1. Country: MARSHALL ISLANDS

2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)

3. **Period Covered:** 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007

4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress:** As in the previous reporting period, the RMI continued to benefit from various projects under the overall project progress. A few of the highlights from this current reporting period include:

1. Deputy Director attended 3rd Management Options Workshop (MOW3) in Nadi, Fiji in October 2006 as well as 2nd Regional Steering Committee (RSC2) which also took place in Nadi. RMI national progress report was tabled at the RSC2 alongside those submitted by Cook Islands, FSM, Solomon Islands, and Tonga.
2. Key MIMRA staff along with RMI Attorney General and industry representative attended pre-WCPFC (FFA briefing) and WCPFC meetings in Apia, Samoa in December 2006; Director attended Joint RFMO Meeting in Kobe, Japan in late January 2007. It is well understood that the project contributes significantly in the form of assisting with FFA briefs for such meetings.
3. The TUFMAN database at MIMRA was upgraded to version 3.0 during this reporting period; in addition, the RMI also benefited from the availability of the CES database system which was provided to all member countries throughout this period.
4. 'National Tuna Data Procedures Documents' (NTDPD) progressed with program visit to RMI during this reporting period. These were later routinely reviewed and updated. National monitoring capacity in the RMI was reviewed and funding requirements under GEF were established during this time.

5. Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):

National level activities:

- A basic observer training course was conducted in Majuro in late February / early March 2007. Considerable effort was undertaken by SPC staff in successfully putting the pre-selection test procedures in place for the course. It was agreed that these procedures would become standardized for future courses. A debriefer course was successfully completed along with port sampling refresher course earlier in August 2006 with senior RMI observers getting full port sampling certification.
- A very timely in-country visit by the PCU was more than welcomed. Details of said visit will comprise part of the highlights for next reporting period as the visit only commenced a little after the end of current reporting period which this report entails.

Regional level activities:

- Deputy Director and VMS Officer from RMI Sea Patrol attended 10th MCS Working Group meeting held at FFA Headquarters in March 2007.
- MIMRA Data Specialist and Sea Patrol VMS Officer attended VMS Training in Canberra, April 2007.
- RMI hosted first WCPFC sub-regional workshop (Northern Group) in Majuro from 23 to 27 June 2007. Participants from Palau, FSM, Kiribati, and Nauru were well-represented and the workshop deemed successful. As with the other WCPFC sub-regional workshops, it is envisaged that key national and regional issues discussed at the Majuro workshop will be taken up considerably at the forthcoming Management Options Workshop (MOW4) scheduled to be held in Rarotonga in October 2007.
- Chief Fisheries Officer for the Oceanic & Industrial Affairs Division, MIMRA attended stock assessment workshops at SPC, Noumea in late June / early July 2007.

6. Challenges/Issues Encountered

Challenges and issues encountered with project activities during this reporting period include:

- Ongoing lack of familiarity with the Project; specifically, which projects fall under or are entitled to GEF funding, etc.
- Inability to keep track or up to date on overall progress of Project.
- Ongoing lack of local/national coordination in formally establishing a national project coordinator at this juncture. In all likelihood, this is further complicated by the fact that another RMI government agency is GEF focal point and there is minimal interaction and/or coordination at the national level when it comes to seeking out who is entitled to what and how.

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

Solutions applied to address the issues and challenges included:

- Need for increased and effective coordination with relevant agencies at the national level.
- Increased awareness and up to date liaison with PCU. Establishment of routine contact with PCU via email has been well-received and very responsive. RMI considers this to be a big plus and thus very positive engagement.
- More frequent liaison with PCU. In-country visit has really helped RMI in ongoing efforts at familiarization of the project and related cross-cutting issues at the national and regional levels.

9. Recommendations for Future Action

The RMI will continue to support in-country visits by the PCU. Effective engagement with PCU will continue to form an integral part of our efforts. As such, continued future correspondence with PCU will remain essential.

10. Report Prepared By: Samuel K. Lanwi, Jr. [for RMI National (OFM Project) Focal Point]

NATIONAL REPORT

NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT TO THE OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)

Reporting Period, July 2006 – June 2007

1. **Country :** TONGA
2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)
3. **Period Covered:** 01 JULY 2006 – 30 JUNE 2007
4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**

Tonga, like all FFA member countries participated in all regional workshops and meetings where GEF OFM Project had made contributions.
5. **Specific Outputs/Results Achieved**

National Level Activities

 - TUFMAN – The TUFMAN database for Tonga was updated during the 3rd quarter of 2006, and also to version 3.0 on first quarter of 2007 and version 4.0 on second quarter of 2007. Tuna Data Procedures Document's were also drawn up and trial of the Longline Logbook started with the logbook delivered to Tonga and taken onboard by one of fishing companies. These trial logbooks were retrieved back for review.
 - Observer Program - National observer program, for Tonga, was also established during the 3rd quarter of 2006. Observer workbook and waterproof sampling pads with debriefing forms were received by Tonga during this period. Debriefing work was carried out by SPC staff in Tonga with the primary aim of selecting experienced observers to become in-country observer debriefers.
 - Operations 'Kurukuru' and 'Islands Chief' was held on 3rd quarter 2006 This was supported by Australian Defence with contributions from FFA MCS Division, to undertake coordinated surveillance operations between and across national jurisdictions.
 - Attachments - An attachment undertaken by one fisheries officer from Tonga, (SPC/OFP), during this reporting period. Also Tonga Fisheries Legal officer attended an attachment in FFA during 1st quarter 2007. An MCS two week attachment was also taken around March 2007 by one Fisheries staff from Tonga.

- National Status Report - An in-country workshop undertaken during first quarter of 2007 for delivery of National Status Report prepared around the same quarter.
- EAFM - During the first quarter of 2007, a consultation was undertaken to progress EAFM on Tuna Fisheries in Tonga, mainly for senior staffs of Tonga Fisheries. Tonga also participated on a training workshop on the delivery of the EAFM process which was conducted by Dr. Rick Fletcher in Vanuatu in 1st quarter of 2007.

6. Regional Level

- MCS – Tonga MCS staff participated in regional operations, (Kurukuru 06), held in Tonga 3rd quarter 2006, undertaking planning and coordination of air and Sea patrols in conjunction with the Pacific Patrol boat program.
- Stock Assessment - Tonga participated in the first OFMP stock assessment workshop that was held at SPC Headquarters in Noumea in early July 2006.
- Tonga also participated on the 9th MCS working Group meeting in Brisbane, October 2006 which included substantial TCC preparations for Pacific SIDS and also the 10th MCS working group meeting in Honiara, March 2007.
- Tonga participated in the National Consultative Committee meeting, October 2006.

7. Challenges/Issues Encountered

Challenges and issues encountered with the project activities within this reporting period (July 2006 – June 2007) included the following:

- One of the main issues encountered by Tonga is that the National Focal Point finds it hard to follow projects assisted by GEF, however, the quarterly reports are of great assistance and the country visit by the Project Coordinator in May 2007.

8. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

- National Focal Point to follow through quarterly reports and coordinator the activities related to GEF contributions. This can be done when coordinator is sending invitations to member countries and good communications with coordinator.

9. Recommendation

More frequent visits by Project Coordinator will be very useful in addition to keeping better communications between focal points and coordinator.

Prepared by: Siliveinusi M. Ha'unga,

National (OFM Project) Focal Point of Contact, TONGA

Paper Number RSC3/INFO.5
Title NATIONAL ANNUAL PROJECT REPORTS

Summary

The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) provides assistance to Pacific Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) at two levels, regionally and at national levels. Each of the countries participating in the OFM Project has designated a Project National Focal Point and these individuals have a number of project related responsibilities, including the preparation of a national annual report. National annual reports prepared by the project focal points for the Federated States of Micronesia and Tonga have been received to-date. Of the 15 countries participating in the OFM Project only five countries (Cook Islands, FSM, Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands and Tonga) submitted reports in 2006.

Recommendation

The Regional Steering Committee is invited to:

- i) advise on the status of national consultative committee mechanisms in-country;
- ii) note the national annual project reports submitted by the FSM and Tonga;
- iii) provide verbal presentations where no written country report has been submitted in advance; and
- iv) raise for discussion matters relating to any national concerns regarding the project activities and their delivery.



FFA



GEF



IUCN
The World Conservation Union

NATIONAL ANNUAL PROJECT REPORTS

Introduction

1. The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) provides assistance to Pacific Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) at two levels, regionally and at national levels. Each of the countries participating in the OFM Project has designated a Project National Focal Point (see **Attachment A - updated as at June 2007**) to the project and these individuals have a number of national level project responsibilities.

National Level Project Management and Coordination and National Consultative Committee

2. Based on information provided to the Project Coordinator by project focal points during country visits, the formation or resurrection of functioning fisheries management committees is in some countries non-existent, at best stalled. In those countries in which fisheries management committees are functioning, it is noticeable that they tend to have active domestic fisheries and industry operators participating in governance processes.

3. The level of discussion related to the project and WCPFC matters at the national consultative level is not known. Ideally the project focal point obtains from the National Consultative Committee (NCCs) process, the endorsement of requests for in-country project activities. They are also expected to monitor the effectiveness of in-country activities; prepare work plans¹ for in-country Project activities and discuss project progress at a national level.

4. There is also the expectation that focal points and NCC processes should identify national concerns regarding project activities and delivery; and ensure integrated coordination of actions and project concepts with those government departments or ministries that have the responsibility and accountability for fisheries management and convention related issues. The NCC should also provide national, non-governmental stakeholders and government representatives alike with an opportunity to be updated and exchange information on the fisheries management developments to ensure transparency of process and multisectoral participation.

Reporting

5. The National Focal Point in each country has been requested to provide the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) with a summary report of its discussions as they relate to project issues highlighting specific issues that need to be brought to the attention of the Regional Steering Committee. The PCU has provided Project National Focal Points with a standardised reporting template for countries to complete and submit to the Regional Steering Committee. The template has been designed to be concise and is mindful of the need not to burden National Focal Points with extensive reporting requirements on top of their daily national work responsibilities.

6. National annual reports prepared by the project focal points for the Federated States of Micronesia and Tonga have been received at the time this paper was prepared. Of the 15 countries participating in the OFM Project only five countries (Cook Islands, FSM, Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands and Tonga) submitted reports in 2006.

Recommendation

7. The Regional Steering Committee is invited to:

- i) advise on the status of national consultative committee mechanisms in-country;

¹ Work plans are originally based on the national needs assessment completed during the design phase of the project. They should be revised on an annual basis by the project focal points to take into account shifting priorities and completed activities.

- ii) note the national annual project reports submitted by the FSM and Tonga;
- iii) provide verbal presentations where no written country report has been submitted in advance; and
- iv) raise for discussion matters relating to any national concerns regarding the project activities and their delivery.

**Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project
NATIONAL (OFM PROJECT) FOCAL POINT**

[UPDATED 21 JUNE 2007]

Country	Focal Point		Designation	Address	Telephone/Fax	Email
COOK ISLANDS	GRAHAM	Peter	Legal Advisor Ministry of Marine Resources	P.O. Box 85 AVARUA, RAROTONGA Cook Islands	Tel: (682) 28721 Fax: (682) 29721	P.W.Graham@mmr.gov.ck
FSM	THOULAG	Bernard	Executive Director National Oceanic Resource Management Authority(NORMA)	P O Box PS122 PALIKIR, POHNPEI Federated States of Micronesia 96941	Tel: (691) 320 2700/5181 Fax: (691) 320 2383	norma@mail.fm
FIJI	NAQALI	Sanaila (Lt Cdr)	Acting Director of Fisheries Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry Fisheries Division	P.O. Box 358 SUVA Fiji	Tel: (679) 336 1122 Fax: (679) 331 8769/336 1184	snaqali@mff.net.fj
KIRIBATI	TEKINAITI	Tooti (Ms)	Ag. Principal Fisheries Officer Fisheries Department	P O Box 276 BIKENIBEU, TARAWA Republic of Kiribati	Tel: (686) 21296 / 21099 Fax: (686) 22289 / 21120	k2toosi@yahoo.com
MARSHALL IS	JOSEPH	Glen	Director Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority	P.O. Box 860 MAJURO Marshall Islands 96960	Tel: (692) 625 8262 Fax: (692) 625 5447	gjoseph@mimra.com mimra@ntamar.net
	LANWI	Sam	Deputy Director Oceanic & Industrial Affairs Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority	P.O. Box 860 MAJURO Marshall Islands 96960	Tel: (692) 625 8262 Fax: (692) 625 5447	skljr@mimra.com
NAURU	DEIYE	Charleston	Chief Executive Officer Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources Authority	Aiwo District Republic of Nauru	Tel: (674) 444 3739/ 3733 Fax: (674) 444 3812	ceonfmra@cenpac.net.nr
	AMRAM	Terry	Oceanic Fisheries Manager Oceanic Department Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources Authority	Aiwo District Republic of Nauru	Tel: (674) 444 3739/ 3733 Fax: (674) 444 3812	tamramnr@yahoo.com
NIUE	PASISI	Brendon	Director Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries	P.O. Box 74 ALOFI Niue	Tel: (683) 4032 Fax: (683) 4079 / 4010	fisheries@mail.gov.nu
PALAU	MALSOL	Nanette	Fisheries Law Compliance Officer Ministry of Resources and Development	P O Box 117 KOROR Republic of Palau 96940	Tel: (680) 488 3125 Fax: (680) 488 3555	dillymalsol@yahoo.com tunapal@palaunet.com

PNG	MARTIN	Paul	Industry Liaison Coordinator National Fisheries Authority	Investment Haus P O Box 2016 PORT MORESBY, NCD Papua New Guinea	Tel: (675) 309 0442 Fax: (675) 3202061	pmartin@fisheries.gov.pg
	KUMORU	Ludwig	Manager – Tuna Fishery National Fisheries Authority	Investment Haus P O Box 2016 PORT MORESBY, NCD Papua New Guinea	Tel: (675) 309 0442 Fax: (675) 3202061	lkumoru@fisheries.gov.pg
SAMOA	MULIPOLA	Antonio.P	Assistant Chief Executive Officer Fisheries Division Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries	P.O. Box 1874 APIA Samoa	Tel: (685) 23863 Fax: (685) 24292	apmulipola@lesamoa.net
SOLOMON IS	LILOQULA	Ruth	Permanent Secretary Department of Fisheries and Marine Resources	P O Box G13 HONIARA Solomon Islands	Tel: (677) 38674 Fax: (677) 38106 / 38730	temale@solomon.com.sb
	OREIHAKA	Ed	Director Department of Fisheries and Marine Resources	P O Box G13 HONIARA Solomon Islands	Tel: (677) 38674 Fax: (677) 38106 / 38730	edohaka@yahoo.com.au
TOKELAU	PELASIO	Mose	Director Department of Economic Development, Natural Resources & Environment;	Tauata o Faleagafulu Building Fakaofu TOKELAU	Tel: (690) 3127 or 3134 Fax: (690) 3108 or 3133	Mose.pelasio@clear.net.nz
TONGA	HA'UNGA	Siliveinusi M.	Fisheries Officer Licensing Department of Fisheries	P. O. Box 871, NUKU'ALOFA Kingdom of Tonga	Tel: (676) 21399,27799 Fax: (676) 23891	shaunga@tongafish.gov.to
TUVALU	FINIKASO	Sam	Director of Fisheries Tuvalu Fisheries Department Ministry of Natural Resources and Lands	VAIAKU, FUNAFUTI Tuvalu	Tel: (688) 20836 ext 2206 Fax: (688) 20151 Cell: (688) 90720	safin70@yahoo.com
VANUATU	NAVITI	William	Acting Director Fisheries Department	Private Mail Bag 045 PORT VILA Republic of Vanuatu	Tel: (678) 23621 Fax: (678) 23641	fish-inspector@vanuatu.com.vu
AUSTRALIA	ANDERSON	Gordon	Pacific Fisheries Program Development Advisor Advisory Group Corporate Governance and Review Division AusAID	02 6206 4315	cell 0400003977	Gordon.anderson@ausaid.gov.au
NEW ZEALAND	LINEHAM	Rebecca	Second Secretary	New Zealand High Commission P.O. Box 697 Honiara	Tel: (677) 28534 Fax: (677) 22377	rebecca.lineham@mfat.govt.nz

Paper Number **RSC3 / WP.6**
Title **2007 FINANCIAL REPORTS**

Summary

The purpose of this paper is to present the financial report in 2007 for the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project to the Regional Steering Committee. This report comprises the acquittal of the 2006 approved Budget and Work Plan with the report of the auditors, the approved revised 2007 Budget and Annual Work Plan, an interim report on budget against expenditures up until 31 August in 2007 and the approved 2008 Budget and Annual Work Plan.

This paper also outlines a plan of action to address if required, a number of budgetary matters that have the potential to impact on the 2008 Budget and Annual Work Plan (AWP). It is proposed that a revised 2008 Budget and AWP be prepared in November for the Committee to consider after the Project Coordination Unit consults with executing agencies and UNDP.

Recommendation

The OFM Project Regional Steering Committee is invited to:

- i) note and endorse the audited 2006 financial report year ending 31st December 2006;
- ii) consider and note the 2007 Interim Financial Report;
- iii) note the 2008 Annual Work Plan and Budget; and
- iv) consider the plan of action relating to the revised 2008 Budget and AWP scheduled for November.



FFA



GEF



UN
DP



IUCN
The World Conservation Union

2007 FINANCIAL REPORT

Introduction

1. The second meeting of the Regional Steering Committee (RSC2) for the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management (OFM) Project) was held on the 21 October 2006 at Nadi, Fiji. This meeting of the RSC considered a revised budget and annual work plan for project activities in 2007. While there was agreement in principle on the proposed revisions to the 2007 Budget and AWP, the Committee decided that further discussion was required between UNDP and the PCU to show clearly the impacts of carry forward attributed to some activities that were not on schedule.

2. The PCU prepared detailed quarterly work plans to support the revised budget for 2007 and in consultation with UNDP, the revised Budget and AWP for 2007 was completed and circulated to the RSC for endorsement. The revised 2007 Budget and AWP were endorsed in November 2006.

2007 Financial Reporting

3. Following the 2006 reporting format for presentation to the Regional Steering Committee, the 2007 financial reporting for the OFM Project is divided into a number of parts. The financial reporting comprises three parts as follows:

4. *Part One* presents the 2006 Financial Report. This is the reporting of expenditures (actuals) against the approved 2006 Annual Budget & AWP.

5. An independent audit of the 2006 expenditures was conducted by the FFA appointed auditors and completed on the 30 May 2007. The resulting audit report was submitted to UNDP, Suva as required. The Auditor's Report is made up of the report and a management letter. A copy of the Auditor's Report for expenditure in 2006 is appended at **Attachment A**.

6. *Part Two* of this paper is presented in two parts:

- Section A presents again the approved 2007 revised Budget & AWP for the information of the RSC, and should be read in conjunction with;
- Section B which is the Interim 2007 Financial Report covering January to August 2007.

7. Lastly, *Part Three* of this report presents the 2008 Budget and AWP approved by the GEF Council and endorsed by the first meeting of the RSC in Honiara.

8. The tables associated with *Parts One, Two and Three* of this report are presented as:

- i) Table A: 2006 Financial Report;
- ii) Table B: 2007 Revised Budget & AWP;
- iii) Table C: 2007 Interim Financial Report;
- iv) Table D: 2008 Approved Budget & AWP.

PART ONE

2006 Financial Report

9. The total budget approved for the first full year (2006) of the project was \$3,171,903¹. As at 31 December 2006, actual expenditure was \$2,092,871 (66% of the 2006 annual budget), leaving an unspent budget of \$1,079,032 (34% of the 2006 annual budget). **Table A** summarizes and reports the financial outcomes of the approved 2006 AWP and Budget at the close of the financial year ending 31 December 2006.

10. The annual independent audit for the OFM Project was completed on 30 May 2007 and submitted to UNDP Suva, the project Implementing Agency. The project has been audited by the FFA appointed auditors. The Auditor's Report is made up of the report and a management letter. A copy of the Auditor's Report for expenditure in 2006 is appended at **Attachment A**.

Summary

11. The 2006 Financial Report (**Table A**), presents the OFM Project expenditures year ending 31 December 2006 against the approved revised 2006 Budget. It reports the 2006 expenditures against the 2006 approved revised Budget & AWP. The Budget reporting format is consistent with UNDP's standardized financial and reporting format known as ATLAS.

Recommendation

12. The Committee is invited to note and endorse the audited 2006 financial report year ending 31st December 2006.

¹ All figures are US Dollars

Table A: 2006 Financial Report



CONSOLIDATED Financial Report

- (a) Designated Institution: Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
- (b) Programme/Project number: PIMS No. 2992
- Programme/Project title: Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project
- (c) Year Ending: 31 December 2006
- (d) Currency: United States Dollars

Item	Chart of Account	Jan-Mar	Apr-June	July-Sept	Oct-Dec	Total Amount				
(f) Opening Balance:		\$420,546	\$81,794	-\$30,532	\$167,406	\$420,546				
(g) Advanced Received:			\$180,847	\$812,649	\$840,572	\$1,834,068				
(h) Available Funds:		\$420,546	\$262,641	\$782,117	\$1,007,978	\$2,254,614				
Detail Expenditures:	Account	Annual Budget 2006				Total Expenditure	Budget Available	% spent	% Available	
Activity 1:										
International Consultants	71200	139,337	4,558	5,472	16,955	24,606	51,591	87,746	37%	63%
Local Consultants	71300	140,565	3,116	328	11,812	72,909	88,165	52,401	63%	37%
Contract Services	71400	619,039	126,662	118,705	117,596	123,451	486,414	132,626	79%	21%
Un Vol	71500						0	0		
Travel	71600	148,750	4,809	4,169	25,763	29,337	64,079	84,671	43%	57%
Service Contract-Company	72100	365,000	0	5,540	161,470	164,258	331,268	33,732	91%	9%
Equip&Furniture	72200	130,000	188	0	91,971	11,932	104,091	25,909	80%	20%
Material & Goods	72300						0	0		
Communication & AV	72400	5,000	417	0	0	0	417	4,583		
Supplies	72500						0	0		
Grants	72600						0	0		
InfoTechEq	72800	18,000	7,250	0	3,349	3,769	14,368	3,632	80%	20%
Rent&Maint	73100						0	0		
Premises Alterations	73200						0	0		
Rnt&Maint	73300						0	0		
Rnt&Maint	73400						0	0		
Prof Svcs	74100						0	0		
AudioVisl	74200						0	0		
MiscExp (workshops)	74500	245,446	7,975	62,305	45,676	53,838	169,793	75,652	69%	31%
Misc Exp (Exchange gain /loss)							0	0		
Total Activity 1 Budget & Exp		1,811,137	154,975	196,519	474,591	484,101	1,310,186	500,951	72%	28%
Activity 2:										
International Consultants	71200	394,986	64,188	4,750	54,335	139,222	262,495	132,491	66%	34%
Local Consultants	71300						0	0		
Contract Services	71400	147,102	12,469	8,613	6,602	34,472	62,156	84,946	42%	58%
Un Vol	71500						0	0		
Travel	71600	80,527	5,667	9,201	2,422	4,337	21,627	58,900	27%	73%
Service Contr-Company	72100						0	0		
Equip&Furn	72200	5,000	0	0	2,398	0	2,398	2,602	48%	52%
Matl&Goods	72300						0	0		
Comm&AV	72400	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	0%	100%
Supplies	72500						0	0		
Grants	72600						0	0		
InfoTechEq	72800	1,879	0	818	0	0	818	1,061		
Rent&Maint	73100						0	0		
PremAlter	73200	10,000	0	0	0	7,929	7,929	2,071	79%	21%
Rnt&Maint	73300						0	0		
Rnt&Maint	73400						0	0		
Professional Services	74100						0	0		
AudioVisl	74200						0	0		
MiscExp (workshops)	74500	313,854	75,574	22,943	46,884	80,047	225,448	88,406	72%	28%
Total Activity 2 Budget & Exp		954,348	157,898	46,326	112,641	266,007	582,871	371,477	61%	39%
Activity 3:										
International Consultants	71200	39,500	2,562	3,972	5,876	0	12,409	27,091	31%	69%
Local Consultants	71300						0	0		
Contract Services	71400	236,368	14,124	22,108	5,664	73,079	114,975	121,393	49%	51%
Un Vol	71500						0	0		
Travel	71600	30,000	4,044	11,228	6,797	5,160	27,229	2,771	91%	9%
Contr-Cmpy	72100						0	0		
Equip&Furn	72200	11,758	0	5,000	0	1,138	6,138	5,620	52%	48%
Matl&Goods	72300	4,000	0	0	0	0	0	4,000	0%	100%
Comm&AV	72400						0	0		
Supplies	72500						0	0		
Grants	72600						0	0		
InfoTechEq	72800						0	0		
Rent&Maint	73100						0	0		
PremAlter	73200						0	0		
Rnt&Maint	73300						0	0		
Rnt&Maint	73400						0	0		
Prof Svcs	74100						0	0		
AudioVisl	74200						0	0		
MiscExp (workshops)	74500	84,792	5,150	8,021	9,142	16,751	39,064	45,728	46%	54%
Misc Exp (Bank fees)							0	0		
Misc Credit (Bank Int)							0	0		Misc credits
Total Activity 3 Budget & Exp		406,418	25,880	50,328	27,479	96,128	199,815	206,603	49%	51%
Total Budget & Expenditures		3,171,903	338,752	293,172	614,712	846,235	2,092,871		66%	34%
Closing Balances & YTD Budget Available:		81,794	-30,532	167,406	161,743	161,743	1,079,031			
<i>% Spent on advances & clwd funds available</i>							92.83%			

NB: The \$4 difference from the auditors report expenditures report on table A is the rounding effect.

PART TWO

Section A. 2007 Revised Budget & AWP (approved)

13. 2007 revised Budget & AWP that was approved by the Committee in November 2007, the revision of which was based on further collaboration between the PCU and UNDP directly after RSC2 in October:

TABLE B: 2007 Revised Budget & AWP

2007 REVISED ANNUAL WORK PLAN AND BUDGET With Actual Carry Forwards													
OUTCOMES/Outputs	Key Activities	Timeframe	Resp. Party	Source of funds	Budget Code	Original 2007 Budget	2006 Actual CFWD	Revised 2007 Budget With Cfw'd budget	2007 cfw'd to 2008	2007 Working Budget			
		Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4											
1. Improved scientific information and knowledge on oceanic transboundary fish stocks and related ecosystem aspects of the WTP WP LME; this information being used to adopt and apply conservation and management measures; relevant national capacities stren	Fishery Monitoring	X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$25,000	\$23,861	\$48,861	\$48,861	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71300 Local Cnslt	\$80,000	\$25,076	\$105,076	\$105,076	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71600 Travel	\$36,000	\$12,282	\$48,282	\$48,282	
		X				SPC	GEF	72800 InfoTechEq	\$0	\$551	\$551	\$551	
					SPC	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$0	-\$12,551	-\$12,551	-\$12,551		
		X			X	SPC	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$30,000	\$9,394	\$39,394	\$39,394	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71600 Travel	\$36,000	\$13,333	\$49,333	\$49,333	
						SPC	GEF	72800 InfoTechEq	\$0	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	
		X				SPC	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$0	\$42,165	\$42,165	\$42,165	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71300 Local Cnslt	\$60,000	\$27,324	\$87,324	\$87,324	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$240,000	\$81,449	\$321,449	\$321,449	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71600 Travel	\$59,500	\$10,500	\$70,000	\$70,000	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	72100 Contr-Cmpy	\$315,000	\$33,732	\$348,732	\$348,732	
		X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	72200 Equip&Furn	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	
		X				SPC	GEF	72800 InfoTechEq	\$0	\$81	\$81	\$81	
		X				SPC	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$0	\$12,478	\$12,478	\$12,478	
		X		X		IUCN	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$18,000	\$61,319	\$79,319	-\$54,319	\$25,000
		X	X	X	X	IUCN	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$30,000	\$41,479	\$71,479	-\$38,479	\$33,000
						IUCN	GEF	72200 Equip&Furn	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$50,000	-\$50,000	\$0
						IUCN	GEF	72400 Comm&AV	\$10,000	\$4,583	\$14,583	-\$14,583	\$0
						IUCN	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	-\$50,000	\$0
		Project Support	X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$35,000	\$5,877	\$40,877	\$40,877
			X	X	X	X	SPC	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$83,055.00	\$25,018	\$108,073	\$108,073
		COMPONENT 1 TOTAL							\$1,377,555	\$500,950	\$1,878,505	-\$207,381	\$1,671,124
	2. The WCPFC established and beginning to function effectively; Pac SIDS taking a lead role in the functioning and management of the Commission and in the related management of the fisheries and the LME; national laws, policies, relevant institutions and	Legal Reform	X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$72,000	\$39,641	\$111,641	\$111,641
			X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71600 Travel	\$9,000	\$9,547	\$18,547	\$18,547
X			X	X	X	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$80,000	\$19,970	\$99,970	\$99,970	
Policy Reform		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$100,000	\$5,000	\$105,000	\$105,000	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$100,000	\$32,939	\$132,939	\$132,939	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71600 Travel	\$45,000	\$36,376	\$81,376	\$81,376	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	72200 Equip&Furn	\$5,000	\$2,602	\$7,602	\$7,602	
						FFA	GEF	72800 InfoTechEq	\$0	\$1,061	\$1,061	\$1,061	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	73200 PremAlter	\$10,000	-\$2,399	\$7,601	\$7,601	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$120,000	\$10,820	\$130,820	\$130,820	
		X	X	X	X	IUCN	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$64,000	\$16,667	\$80,667	-\$25,667	\$55,000
		X	X	X	X	IUCN	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$20,000	\$20,833	\$40,833	-\$23,833	\$17,000
		X	X	X	X	IUCN	GEF	71600 Travel	\$24,000	\$860	\$24,860	-\$9,860	\$15,000
						X	IUCN	GEF	72400 Comm&AV	\$2,000	\$1,000	\$3,000	\$3,000
						X	IUCN	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$30,000	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000
Institutional Reform		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$72,000	\$61,393	\$133,393	\$133,393	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$40,000	\$40,000	
Compliance Strengthening		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$60,000	\$45,965	\$105,965	\$105,965	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71600 Travel	\$9,000	\$7,117	\$16,117	\$16,117	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$90,000	\$42,085	\$132,085	\$132,085	
Project Support		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$55,440	\$0	\$55,440	\$55,440	
COMPONENT 2 TOTAL								\$987,440	\$371,477	\$1,358,917	-\$59,360	\$1,299,557	
3. Effective project management at national and regional level; major governmental and NGO stakeholders participating in Project activities and consultative mechanisms at national and regional levels; information on the Project and the WCPF process contr		Information System	X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$3,000	\$1,938	\$4,938	\$4,938
			X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	72300 Matl&Goods	\$4,000	\$4,000	\$8,000	\$8,000
		Monitoring & Evaluation	X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$20,000
			X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$3,000	\$18,800	\$21,800	\$21,800
						FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
		Stakeholder Participation	X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$80,000	\$40,408	\$120,408	\$120,408
	Proj. Mgmt & Coordination	X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71200 Local Cnslt	\$20,000	\$15,153	\$35,153	\$35,153	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71400 Cntract Serv	\$135,000	\$62,186	\$197,186	\$197,186	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	71600 Travel	\$30,000	\$2,771	\$32,771	\$32,771	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	72200 Equip&Furn	\$3,000	\$5,620	\$8,620	\$8,620	
		X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$65,000	\$45,729	\$110,729	\$110,729	
	Project Support	X	X	X	X	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$19,110	-\$1	\$19,109	\$19,109	
COMPONENT 3 TOTAL							\$372,110	\$206,604	\$578,714	\$0	\$578,714		
GRAND TOTAL	Total Revised 2007 Annual Work Plan and Budget						\$2,737,105	\$1,079,031	\$3,816,136	-\$266,741	\$3,549,395		

Section B. Interim 2007 Financial Report (January to August 2007)

15. The total approved revised budget for year 2007 is \$3,549,395. The break down of the revised 2007 budget & AWP is as follows:

	Amount \$
2007 Approved Budget	2,737,105
Cfwd budget from 2006	1,079,031
IUCN 2006 budget cfwd to 2008	(266,741)

2007 Revised Budget	3,549,395
	=====

16. Total expenditure to August 2007 is \$1,854,963 which is 52% of the annual budget.

Summary

17. The 2007 Interim Financial Report (**Table C**), presents the OFM Project activities expenditure YTD 31 August 2007 against the revised approved 2007 Annual Work Plan and Budget. At year to date (August 2007), 52% of the budget was spent with 48 % of the budget remaining.

18. The last column in **Table C** provides predictions, as at the time of writing this report, of anticipated budget line spending directions.

TABLE C: 2007 Interim Financial Report



INTERIM 2007 CONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL REPORT

- (a) Designated Institution: Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
- (b) Programme/Project number: PIMS No. 2992
- Programme/Project title: Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project
- (c) For the period: January - August 2007
- (d) Currency: United States Dollars

Item	Chart of Account	Jan-Mar	Apr-June	July-Aug	Total Amount					
(f) Opening Balance:		\$163,359	\$284,700	\$192,669	\$163,359					
(g) Advanced Received:		\$871,937	\$667,781	\$802,520	\$2,342,238					
(h) Available Funds:		\$1,035,296	\$952,481	\$995,189	\$2,505,597					
Detail Expenditures:	Account	Annual Budget 2007			Total	Budget Available	% spent	% Available	Comments - Key: Blue = under spent, Red = Anticipated over expenditure, Black = Spending on target	
Activity 1:										
International Consultants	71200	113,255	2,337	1,024	11,323	14,684	98,571	13%	87%	Fishery Monitoring (1.1) & Stock Assessment (1.2) consult
Local Consultants	71300	192,400	16,112	27,888	18,245	62,244	130,156	32%	68%	Field assistance (1.3) & National coordinators (1.1)
Contract Services	71400	595,326	132,381	157,072	107,542	396,995	198,331	67%	33%	Anticipated over expenditures due to CROP agreed 7% salary increment.
Un Vol	71500					0	0			
Travel	71600	167,614	27,307	24,023	13,720	65,049	102,565	39%	61%	Travel for 1.1, 1.2, & 1.3 on target
Service Contract-Company	72100	348,732	297,360	56,421	0	353,781	-5,049	101%	-1%	Seamount mapping consultancy overspent but subcomponent 1.3 under spent.
Equip&Furniture	72200	100,000	16,581	9,607	0	26,189	73,811	26%	74%	1.3 on target
Material & Goods	72300					0	0			
Communication & AV	72400	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Supplies	72500					0	0			
Grants	72600					0	0			
InfoTechEq	72800	3,632	0	0	0	3,632	0	0%	100%	
Rent&Maint	73100					0	0			
Premises Alterations	73200					0	0			
Rnt&Maint	73300					0	0			
Rnt&Maint	73400					0	0			
Prof Svcs	74100					0	0			
AudioVisl	74200					0	0			
MiscExp (workshops)	74500	150,165	68,516	48,843	33,932	151,291	-1,126	101%	-1%	Current deficit due to Q4 2006 programme support not charged until Q1 2007.
Misc Exp (Exchange gain/(loss))				22,152	30,682	52,834	-52,834			SPC operates in XPF & do not operate a USD account. A weak USD has resulted in exchange losses.
Total Activity 1 Budget & Exp		1,671,124	560,594	347,030	215,444	1,123,068	548,056	67%	33%	
Activity 2										
International Consultants	71200	512,060	32,365	104,512	65,403	202,280	309,780	40%	60%	LR, FM, IR & CS consultancy
Local Consultants	71300					0	0			
Contract Services	71400	149,939	45,297	34,122	0	79,419	70,520	53%	47%	2.2 on target
Un Vol	71500					0	0			
Travel	71600	131,040	18,009	36,231	78	54,318	76,722	41%	59%	2.2 on target
Service Contr-Company	72100					0	0			
Equip&Furn	72200	7,602	0	0	0	7,602	0	0%	100%	2.2 under spent
Matl&Goods	72300					0	0			
Comm&AV	72400	3,000	0	0	0	3,000	0	0%	100%	IUCN
Supplies	72500					0	0			
Grants	72600					0	0			
InfoTechEq	72800					0	0			
Rent&Maint	73100					0	0			
PremAlter	73200	7,601	0	4,056	0	4,056	3,545	53%	47%	BL in 2.2 under spent
Rnt&Maint	73300					0	0			
Rnt&Maint	73400					0	0			
Professional Services	74100					0	0			
AudioVisl	74200					0	0			
MiscExp (workshops)	74500	488,315	26,028	147,407	0	173,435	314,880	36%	64%	BL in 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 & 2.4 on target
Total Activity 2 Budget & Exp		1,299,557	121,699	326,328	65,481	513,507	786,050	40%	60%	
Activity 3										
International Consultants	71200	60,091	0	5,153	0	5,153	54,938	9%	91%	BL in 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 & 3.4 on target
Local Consultants	71300					0	0			
Contract Services	71400	339,394	57,894	56,162	56,000	170,057	169,337	50%	50%	BL on target except for PFAO
Un Vol	71500					0	0			
Travel	71600	32,771	4,789	13,249	6,129	24,167	8,604	74%	26%	BL in 3.4 on target
Contr-Cmpy	72100					0	0			
Equip&Furn	72200	8,620	0	2,589	0	2,589	6,031	30%	70%	BL in 3.4 under spent
Matl&Goods	72300	8,000	0	5,451	1,503	6,953	1,047	87%	13%	BL in 3.1 on target
Comm&AV	72400					0	0			
Supplies	72500					0	0			
Grants	72600					0	0			
InfoTechEq	72800					0	0			
Rent&Maint	73100					0	0			
PremAlter	73200					0	0			
Rnt&Maint	73300					0	0			
Rnt&Maint	73400					0	0			
Prof Svcs	74100					0	0			
AudioVisl	74200					0	0			
MiscExp (workshops)	74500	129,838	5,620	6,457	0	12,078	117,760	9%	91%	BL on target except for National consultative committee unspent.
Misc Exp (Bank fees)				25		25	-25			Misc bank charges
Misc Credit (Bank Int)				-2,634		-2,634	2,634			Bank interest
Total Activity 3 Budget & Exp		578,714	68,303	86,453	63,631	218,388	360,326	38%	62%	
Total Budget & Expenditures		3,549,395	750,596	759,811	344,556	1,854,963		52%	48%	
Closing Balances & YTD Budget Available:			284,700	192,669	650,634	650,634	1,694,432			
<small>% Spent on advances & chfd funds available 74.03%</small>										

Recommendation

19. The Committee is invited to consider and note the 2007 Interim Financial Report.

PART THREE

2008 Budget and Annual Work Plan

Introduction

20. The 2008 Budget & AWP presently before the Committee was originally approved by the GEF Council and reviewed and endorsed by RSC1 in October 2005. It provides for a total budget of \$2,058,330 in 2008. The break down of the budget by component for 2008 is as follows:

	<u>\$/USD</u>
Component 1	861,040
Component 2	801,640
Component 3	395,650

Total	2,058,330
	=====

Issues with Potential Impacts on the 2008 Budget and AWP

21. A number of issues have emerged in the last 12 months that have the potential to impact on the project budget and work plans. Principally, these matters relate to the effects of the application of the CROP agreed salary increment of 7 percent on project funded positions, and secondly a weak US dollar and the impact of the exchange rate gains/losses on activities in Component One implemented by the Secretariat of the Pacific Community who operate in Polynesian Francs (XFP).

22. While at this point it is not deemed critical, the emerging trend is evident and it was thought prudent to bring these matters to the attention of the Committee now, although the full affect will not be clear until the last quarter of this financial year. Given these developments it decided that a revised budget and AWP for 2008 would not be presented to the Committee at this stage.

23. A revised 2008 Budget and AWP will be prepared in November and circulated to the Committee for their comments and endorsement. It is anticipated that the intervening two month period will provide further details of expenditure related to activities and of impacts of exchange rate losses or gains. It will also provide an opportunity for the PCU to consult further with executing agencies to address any negative budgetary impacts with solutions that will have minimal if any impact on the overall project budget and its intended outputs and outcomes.

TABLE D: 2008 Approved Budget & AWP



**OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
2008 DRAFT BUDGETS AND ANNUAL WORKPLAN**

OUTCOMES/Outputs	Key Activities	Timeframe				Resp. Party	Source of funds	Budget Code	2008 Approved Budget	Quarterly Activity Descriptions				
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4					Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
1. Improved scientific information and knowledge on oceanic transboundary fish stocks and related ecosystem aspects of the WTP WP LME; this information being used to adopt and apply conservation and management measures; relevant national capacities strengthened	Fishery Monitoring	x	x	x	x	SPC	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$25,000	By-catch estimation consultancy				
		x	x	x	x	SPC	GEF	71300 Local Cnslt	\$80,000	Estimation by-catch; develop observer database, TUFMAN video training module				
		x	x	x	x	SPC	GEF	71400 Contract Serv	\$100,000	Position costs				
		x	x	x	x	SPC	GEF	71600 Travel	\$33,000	5 duty travel missions to review and support national monitoring programmes; 6 monitoring attachments to OFP				
		x				SPC	GEF	72800 InfoTechEq	\$3,000	Equipment support				
		x				SPC	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$42,000	2nd tuna date workshop early 2008				
		x	x	x	x	SPC	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$30,000	MPC development (Foster)				
		x	x	x	x	SPC	GEF	71400 Contract Serv	\$100,000	Position costs				
		x	x	x		SPC	GEF	71600 Travel	\$33,000	6 duty travel missions for preparation 3 National Oceanic Fisheries Status reports, train scientific counterparts in-country, facilitate attachments of national technical staff to OFP				
		x	x			SPC	GEF	72800 InfoTechEq	\$3,000	Equipment				
	Stock Assessment	x				SPC	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$42,000	Workshops on stock assessment methods and analysis of oceanographic impacts on fisheries July 08				
						SPC	GEF	71300 Local Cnslt	\$0					
		x	x	x		SPC	GEF	71400 Contract Serv	\$240,000	Coordinate in-country biological sampling of stomach contents and tissue samples for national observer programs, lab-based analysis of samples and data base will be updated; analysis of tag recoveries (including electronic tags), biological sampling SPC newsletter,				
		x	x	x		SPC	GEF	71600 Travel	\$36,000	Coordinate national involvement in field operations for tissue sampling, conduct a co-funded scientific cruise in Bismarck Sea to study influence of seamounts on benthic and pelagic ecosystems; present scientific papers at fisheries meetings				
						SPC	GEF	72100 Contr-Cmpy	\$0					
						SPC	GEF	72200 Equip&Furn	\$0					
						SPC	GEF	72800 InfoTechEq	\$0					
						SPC	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$0					
		x	x			IUCN	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$0	Research cruise contract signing (Activity will be funded from cwf)				
		x	x			IUCN	GEF	72200 Equip&Furn	\$0	Execution of cruise (Activity will be funded from cwf)				
Ecosystem Analysis	x	x			IUCN	GEF	72400 Comm&AV	\$5,000	Preparation for events in ports					
	x	x			IUCN	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$0	Research cruise contract signing (Activity will be funded from cwf)					
	x	x	x		SPC	GEF	71400 Contract Serv	\$35,000	Data processing/management					
	x	x	x		SPC	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$54,040.00	Programme Support					
	COMPONENT 1 TOTAL									\$861,040				
	2. The WCPCF established and beginning to function effectively; Pac SIDS taking a lead role in the functioning and management of the Commission and in the related management of the fisheries and the LME; national laws, policies, relevant institutions and	Legal Reform	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$72,000	Legal conference			
			x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71600 Travel	\$9,000	consultancy, Ben Martin Tsamany for WCPCF workshops			
			x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$20,000	Attachments			
			x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$100,000	Tonga, Niue + two other countries (Prosecution & Dockside Boarding)			
			x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71400 Contract Serv	\$100,000	Fisheries Management Consultancy			
x			x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71600 Travel	\$45,000	FMA Position costs				
x			x	x	x	FFA	GEF	72200 Equip&Furn	\$5,000	FMA travel & Attachments travel costs				
x			x	x	x	FFA	GEF	72800 InfoTechEq	\$0	Equipment support				
x			x	x	x	FFA	GEF	73200 Prem&Mat	\$10,000	Country support				
x			x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$40,000	WCPCF, National workshop, Vanuatu				
Policy Reform		x	x	x	x	IUCN	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$44,000	WCPCF National workshop, SI				
		x	x	x	x	IUCN	GEF	71400 Contract Serv	\$10,000	Development and coordination of policy work in region with FFA				
		x	x	x	x	IUCN	GEF	71600 Travel	\$12,000	Participation in expert consultation on corruption and fisheries in DC				
		x	x	x	x	IUCN	GEF	72400 Comm&AV	\$8,000	Regional travel - consultants				
		x	x	x	x	IUCN	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$30,000	Regional travel - consultants				
		x	x	x	x	IUCN	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$30,000	Regional travel - consultants				
		x	x	x	x	IUCN	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$30,000	Printing, media for workshop				
		x	x	x	x	IUCN	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$30,000	PI vision for regional fisheries governance				
		x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$72,000	Marshall Islands IS review scoping				
		x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$20,000	Samoa IS review scoping				
Institutional Reform	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$60,000	MCS Officer OJT - ALC inspections, FJ 15k					
	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71600 Travel	\$9,000	Fellowships attachments with NZ Fish.					
	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$90,000	Fellowships/Attachments					
	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$90,000	FMA Wkgp 7004 preparation					
	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$90,000	National in-country & dockside and prosecution WkShop. Either Q2 or Q3 - 7k					
Compliance Strengthening	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$45,640	Programme Support					
	COMPONENT 2 TOTAL									\$801,640				
	Information System	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$3,000	Information consultancy				
		x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	72300 Misc&Goods	\$4,000	Publications, CDs				
		x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71200 Intl Cnslt	\$60,000	Annual Review				
x		x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71400 Contract Serv	\$3,000	Annual Audit for 2007					
x		x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$0	No Budget					
Stakeholder Participation	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71400 Contract Serv	\$80,000	Transfer to WWF & PTIA					
	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71200 Local Cnslt	\$20,000	Consultancy					
	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71400 Contract Serv	\$135,000	Position costs					
	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	71600 Travel	\$30,000	OFP PC Travel					
	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	72200 Equip&Furn	\$0	Laptop replacement (anticipated cwf)					
Proj. Mgmt & Coordination	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$40,000	In Country support for National Consultative Committees					
	x	x	x	x	FFA	GEF	74500 MiscExp	\$40,000	1.RSC 4Mid Term Review out come 2. In country support for National Consultative Committees					
	COMPONENT 3 TOTAL									\$395,650				
	GRAND TOTAL									\$2,058,330				
	Total Revised 2007 Annual Work Plan and Budget													

Recommendation

24. The Committee is invited to:
- i) note the 2008 Annual Work Plan and Budget;

- ii) consider the plan of action relating to the revised 2008 Budget and AWP scheduled for November.

Conclusion

25. This report has been prepared for the purpose of presenting the financial reports in 2007 for the OFM Project, to the third meeting of the Regional Steering Committee with whom the responsibility lies for overall oversight of the project. This Committee paper contains:

- i) the 2006 Acquittal Financial Report;
- ii) 2006 Audit Report;
- iii) approved revised 2007 Budget and AWP;
- iv) 2007 Interim Financial Report year to date 31 August 2007; and
- v) the 2008 Budget and Work Plan.

26. The PCU has prepared these financial reports adhering to best practice, international standards of accounting and in accordance with the financial regulations of the FFA and UNDP. Overall the third meeting of the OFM Project Regional Steering Committee (RSC3) is invited to consider and endorse the following recommendations.

Recommendations

27. The OFM Project Regional Steering Committee is invited to:

- i) note and endorse the audited 2006 financial report year ending 31st December 2006;
- ii) consider and note the 2007 Interim Financial Report;
- iii) consider and note the 2008 Annual Work Plan and Budget; and
- v) consider the plan of action relating to the revised 2008 Budget and AWP scheduled for November.

AUDITOR'S REPORT

Auditor's report to

The Project Coordinator and The Resident Representative

a) *Certification of Statement of Expenditure*

We have audited the accompanying Combined Delivery Reports (CDR) of the UNDP Atlas project number: 00046932 for the 12 months period from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2006. The statement is the responsibility of the management of the project. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the statement based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with International Standards of Auditing. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the statement is free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the statement. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the statement. We believe our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

Unqualified Audit Opinion

In our opinion, the accompanying CDR presents fairly, in all material respects the expenditures of USD2, 092,875 incurred by the project for the period from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2006 in accordance with UNDP accounting requirements.

b) *Certification of Statement of Assets and Equipment*

We have audited the accompanying Statement of Assets and Equipment of the UNDP Atlas project number 00046932 for the 12 months period from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2006. The statement is the responsibility of the management of the project. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the statement based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with International Standards of Auditing. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the statement is free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the statement. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the statement. We believe our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

Unqualified Audit Opinion

In our opinion, the statement of assets and equipment presents fairly, in all material respects the inventory balance of the project amounting to USD27, 218 maintained by the project for the period from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2006 in accordance with UNDP requirements.

c) *Certification of Statement of Cash Position*

We have audited the accompanying Statement of Cash Position of the UNDP Atlas project number 00046932 for the period from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2006. The statement is the responsibility of the management of the project. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the statement based on our audit.

We conducted our audit in accordance with International Standards of Auditing. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the statement is free of material misstatement. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the statement. An audit also includes assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the statement. We believe our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion.

Unqualified Audit Opinion

In our opinion, the statement of cash position presents fairly, in all material respects the cash balance of the project amounting to USD252, 128 for the period from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2006 in accordance with UNDP requirements.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of UNDP and the Forum Fisheries Agency.

CBL Certified Practising Accountants

Date: 30th May 2007
Honiara



BY Gideon Zoleveke
PARTNER

PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
 STATEMENT OF ASSETS/EQUIPMENT
FOR THE YEAR ENDED 31ST DECEMBER 2006

<u>Assets Descriptions</u>	<u>SPC XPF</u>	<u>FFA AUD</u>	<u>Rate</u>	<u>USD</u>
Computer Laptop (3 x Toshiba)		10,292	1.298019	7,929
Projector x 1		2,473	1.338927	1,847
Computer Laptop (VGN - SZ25GP)	341,500		90.60759	3,769
Computer Laptop (TECTRA M5 English)	297,300		97.50738	3,049
Computer Laptop (VAIO VGN - FJ58GP English)	247,700		101.14332	2,449
Computer Laptop (TECTRA M5 English)	248,263		91.105688	2,725
Computer Laptop (TECTRA M5 English)	248,262		91.105688	2,725
Computer Laptop (TECTRA M5 English)	248,263		91.105688	2,725
	<u>1,631,288</u>	<u>12,765</u>		<u>27,218</u>



30th May 2007

**PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
STATEMENT OF CASH POSITION
YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2006**

	2005 FFA USD	2006 FFA USD
Funds carry forward 1 Jan 2006		243,439
2005 Bank Interests		616
Inflow of funds	379,675	756,935
Outflow of funds	-136,236	-774,523
Bank fees		54
Balance per ledger 31 December 2006	243,439	226,521
Add: Bank fees & Interest		2,375
Add back outstanding obligations		23,232
Balance per Bank 31 December 2006	243,439	252,128



30k May 2007

30th May 2007

Project Coordinator
Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project
Forum Fisheries Agency
P O Box 629
Honiara

Dear Sir,

**MANAGEMENT LETTER - PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT.
FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 31ST DECEMBER 2006**

During our audit of Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project for the period from 1 January 2006 to 31 December 2006, certain matters came to our notice which we wish to draw to your attention. Our comments and recommendations are set out in the attached appendices.

We have included your comments in response to each of the points we have raised.

Our internal control memorandum is intended to provide constructive assistance to management. However, you will appreciate that the points included therein only came to our attention as a result of our normal audit procedures. The scope of these procedures is determined by us primarily to enable us to express an opinion on the PIOFMP financial report.

We hope that you will find this memorandum to be a valuable product of the audit process.

We would like to express our appreciation for the co-operation and the assistance rendered to our staff by management and staff of FFA during the conduct of the audit.

Yours faithfully,



Gideon Zoleveke
Partner

PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
MANAGEMENT LETTER
FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2006

Index

1. Review of the Project Progress
 - 1.1 Work Plans and Financial Reports
 - 1.2 Annual Project Reports
 - 1.3 UNDP's Roles and Responsibilities to the Project
2. Assessment of Internal Control Systems
3. Available Facilities and Right of Access
4. Audit Findings
 - 4.1 Activity One Audit Findings
 - 4.1.1 Advance not fully acquitted (Priority medium)
 - 4.1.2 Position upgraded without written justification (Priority low)
 - 4.1.3 Non compliance with internal procedures for consultant recruitment (Priority low)
 - 4.1.4 Non compliance with internal procedures for payment of consultants (Priority medium)
 - 4.1.5 Non compliance with SPC's Accommodation Policy (Priority medium)
 - 4.1.6 Overspending (Priority medium)
 - 4.1.7 Management fees not posted (Priority low)
 - 4.1.8 Late posting of expenses (Priority low)
 - 4.2 Activity Two and Three Audit Findings
 - 4.2.1 Project Work Plans (Priority low)
 - 4.2.2 Minutes of Regional Steering Committee Meetings (Priority low)
 - 4.2.3 Overspending (Priority medium)
 - 4.2.4 FFA Project Ledger (Priority low)
 - 4.2.5 WWF South Pacific Programme (Priority low)

1. Review of the Project Progress

The following representation comprises the management letter compiled from the independent audit of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) for the financial year ended 31st December, 2006. The project is executed by the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), Honiara, Solomon Islands. The project is administered by the Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) housed at the FFA Headquarter in Honiara.

We were responsible for the overall audit of the Project. This entails auditing records held at FFA Headquarters in Honiara and those held by SPC and IUCN. The SPC audit was however conducted by Pricewaterhouse Coopers and their management letter and audit findings were then forwarded to us. IUCN records were forwarded to FFA in Honiara and these have been subjected to our normal audit processes and procedures. Our management letter therefore comprises a consolidation of all of our findings. These are specifically dealt with in the relevant sections below.

Our tasks were limited to the audit of the Project books and documents in the Project Office. We were unable to carry out field visits to verify the implementation phase on project locations and to consultants, contractors and other persons or firms engaged by the project management.

We are therefore unable to comment on the actual project implementation.

Management should include in the future audits, site visits by auditors to verify whether the project funds have been used in the Project costs or alternatively engage the auditors of SPC or IUCN to verify, sight and/or interview project officers on location where projects are being implemented.

1.1 Work Plans and Financial Reports

We noted that quarterly financial reports were compiled, reviewed, and signed off for submission to the UNDP Office in Suva, Fiji. To verify the accuracy and existence of amounts, we traced all figures to the FFA project ledger and have satisfied our selves that all balances relating to receipts and expenditures for the period were taken up correctly when the relevant income and expenditures were received and incurred.

Also, our review of the Project bank account (USD #4) revealed that there was a monthly reconciliation of the account to bank statement balances and the general ledger. We have sighted monthly reconciliation statements placed on file and have satisfied ourselves that reconciliations were done continuously.

Compliance with reporting requirements set out in the Letter of Agreement between FFA and SPC

SPC has complied with all the requirements for timely reporting and has sent the following reports to FFA:

- Financial monthly reports in the format requested by FFA.
- Progress reports covering the period concerned.

Management has continued to comply well with all the requirements for timely reporting on the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project.

There is no indication that quarterly financial reports have been late for submission to the UNDP Office, Fiji.

Both the quarterly and annual work plans were executed in accordance with the requirements of the project. We note however in 4.2.1 that the discrepancy in fully

executing or implementing the work plans was due mainly to circumstances beyond the control of PCU and difficulties faced by IUCN in commencing research activities.

1.2 Annual Project Reports

The minutes of the RSC are documented as a “Summary Record of Discussions”. We note that records of the meetings are circulated and endorsed by the RSC intersessionally. They are noted as being acceptable to all members present at the meeting.

We were unable to sight a copy of the 2006 Annual Project Report (APR) although reference was made to them in the APR in the minutes. It appears that the quarterly and annual work plans and the Annual Project Report (APR) were completed as a monitoring obligation and tabled by the management of FFA at the RSC meetings.

1.3 UNDP’s Roles and Responsibilities to the Project

We have reviewed the UNDP Project Implementation guidelines and are satisfied that the OFM Project complies with the UNDP guidelines and procedures.

2. Assessment of Internal Control Systems

Observation

Our review of systems of policies and procedures that protect the assets of OFM revealed that effective control was maintained within OFM. We have reviewed the findings of Pricewaterhouse Coopers on internal controls and concur that they are consistent with our findings.

In a general way, we report that:

- Effective procedures are in place for handling of funds received and expended by the Oceanic Fisheries Management Project for the financial year ended 31st December 2006;
- Payments are supported by invoices, documentations, correspondences and are properly authorized by the finance manager;
- There is no indication that Double payments could occur;
- Our audit indicated that good control measures are in place for writing and signing checks or vouchers and receiving, recording, securing and depositing cash and other receipts. Such procedures ensures that no single individual is responsible for receiving, recording and depositing funds or writing and signing checks at the time of the audit;
- Oceanic Fisheries Management has maintained an effective accounting software where processing and monitoring of all income and expenditures were taken up correctly when they are received and incurred;
- There is safe accessing of data, inputting and changing of electronic data are restricted access by password to only personnel who maintained project documents;
- Effective procedures for approving contracts to which OFM is a party including securing competitive bids from consultants are in place;
- There is manpower in terms of staffing at OFM to ensure these policies and procedures are carried out, professionalism is maintained at all times and to achieve results.

Activities Two and Three - FFA and IUCN

During the conduct of our audit at Project office, we noted that three staff were employed, the Project Coordinator, Fisheries Management Advisor and Project Finance Officer. We noted that all transactions during the twelve months audited for Activities two and three, complied with the UNDP Programming Manual chapters 6.4 and 6.5 and the South Pacific Forum Fisheries Agency's financial regulation. The project was fully resourced at audit date except for cases relating to IUCN where project activities did not eventuate during the period. There was no audit evidence to substantiate the existence of human errors in the books and records maintained for Activities two and three.

Activity One - SPC and IUCN

Our review of SPC's Management Letter highlighted a number of non compliance with internal procedures and policies.

We note however, that circumstances prevailing at the time may have made these procedures inoperable. Generally, OFM Project continues to comply with the UNDP Programming Manual, South Pacific Forum Fisheries Agency's financial regulation and the financial policies and procedures manual of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community

Recommendation

We recommend that management review the changing operational circumstances in order to update existing financial policies and procedures.

Management Comments

3. Available Facilities and Right of Access

During the course of our audit, we have had full and complete access to all records and documents available at FFA and to all employees. We are grateful to FFA for the assistance accorded to us by the management and staff of OFM.

4. Audit Findings

The audit findings contained in this management letter relates to all project activities. Those audit findings described in component one (SPC) of the letter are those of Pricewaterhouse Coopers. The audit findings relating to component two and three (FFA and IUCN) were assessed directly by ourselves.

4.1 Activity One Audit Findings

4.1.1 Advance not fully acquitted (Priority medium)

Observation (Compliance)

During the tagging campaign in Papua New Guinea, advance payments were made to PNG Tagging coordinator, Dr A. Lewis, into his personal bank account, to cover expenses related to the day-to-day organization of the campaign. These expenses were to be acquitted afterwards by sending the original invoices to the SPC. We observed that 48, 058 Kina out of the total advance of 600, 745 kina was not acquitted (approximately XPF1, 500,000 or USD16, 000).

Recommendation

We recommend that advances made to the consultant be covered by a letter of agreement, jointly signed by SPC and the consultant, which states that all expenditure by the consultant must be fully acquitted with the project requirements.

Management response

The advance payments were made to personal PNG bank account of the project coordinator in order to facilitate the purchase of essentials (fuel, food etc) for the crew and the scientific staff working for the three-month phase 1 of the PNG tagging project on the chartered vessel Soltai 6. SPC was requested by the owner of the vessel to advance the funds and purchase fuel, oil, water, and food for the crew which was then deducted from the charter costs of USD384, 000 as Soltai Fishing Ltd did not have a bank account in PNG and could not make the requisite purchases for the three - month cruise. This meant a huge unplanned increase in the workload of the coordinator which he undertook on top of his scientific and coordination duties.

The time constraints were severe in each port of call (only one day) to undertake the necessary purchases which led to some invoices not collected and some bonuses for the crew not signed off. (The crew at each port of call requested advances on their bonuses which were based on the number of fish caught and tagged.)

In future greater efforts will be made to ensure that all invoices are collected and all crew bonuses are signed off.

4.1.2 Position upgraded without written justification (Priority low)

Observation (Guidelines)

The contract of a data entry technician (Savea Sonia) was renewed in November 2006. Her position was upgraded from “E9” to “F4”, which meant a salary increase of XPF15, 000 (USD158.00) every month. We were unable to find written justification for this upgrade in her personal file.

Recommendation

We recommend that SPC establish written duty statements.

Management response

The positions of the Oceanic Fisheries data entry technicians were reclassified during the year in light of the change of duties and increased data quality control duties.

4.1.3 Non compliance with internal procedures for consultant recruitment (Priority low)

Observation (Compliance)

SPC's rules indicate that, in the event that the budget for an operation is equal to or greater than XPF2, 000,000 (USD21, 000) the section/programme head must consider the files of at least three applicants. This condition may be waived in cases where an individual consultant is demonstrably the only person who could undertake the proposed assignment. In such cases, the choice of consultant must be justified and then approved by the Director General (or the Director of Corporate Services).

We note that this rule was not followed in respect to Mrs. Chagnaud, Mr. Itano and Mr. Fournier. No evidence of the required justification was found. However, the Director General of SPC approved the appointments by signing the contracts with the terms of reference.

Recommendation

When a consultant is the only person who could undertake the assignment, we recommend that SPC follows the formal procedures for the dispensation mentioned above.

Management response

Consultants hired without an invitation to tender are the only ones who are able to undertake the assignment.

4.1.4 Non compliance with internal procedures for payment of consultants (Priority medium)

Observation (Compliance)

SPC's rules (dated 2002) indicate that the normal daily rate of payment for a consultant is set at USD250 per day. However, the Director General or the Director of Corporate Services may authorize payment of higher fees, on an exceptional basis, upon received documented proof from the head of the section and /or programme concerned with the recruitment. During the audit, we noted that Mr. Fournier, Mr. Lewis and Mr. Itano received remuneration of approximately USD400 per day. We did not obtain the documented proof mentioned above.

Recommendation

We recommend that SPC complies with its policy on hiring consultants or consider updating policy if not aligned with market.

Management response

The consultants' fees paid are the normal rate for such specialists.

4.1.5 Non compliance with SPC's Accommodation Policy (Priority medium)

Observation (Compliance)

SPC normally allocates a two - bedroom accommodation to single or married staff with or without children. We observed that one staff member who fulfilled the conditions for obtaining a two - bedroom accommodation, had a three - bedroom house. Consequently, the excess cost charged to the program is estimated at XPF26, 250 (USD276.00) per month.

Recommendation

We recommend that SPC complies with its policy on accommodation.

Management response

The allocation of the three bed - roomed house was done due to the pressure of time and logistic constraints of finding appropriate housing for the large increase in the number of SPC staff during the past 18 months. There was a call for two bedroom apartments in exchange for a three bedroom house on the SPC housing complex at Receiving. The allocation in this instance was made according to the SPC housing policy which states that allocation is based on the applicant's length of continuous residency in Receiving, and the applicant's length of continuous service with SPC.

4.1.6 Overspending (Priority medium)

Observation (Compliance)

A review of the summary statement of income and expenditure shows the following overspending (compared to USD revised budget):

Fishery Monitoring

- International Consultants: +USD7,573.19
- Contract Services: +USD2,758.40
- Info/tech/equipment: +USD2,448.81
- Miscellaneous expenditure: +USD14,853.84

Stock Assessment

- Info/tech/equipment: +USD5,497.48
- Miscellaneous expenditure: +USD6,165.36

Ecosystem Analysis

- Equipment and furniture: +USD4,838.58
- Info/tech/equipment: +USD2,241.32

Project Support

- Data Entry: +USD3,510.42

Recommendation

SPC should ensure that the reasons for overspending are identified and that corrective measures are undertaken. We recommend that SPC validate these changes with the concerned authority.

Management response

The USD budget revision was made in September 2006 and it was difficult to predict with precision actual expenditure for the fourth quarter.

In addition, the cost of operating in Noumea, New Caledonia is comparatively higher than other places in the Pacific and this is reflected in both project design and budget allocations. Projected costs in some areas have increased.

Figures identified in section 4.1.6 by the auditor's that examined SPC books in relation to expenditure against Activity One, examines expenditure at a sub-component level within Activity One only of the project. The project Executing Agency reports to UNDP at the prescribed level according to UNDP ATLAS Budgetary and Expense Codes (Nov 2004), set out in the UNDP Financial Report (FR01) and which in turn generates the Combined Delivery Report (CDR). Funds to date have been applied against "national and regional results" and the costs of project operation are on the whole within the confines of the budget i.e. there is no identified overspending as per the CDR for Activity One.

4.1.7 Management fees not posted (Priority low)

Observation (Compliance)

To support the administrative cost of managing the program, management fees of 7% of the funds received are charged by SPC. This amount represents XPF4, 350,996 (USD45, 704.00) for the first two instalments received in 2006. No charge has been recorded for this in relation to the last instalments for the year. Consequently, total expenses for 2006 were understated by XPF2, 130,793 (USD22, 382.00).

Recommendation

SPC should perform, towards year end, a reasonable check on the program to ensure that an appropriate amount of fees has been claimed.

Management response

No changes in the financial statement will be made for the period 1 January to 31 December 2006 as the financial reports have already been sent to FFA and acquitted.

4.1.8 Late posting of expenses (Priority low)

Observation (Compliance)

Some 2006 expenditures for a total amount of XPF475, 178 (USD4, 991.00) have been charged to the project in January 2007. Consequently, these were not included in both summary statement of income and expenditure and statement of cash position as at December 31st, 2006.

Recommendation

Nil

Management response

Nil

4.2 Activity Two and Three Audit Findings

4.2.1 Project Work Plans (Priority low)

Observation (Resources)

We reviewed the Project Work Plans at the project office. There were no issues that would hinder the implementation of the Project.

However, we noted the work of IUCN was held up due to current problems faced with unavailability of vessels to carry out research and project activities. We noted in the minutes that the committee was striving to secure an appropriate vessel to conduct the scientific research as planned, but that they would not know until February 2007 which falls in a new financial year. Our reporting of IUCN activities were confined to documents such as, receipts and acquittals sent to OFM and interviews conducted with OFM personnel. In this respect, we were unable to comment any further of project activities.

Results

No exception noted

Recommendation

We recommend management continue to comply with the Project Work Plans.

Management Comments

Project activities that were to have been undertaken by the IUCN remain the only major discrepancy in the annual work plans of the project. Circumstances beyond the control of the PCU and in some respects IUCN itself prevent the seamount research activities commencing. The matter was also placed before the Project Regional Steering Committee in October 2006 who agreed to allow IUCN to work out which of the alternative options would be employed in 2007. To date IUCN have not been able to advise alternative options to address the related project output and outcomes. The PCU will now promote a suggestion by SPC for the use of IUCN research funds for similar work beginning undertaken at SPC and for which further financial support is required.

4.2.2 Minutes of Regional Steering Committee Meetings (Priority low)

Observation

During the course of our audit, we sighted minutes of the 1st and 2nd meetings of the Regional Steering Committee in Honiara and Fiji respectively. Our review of past meeting held had it that there was no part to hinder the work of Oceanic Fisheries Management. We have agreed all issues to minutes and are satisfied that there were no matters unusual that need special investigation. We noted proper documents were maintained and filed by OFM personnel at audit date. Similarly, we have satisfied there was overwhelming support given by Small Member Countries towards the work of the organization in the region.

We were unable to sight signed minutes. Electronic copies handed to us were printed from documents maintained by OFM during the time of the audit. However, we were informed that minutes of meetings made available to us were endorsed by RSC respectively.

Recommendation

Minutes are very important documents of meetings held. It implies that all parties to the meetings have agreed on the matters and they represent a true record of meetings. All original minutes should be filed at OFM office.

Minutes also record the authorization of revenues and expenditures and commitments to procurements of assets or liabilities.

Management Comments

We note the auditor's comments and think they hold merit. However, traditionally Records of Proceedings are cleared at the close of regional meetings and records state that the forum has endorsed the outcomes on all issues. They are not typically signed by the chairperson/country.

4.2.3 Overspending (Priority medium)

Observation (Compliance)

Our review of OFM detailed expenditure worksheet shows the following overspending (compared to USD revised budget):

Policy Reform

- Fisheries Management Consultants: +USD31,174.00

Policy Reform

- National Fisheries Management Workshops: +USD4,470.00

Results

The financial effect of the over expenditure is a shortfall in the budgetary allocation for other expenditures for the year. These funds will have to be drawn either from other allocations or sources within the project to complete activities thereby depriving other activities of their allocations.

Recommendation

We recommend management ensure that the reasons for overspending are identified and that corrective measures are promptly undertaken. Chapter six of the UNDP Programming Manual, clause 6.5.2 (c) specifies that disbursements do not exceed the available funds or the amount allocated to each approved budgetary category.

Managements Comments

A number of issues relating to by-catch issues (turtles, sharks, seabirds and FADs) in the Commission arose during the year for which fisheries management consultancies were required. This work was established until mid 2006 and provisions were not detailed in the quarterly work plans. Expenditure was incurred under this budget category in anticipation of under spending in other areas of the project. The work remains consistent with the outputs and outcomes of fisheries management consultancies and advice for Pacific countries on the WCPF Commission.

The 2006 budget National Fisheries Management workshops expenditures exceeded marginally the budget estimated for this activity. A workshop was held in Vanuatu and another in Samoa were slightly more expensive than anticipated.

4.2.4 FFA Project Ledger (Priority low)

Observation (Guidance)

Our audit revealed that as at 31st December, 2006, a balance of USD13, 923.00 was taken up in FFA project Ledger as a liability for OFM to reimburse FFA (Trust Fund). This relates to OFM expenditures paid by FFA and to be reimbursed at a later date when funds are forthcoming. We were informed by FFA personnel that this amount represents overpayment of OFM expenditures by Trust Fund. However, from information obtained from OFM Finance Officer, he was not aware of any overpayments of this kind which is still outstanding. He claimed that all expenditures paid by Trust Fund were reimbursed in full and by now there was non left. In the books of FFA (Trust Fund) it was obvious that the balance of USD13, 923.00 remain as arrears at audit date.

Results

The financial effect of the above is that a debt is recorded in the books of the Trust Fund whilst a corresponding liability is recorded in the books of OFM. These are additional financial and potential cash flow burdens for both entities given the limited financial resources made available to the entities annually.

Recommendation

We recommend management ensure that proper reconciliations are done to monitor such reimbursable expense. We report that a balance of USD13, 923.00 is material for project funds and can have an effect on the financial reports of OFM if it is not addressed accordingly.

Management Comments

Initially FFA trust funds have made payments for a majority of project activities (component's two and three) on a reimbursement basis. Monthly bills are produced and the PCU ensures that immediate payment is made from the project USD account to cover this expenditure. As the project unit became more established the tendency is to pay bills directly where possible to reduce the two step billing arrangement as much as possible with FFA Finance.

A fiscal examination of this discrepancy post audit has been conducted. The examination of the FFA finance ledgers could not substantiate the amount of USD13, 923 as being owed by the project to the FFA. A memo from the FFA Finance Department stating that expenditure to the amount of USD13,923 has been incorrectly attributed to the project has been forwarded to the Auditor's and is on record with the PCU. The matter is now considered closed.

4.2.5 WWF South Pacific Programme (Priority low)

Observation (Compliance)

Our audit revealed that at 31st December 2006, a balance of USD37, 985.00 transferred to WWF in Suva, Fiji still remained outstanding and is yet to be acquitted by WWF. We sighted the letter of agreement signed by both parties for the implementation of the United Nations Development Programme/Global Environmental Facility. We then sent a letter of confirmation to confirm funds held by WWF. We were advised by the client that receipts and acquittals would be sent very soon. However, after completion of our task we were unable to verify receipts and acquittals sent from WWF. In this respect, we were unable to ascertain whether funds allocated to run project activities were utilized for its purposes.

Recommendation

We recommend management ensure that receipts and acquittals are returned prior to the commencement of audit work. Lack of these documents would cause long delays in future completing audit tasks.

Management must also ensure that there is timely follow up with parties to which they disburse funds to for one off projects.

Management Comments

The LOA with WWF was not concluded until late 2006 (November). Funds for the commencement of activities described in the agreement were made available immediately the agreement was concluded in the hope that a workshop could take place in December 2006. The uncertainty of when the agreement would be formally completed and the limited time to organize an event resulted in a deferment of the workshop.

At the time of auditing while funds had been transferred, no expenses had occurred. We note the auditors' comments concerning non-acknowledgement of receipt of funds in 2006. Communication has since been provided by WWF concerning the receipt of funds. The PCU will ensure in future that acknowledgement is immediate and clearly recorded.

Paper Number RSC3/WP 7
Title **MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS
OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT –
PROCESS AND TERMS OF REFERENCES**

Summary

The purpose of this paper is to provide the Regional Steering Committee with relevant information relating to Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project. The document outlines the rationale, the main deliverables and the ethical conduct of the evaluation.

The objective of the Mid-term Evaluation of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project is to determine progress being made towards the achievement of project outcomes and identify course correction if needed. It will also highlight initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management and finances.

Recommendation

The Regional Steering Committee is invited to:

- i) consider and comment on the draft Terms of Reference for the consultancy that will perform the Mid-term Evaluation; and
- ii) endorse the approach, context and timeframe for the Mid-term Evaluation of the OFM Project.



FFA



IUCN
The World Conservation Union

MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT – PROCESS AND TERMS OF REFERENCES

Introduction

1. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:
 - i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
 - ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and
 - iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.
2. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.
3. In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods (e.g. over 5 or 6 years) are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

Evaluation Objective

4. The objective of the Mid-term Evaluation of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) is to determine progress being made towards the achievement of project outcomes and identify course correction, if needed.
5. The evaluation will determine initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management and an assessment of the impact of the activities to date and best practices. This evaluation will provide the Governments of Pacific Islands, the FFA, UNDP, IUCN, SPC, project donors and stakeholders with an assessment of the project progress towards achievement of the intended results. It will also provide recommendations on the possible future project focus, including its management, financial issues and institutional implementation framework.

Review Process.

6. The Mid-term Evaluation will be supervised by the UNDP Deputy Resident Representative and UNDP Regional Technical Adviser in the Regional Bureau for Asia and Pacific (RBAP) in close collaboration with the FFA. A contract will be developed for signature by the successful consultants. The contract will detail all aspects of input and required deliverables. The consultants will be bound by the terms and conditions of UNDP Procurement Rules and Guidelines. Two consultants (a team leader and an regional resource specialist) will conduct consultations at selected project sites with national and regional stakeholders to determine project achievements and challenges and with which to provide recommendations for future project focus. The evaluation is expected to commence in late June 2008 and should be completed by 31 October 2008.
7. On completion of the evaluation, the MTE consultants will circulate draft outputs to key stakeholders for comments before completing a final evaluation report. The deliverables of the MTE will be a report that provides advice on project management regarding opportunities to improve the project's efficiency, effectiveness and will be presented at the fourth Regional Steering Committee Meeting.

Recommendation

8. The Regional Steering Committee is invited to:

- iii) consider and comment on the draft Terms of Reference for the consultancy that will perform the Mid-term Evaluation; and
- i) endorse the approach, context and timeframe for the Mid-term Evaluation of the OFM Project.



ATTACHMENT A

TERMS OF REFERENCE [Draft, September 2007]

Mid-term Evaluation of UNDP-GEF's Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project – PIMS 2992

A Introduction

The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) is a multi-governmental five year initiative by 14 independent islands nations and one territory¹ to address the sustainable management of regional fish stocks in the Pacific region. The project is implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) through its Fiji country office and executed by the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA). The project document was signed by UNDP on 30 September 2005 and by the FFA on 13 July 2005. The execution start date was not until November of the last quarter of 2005 which resulted in the first Regional Steering Committee agreeing to adjust the 5 year period of project implementation across 2005 to completion in 2010 and a post evaluation phase in 2012.

The OFM Project fits within the overarching Strategic Action Programme (SAP) for the International Waters of the Pacific Island Developing States (RAS/98/G32) which contained at the time, two complementary linked consultative sub programmes: Integrated Coastal and Watershed Management and Oceanic Fisheries Management. The delivery of actions of the full OFM Project is now undertaken directly by the FFA rather than through the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). The mid-term evaluation (MTE) is confined to the OFM Project executed by the FFA.

Project objectives

The two OFM Project objectives address the threats to the sustainability of the use of the region's oceanic fish resources identified in the SAP, principally the lack of understanding and the weaknesses in governance relating to oceanic fisheries in the International Waters in the region. They seek to improve the understanding of transboundary oceanic fisheries resources and create new regional institutional arrangements as well as realigning, reforming and strengthening national arrangements for the conservation and management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources.

The origins of the project, its preparation, its objectives and structure address the concerns that Pacific Islands small developing States (Pacific SIDS) have for the unsustainable use of transboundary oceanic fish stocks of the Pacific region and unsustainable levels and patterns of exploitation in the fisheries that target those stocks.

At the centre of these concerns is the transboundary nature of the stocks. The stocks are dominantly highly migratory, with their range extending through waters under the jurisdiction of around 20 countries and into large areas of high seas. Each of the countries within whose waters the stocks occur has responsibilities under international law to adopt measures for the

¹ The 14 Pacific Island States and territory that qualify for GEF support under the OFM Project are: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.





conservation and management of these stocks. But without a coherent and legally binding framework to establish and apply measures throughout the range of the stocks, including the high seas, the efforts made by individual countries in their own waters can be undermined by unregulated fishing on the high seas and by inconsistencies in measures in different national zones.

These are global concerns. They were important issues in the preparation of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) during the 1970s, particularly in the provisions relating to management of fishing on the high seas and management of fishing for highly migratory species. In 1992 they found expression in the call from the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development (UNCED) within Agenda 21 for a UN intergovernmental conference on high seas fishing and they are also the key concerns addressed in the UN Fish Stocks Agreement.

A Project Coordination Unit (PCU) based at the FFA administers the project.

B Objective and Purpose of the Mid-term Evaluation

“The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all projects with long implementation periods (e.g. over 5 or 6 years) are strongly encouraged to conduct mid-term evaluations. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Council decisions on transparency and better access of information during implementation.

Mid-term evaluations are intended to identify potential project design problems, assess progress towards the achievement of objectives, identify and document lessons learned (including lessons that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects), and to make recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve the project. It is expected to serve as a means of validating or filling the gaps in the initial assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency obtained from monitoring. The mid-term evaluation provides the opportunity to assess early signs of project success or failure and prompt necessary adjustments.”

The objective of the MTE is to principally to provide an assessment of the progress made towards the OFM project's original objectives and outputs. It should also identify strengths and weaknesses; and provide an evaluation of the implementation and management of the project by identifying factors that have facilitated or impeded the achievements of the project objectives and outputs. In addition, the MTE should also provide recommendations and lessons learned to assist on defining future directions for the project.



The key stakeholders for the MTE include the Global Environment Facility (and the global community), UNDP, Pacific SIDS, Pacific regional organizations, relevant donor organizations and industry and environment non-government organizations.

The following key issues should be addressed during the MTE of the OFM Project [modified from the MTE TORs for the ICWM component of the SAP – Anna would need to add more to this]:

- Assess progress towards attaining the Programme’s regional and global environmental objectives as described in GEF operational focal areas 9;
- Assess progress towards achievement of OFM Project outcomes;
- Describe the project’s adaptive management processes – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions, and have the changes been appropriate?
- Review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various institutional arrangements for project implementation and the level of coordination between relevant players;
- Review any partnership arrangements with other donors and comment on their strengths and weaknesses;
- Describe and assess the efforts of UNDP, the FFA, Secretariat for the Pacific Community (SPC) and The World Conservation Union (IUCN) in support of the PCU and national institutions;
- Review and evaluate the extent to which OFM Project impacts have reached the intended beneficiaries, both within and outside project sites;
- Assess the likelihood of continuation of project outcomes and benefits after completion of GEF funding;
- Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of OFM Project outcomes;
- Assess whether the Logical Framework approach and performance indicators have been used as effective management tools;
- Review the implementation of the projects monitoring and evaluation plans;
- Describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of:
 - country ownership/drivenness;
 - regional cooperation and inter-governmental cooperation;
 - stakeholder participation;
 - adaptive management processes;
 - efforts to secure sustainability; and
 - the role of M&E in project implementation.

In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly, including to other, similar projects in the UNDP/GEF pipeline and portfolio.

The Report of the MTE will be a stand-alone document that substantiates its recommendations and conclusions and will be targeted at meeting the evaluation needs of all key stakeholders (GEF, UNDP, FFA, SPC, IUCN and participating countries).

C Scope of the Evaluation





The scope of the MTE will critically assess issues pertaining to the relevance, performance (based on indicators identified in the logframe matrix) and success of the project including the sustainability of results. In considering the effectiveness, efficiency, relevant impacts and sustainability of the project the MTE will also make an assessment to-date of project implementation, design and management and administration. The evaluation will also result in the formulation of recommendations and identification of lessons learned to assist determining future directions of the project.

Project Impact (Results)

This section should be read in conjunction with the objectives of the MTE, specifically the key issues identified Section B.

The Evaluation will examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of operational activities and results achieved by the project to-date, by showing how the component(s) processes and outcomes have contributed (or have the potential to contribute) to the achievement of project goals and objectives. Specifically the MTE will:

- assess, quantitatively and qualitatively, the achievements and impact in terms of outputs and their contribution to outcomes as defined in the project document;
- assess to what extent the project has or will contribute to the establishment of regional arrangements for sustainable oceanic fisheries management;
- assess to what extent the project has made impacts on the promotion of Pacific SIDS participation in decision-making and the realignment and strength of local governance in sustainable fisheries management;
- how the project contributed to improved governance at national levels, and examine how governance issues have impacted on the achievement of project goals and outputs;
- determine lessons learned and assess the sustainability of project results; and
- provide recommendations for how the project implementation can be strengthened and can most effectively support regional and national priorities, management of transboundary oceanic fishery resources and strengthen and achieve project objectives.

Project Design

The MTE will assess:

- i) the extent to which the overall project design remains valid;
- ii) review the project's concept, strategy and approach within the context of effective capacity development and sustainability;
- iii) assess the approach used in design and whether the selected intervention strategy addresses the root causes and principal threats in the project area;
- iv) the effectiveness and the methodology of the overall project structure, how effectively the project addresses responsibilities especially towards capacity building and challenges; and
- v) assess plans and potential for replication.

Project Management and Administration

The MTE will assess the extent to which project management has been effective, efficient and responsive in the following areas:

- i) *Project Delivery*





The MTE will assess to what extent the OFM Project has achieved its immediate objectives. It will also identify what outputs have been produced and how they have enabled the OFM Project to achieve its objectives. The assessment will address the following priority areas:

- a) Progress of the OFM Project towards achieving anticipated outcomes by assessing the efficiency and quality of project activities, progress towards immediate objectives (level of indicator achievement if available); and
- b) partnerships of collaboration between governments, intergovernmental and NGOs, national level involvement and perceptions and the involvement of other stakeholders.

ii) *Project Implementation*

The evaluation will assess of the overall institutional arrangements for the execution, implementation, management, monitoring and evaluation and risk management of the project, including the assessment and review of:

- a) the OFM Project management structure and implementation arrangements at all levels, in order to provide an opinion on its efficiency and cost effectiveness;
- b) the project implementation structure of the project for oversight by UNDP, FFA, Regional Steering Committee (RSC) – multipartite review processes, and national consultative committees); project execution by FFA as the executing agency under the UNDP National Execution (NEX) modality, the PCU and the project focal points; and project implementation by UNDP as the implementing agency;
- c) whether there has been a monitoring and evaluation framework for the OFM Project and the use of logical framework as a management tool during implementation;
- d) whether the reporting framework is effective and appropriate and if it is suitable for replication/continuation for any future project support;
- e) indicators of adaptive management;
- f) the mechanisms for information dissemination of project implementation; and
- g) risk management by identifying any problems or constraints which may impact, or are impacting on the successful delivery of the OFM Project, whether they have been, or are being appropriately dealt with and if they are likely to be repeated in future phases.

iii) *Project Finances*

The evaluation will critically analyze the project finance elements including:

- a) budget procedures including the review of audits; and the subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations; and any changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions providing an opinion on the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions;
- b) the appropriateness of and efficiency of disbursements and actual spending;
- c) the effectiveness of coordinating mechanisms by evaluating the appropriateness and efficiency of coordinating mechanisms between UNDP, the FFA (including internal coordination), with SPC & IUCN and GEF;
- d) by providing an overview of actual spending versus budget expectations;
- e) assessing how the project has materialized/leveraged co-financing for various components; and
- f) assessing the financial effectiveness of the PCU as a regional approach in support of in-country conservation and sustainable oceanic fisheries resource



management initiatives in the Pacific, and if so how can this approach be improved.

D Products Expected from the Evaluation

The main product of the MTE will be a Mid-term Evaluation Report based on an agreed format (**Annex A**)

The final Mid-term Evaluation Report of no more than 40 pages (excluding an Executive Summary and annexes) will include:

- findings and conclusions in relation to issues to be addressed under sections B and C of these TORs; and
- assessments of gaps and/or additional measures needed to justify future GEF investment in the Pacific Islands region in relation to International Waters issues and sustainable oceanic fisheries resource management.

The draft and final Mid-Term Evaluation Report will be:

- written in the format outlined in Annex A;
- submitted to UNDP and the FFA in time for distribution to project focal points who will participate in the Regional Steering Committee/Multipartite Review meeting scheduled for **early October 2008** at Honiara, Solomon Islands. This will require the submission of a draft on or before **10 August 2008**. Based on feedback from stakeholders, including those participating in the Regional Steering Committee at Honiara, a final report will be prepared by **31 October 2008**; and
- produced in hardcopy and electronically of which 50 hard copies of the Final Mid-Term Report will be submitted to UNDP and the FFA. Electronic copies of both the draft and the final reports will also be submitted to UNDP and the FFA at the time of their respective due dates.

E Methodology

The MTE will be undertaken through a combination of processes including desk research, selected site visits, questionnaires and interviews - involving all stakeholders, including, but not restricted to: UNDP (Suva, Bangkok, New York), GEF, FFA, SPC, IUCN, SPREP, participating Governments, regional ENGOs and industry, communities, resource users and local governments.

The methodology for the study is envisaged to cover the following areas:

- Desk study review of all relevant OFM Project documentation, including but not confined to those listed at **Annex B**;
- Fiji-based consultations with UNDP, SPC, IUCN, WWF South Pacific Programme, University of the South Pacific Marine Programme (USP), Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITIA, including Pacific Islands Private Sector Organisation (PIPSO) based at the Forum Secretariat and PITIA Fiji based officials) national project related stakeholders, other Fiji-based agencies;
- Solomon Islands-based consultations with UNDP, FFA, national project-related stakeholders, other Fiji-based agencies;
- Selected visits to Fiji, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru and Samoa;



- Participation in the Regional Steering Committee/Multipartite Review Meeting scheduled for early October 2008 at Honiara, Solomon Islands.

A total of approximately 45 days (including in-country travel, meeting participation, research, write-up and presentation) has been budgeted to support the Evaluation.

F Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will comprise two consultants with the appropriate expertise, a team leader and a Pacific island national (Regional resource specialist). Principles of gender equity will and selection will be subject to the UNDP Ethical Code of Conduct appended at **Annex C**.

The following attributes are requirements for the selection of the review team:

Team Leader

- Academic and/or professional background in the institutional aspects of resource management with a minimum of 15 years experience;
- In depth knowledge of the international sustainable development agenda, particularly with emphasis on the regional priorities of Pacific region and SIDS, regional groupings, structures and operations;
- Experience in the evaluation of technical assistance projects, preferably with UNDP or other United Nations development agencies and major donors;
- Experience in the evaluation of GEF funded projects, preferably those under the International Waters portfolio;
- Proven capacity in working across the levels of institutions from policy, to legislation and organisations;
- Excellent leading multi-disciplinary teams to deliver quality products in high stress or short deadline situations;
- An ability to assess institutional capacity and incentives;
- Excellent written and English communication skills with a demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions; and
- Excellent facilitation skills.

Regional Resource Specialist

- Academic / professional background in oceanic fisheries management/fisheries science with extensive experience in sustainable development and conservation – preferably in Pacific Islands environments with a minimum of 15 years of working experience;
- An understanding of GEF principles and the expected impacts in terms of global benefits;
- Experience in implementation or evaluation of technical assistance projects;
- An understanding of UNDP, the FFA, SPREP and IUCN activities and operational programmes in the Pacific region;
- Skills and experience in oceanic fisheries management regimes, preferably the development and establishment of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Convention;





- Excellent written and English communication skills; and
- Excellent facilitation skills.

Applications

Expressions of interest should include:

- A short (maximum three page) covering letter addressing the evaluation criteria;
- Curriculum vitae, including references;
- Cost estimates for services rendered including:
 - a) daily consultancy fees, travel costs, communication costs, publishing and stationary costs and other logistical costs as relevant; and
 - b) airfares, anticipated accommodation and living costs are to be included in overall fee charged

G Implementation Arrangements

Responsibility for overall supervision and contracting of the MTE rests with UNDP. The review consultants will be bound by the terms and conditions of the UNDP Procurement Rules and Guidelines. An [indicative schedule \(2008\)](#) for the completion of the MTE is as follows:

16 June	Reviewers commence evaluation
16 - 20 June	Reviewers assemble in Suva, Fiji for briefing by UNDP and Fiji based consultations
23 – 27 June	Reviewers assemble in Honiara, Solomon Islands for consultations
1 – 26 July	Travel to Fiji, Solomon Islands, New Caledonia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru and Samoa
August 10	Draft Report completed
October (early)	Report presentation at RSC4, Solomon Islands
October 31	Final Report submitted to UNDP & the FFA

Applications

Expressions of interest should be addressed to:

*The Resident Representative
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
Private Mail Bag
Suva
FIJI*

*Re: Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project
Email: registry.ug@undp.org*

Applications submission deadline: **30 May 2008**.



IUCN
The World Conservation Union



ANNEX A

Evaluation Report: Sample Outline

Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

Findings and Conclusions

- Project formulation
 - Implementation approach
 - Country ownership/Drivenness
 - Stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - Cost-effectiveness
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Indicators
 - Management arrangements
- Implementation
 - Financial Planning
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Execution and implementation modalities
 - Management by the UNDP country office
 - Coordination and operational issues
- Results
 - Attainment of objectives
 - Sustainability
 - Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

Recommendations

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons learned





- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

Annexes

- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Summary of Evaluation Findings (see Table 1 attached)



Table 1. Summary of Evaluation Findings

OBJECTIVE	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	MID TERM TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY *	RATING **
OUTCOMES	MEASURABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT LOGFRAME	MID TERM TARGET	STATUS OF DELIVERY	RATING
* STATUS OF DELIVERY:		** RATINGS:	Highly Satisfactory = HS	
GREEN / COMPLETED	= Indicators show successful achievement		Satisfactory = S	
YELLOW	= Indicators show expected completion by end of Project		Marginally Satisfactory = MS	
RED	= Indicators show poor achievement - unlikely to be complete by end of Project		Unsatisfactory = U	



ANNEX B

Key Documentation for Review

1. UNDP/GEF Project Document
2. Quarterly project progress reports
3. Project Implementation Report/Annual Project Report (PIR/APR)
4. GEF International Waters Results Framework Reports
5. Tracking tools for GEF International Focal Area/IWP
6. Inception Report
7. Regional Steering Committee/Multipartite Review Minutes/Reports
8. Project Technical Reports
9. Financial and Audit Reports



ANNEX C

Ethical Code of Conduct for UNDP Evaluations

Evaluations of UNDP-supported activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business.

Evaluators:

Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded

Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.





**THIRD MEETING OF THE REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (RSC)
FOR THE PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT
PROJECT**

Rarotonga, Cook Islands
06 October 2007

SUMMARY RECORD OF DISCUSSION¹

1. The third meeting of the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) for the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFM Project) was held at the Rarotonga, Cook Islands on 06 October 2007. Representatives from the following participating country Governments and organizations were present: Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC), the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA), World Wildlife Fund for Nature, and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP Suva country office). A list of participants is appended at **Attachment A**.

Opening of Meeting

2. The Project Coordinator briefly welcomed the delegates and acknowledged the presence of UNDP and other organizations at the meeting. The Tongan Project Focal Point, Mr. Silivenusi Ha'unga was invited to open the meeting with a prayer.

Introductory Remarks

3. Mr. Toily Kurbanov, Deputy Regional Representative, UNDP Suva, made introductory remarks that explained the importance of the Oceanic Fisheries Management Project (OFMP) and objective of the meeting. A copy of his introductory remarks is appended at **Attachment B**.

Opening Remarks

4. Mr Dan Sua, Director-General of the Pacific Islands Forum fisheries Agency made an opening address. A copy of his opening address is appended at **Attachment C**.

Procedural Issues

5. The Co-Chairs for this meeting are Fiji Director of Fisheries and Deputy Regional Representative, UNDP Suva Office.

Apologies

6. The Co-Chair conveyed apologies of Niue, Tokelau, and the Marshall Islands.

¹ Endorsed on 2007

Adoption of Agenda

7. The provisional agenda was adopted, and a copy is appended at **Attachment D**.

Agenda Item 1: Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project Annual Report (UNDP/GEF Annual Project Report/Project Implementation Report)

8. Prior to reporting from SPC, FFA and IUCN on current GEF projects Ms Barbara Hanchard the OFM Project Co-coordinator provided an overview of the “Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project Annual Reports”. These reports are required to be completed for GEF funded projects and are designed to provide monitoring and evaluation information required by both UNDP and GEF..

9. The Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project has now been operational for 2 years (1 October 2005- 30 September 2007). The financial reporting on GEF funded projects is required on a financial year basis (1 June to 30 July). The annual narrative reports presented at this meeting prepared in the UNDP/GEF standardized format are from June 2006 to July 2007 against project strategic objectives and outcomes.

10. Dr. John Hampton from SPC made a presentation of science related work contained in Component One of the OFM Project which SPC have the responsibility for implementing. Dr. Hampton reported against the 3 sub-components of Component 1: Fishery Monitoring, Coordination and Enhancement; Stock Assessment; and Ecosystem Analysis. Within each sub-component SPC are building information and knowledge, with staff assigned to activities within each sub-component.

11. The Tufman project being applied by SPC has now been identified as an essential tool for reconciling, recording and monitoring data. Implementation at a national levels are now being undertaken on a country by country basis. Each country has a designated person responsible for the Tufman software, with their prime responsibilities being data entry and the production of reports to assist in the management of fisheries at a national level. The Tufman software in-country development and training has been identified as an effective means of applying monitoring systems at a national and regional level and continued work will be undertaken by SPC to implement it in countries where it has not yet been applied. In countries where it has been implemented, ongoing support will be provided to enhance systems, provide ongoing training and further develop the application of Tufman. A second workshop of in-country coordinators will also be held in March 2008.

12. Under the Fishery Monitoring, Coordination and Enhancement sub-component the SPC tabled the proposal to activate in-country staff attachments and explained that these attachments would allow for a concentrated level of assistance on the ground in country and would continue for the life of the OFM project.

13. Under the Stock Assessment sub-component the principal work being undertaken at a national level is the production of National Tuna Fishery Status Reports. At a regional level the OFM project supports the provision of scientific advisory services to the Western and Central Pacific Commission (WCPFC).

14. It is intended to undertake the National Tuna Fishery Status Reports in conjunction with the Ecological Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) work being undertaken by FFA, as these two programs compliment each other.

15. The advisory services to the Commission range from stock assessment training workshops for FFA member countries to direct scientific advice to the Commission based on

specific scientific questions being raised by the Commission. The first Stock Assessment training workshop was held in June 2006. Since the first workshop, subsequent workshops have been held in June 2007, for both those undertaking a workshop for the first time and those who had completed the initial workshop. Feedback from the workshops has been positive and SPC will continue to hold the workshops annually, as well as providing on-going support to workshop participants to ensure the skills they have learnt are maintained and applied.

16. The comment was also made by SPC that teaching is not SPC's field of expertise. As such, in the future it may be appropriate for SPC to collaborate or hand over the task of providing stock assessment training to those with specific expertise in this area. It was suggested that universities may have greater expertise in this area, in particular University of South Pacific (USP).

17. Under the Ecosystem Analysis sub-component, information was provided on the tagging program, seamount mapping and the Ecological Risk Assessment (ERA). The recent tagging program in PNG has successfully tagged more than 2,000 fish. The total number of tag recoveries has now reached 600. Tags have been recovered from far reaching areas, as a result of the translation of information on tag recovery into a number of languages and the promotion of the tagging program throughout the region. From the GEF funding successful leveraging of additional funding for the tagging program has also been possible.

18. In regard to the ERA future work to be undertaken by SPC under the project and at the national level was detailed.

19. A question relating to the seamount mapping work to be undertaken and future IUCN cruises to undertake this work was raised by the Committee. The meeting was advised that it is still IUCN's intention to undertake the research cruise and efforts are being made to secure co-financing to meet the short fall left by the non-progress of the original arrangements. Final decisions on these activities are expected to be made by the end of 2007.

20. The Committee sought clarification on whether the tagging was throughout the region and not just in the waters surrounding PNG was raised. SPC explained that the tagging project in the waters surrounding PNG is intended to be the first phase of a new regional tagging program.

21. A number of questions concerning the future development and application of the Tufman Database were raised. It was explained that the software can be modified to meet specific data requirements and used, as it has been by some countries to process information that can be used in national reporting requirements to the Commission.

22. SPC explained that most fisheries agencies typically have a small staff numbers and while ongoing training on the Tufman system is essential, attempts are also being made to keep this training to a minimum to ensure staff were not tired up for prolonged periods.

23. Mr. Moses Amos Director of Fisheries Management Division at the FFA reported on the work being undertaken by the Fisheries Management Division under Component 2 of the OFM project, which includes Legal Reform; Policy Reform and Institutional Reform.

24. FFA reported that as part of efforts for legal reform national, legislation reviews are being undertaken to assist in the incorporation at the national level of conservation and management measures adopted by the WCPFC. These reviews also assist countries in standardizing their legislation and ensuring they comply with contemporary fisheries legislation.

25. Fellowships at FFA have also been provided to legal officers from Pacific Island Countries (PIC) to assist in capacity building and the development of national legislation.

26. Within the policy reform sub-component the principles of the Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) is being applied. This sub-component has made use of prominent regional consultants from throughout the region who are intimately involved in tuna resources fisheries management for EAFM work. It is intended that three EAFM reports will be completed each year. To date reports have been completed for Vanuatu and Palau, with Nauru, FSM and Kirabati in various stages of undertaking the EAFM process.

27. Three WCPFC Sub-regional workshops have also been conducted under policy reform. These workshops have been designed to enable FFA members to develop their understanding and positions on Commission related matters. In regard to institutional strengthening, Nauru is the only country where concentrated work to develop institutional strengthening has been applied to date.

28. Mr. Michael Ferris, Director of Operations at the FFA reported on the work being undertaken by the Monitoring Compliance and Surveillance (MCS) for the Compliance Strengthening activities of the project under Component 2 of the OFM project.

29. FFA provided an overview of the MCS work under the sub-component Compliance Strengthening, which included the following:

- MCS in-country workshops conducted in Vanuatu, PNG and Tuvalu;
- MCS input to the legal review workshops to provide linkages between legislation and compliance application;
- IUU plan developed for the Cook Islands;
- VMS workshop conducted in Canberra; and
- VMS data sharing arrangements to improve the effectiveness of compliance operations.

30. Following the presentation PNG raised the question of the effectiveness of the VMS throughout the region. The meeting was advised that an effective VMS system would be in place as at 1 December 2007, to align with the commencement of the Vessel Day Scheme (VDS).

31. At the end of the presentations provided by the FFA, member countries commended the FFA on assisting members towards effective implementation of many of the current fisheries treaties and arrangements, WCPFC Convention, Fish stock agreement and FAO guidelines through the project. They acknowledged that the legal workshops helped members identify the gaps in their national legislations and with revising old regulations. The Committee noted that Palau sent seven participants to the FFA legal workshops and expressed sincere appreciation to the FFA and the OFM Project for capacity development and funding.

32. A presentation on project coordination was made by Ms. Barbara Hanchard to report against Component three of the OFM project, which includes four sub-components Project Information System, Monitoring and Evaluation, Stakeholder Participation and Awareness Raising and Project Management and Coordination.

33. The key points raised were as follows:

- The successful work of WWF under the project in relation to the dissemination of information to environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOS) and WWF's attendance at the annual Management Options Workshop (MOW) and Commission meetings;

- The development and implementation of recommendations from the Knowledge Management Strategy;
- All monitoring and evaluation requirements have been met by the Project Coordination Unit (PCU);
- Formal links between the project and a regional environmental NGO and the regional tuna industry association (Pacific Islands Tuna Association) have been established;
- Project visits to countries are on-going but are impacted by the heavy regional fisheries agenda;
- Other GEF funded initiatives include the development of a project through the WCPFC Secretariat to provide assistance to Indonesia, Vietnam and the Philippines for a complete overview of the tuna stocks throughout their geographical distribution;
- The GEF Pacific Alliance for Sustainability (GEF-PAS) process currently being discuss for a future funding framework; and
- The need for participating countries in the OFM project to have input and engage in the mid-term review of the OFM project scheduled for 2008 which will have implications for funding beyond 2010 when the current GEF funding finishes.

34. Mr. Taholo Kami, the Regional Director for IUCN in the Pacific addressed the Committee reporting on the status of the activities that IUCN are responsible for under Components 1 and 2 of the OFM project. The Committee was advised that while the scientific aspects of the activities are pending some progress has been made with regards to fisheries management policy in collaboration with the FFA including support for Pacific islands participation at the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Organisation meeting in Chile. IUCN also reported on other aspects of their new Pacific programme for legal reform and institutional reform from a legal perspective. This work included community and outreach programs identifying environmental issues associated with tuna fishing activities.

35. The Committee considered and endorsed the project annual reports presented to the RSC3.

Agenda Item 2: National Annual Project Reports

36. The PCU presented information paper RSC2/INFO.5 National Annual Reports and reiterated the responsibilities of the National Project Focal Points for the OFM Project. The presentation also highlighted the low level of operation of project National Consultative Committees noting that many countries are making good progress towards re-establishing national tuna fisheries management committees.

37. The Committee noted the written submission of annual national project reports by at least 8 member countries including the Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. These reports are appended at **Attachment E** Those countries that had not submitted reports were invited to submit them to the PCU as soon as practically possible. These countries were, nonetheless, able to make presentations of their national reports at this meeting.

38. The Committee noted the attempt by the Project Coordinator to complete in-country consultations including Kiribati and Palau to further discuss national issues before the annual committee meeting. The Committee encouraged the Project Coordinator to complete the visits

to provide assistance with national level priorities and to assist focal points with coordination responsibilities and reporting difficulties.

39. In their submission of national reports, members outlined several issues including the lack of awareness of project activities including objectives, outputs and criteria, and exchange of information between PCU and national focal points. It was pointed out that there existed confusion due to the lack of clarity on project activities actually funded by this project. There needs to be clear record and track of in-country project implemented activities. It was suggested that the development of a TOR for each project activities would better enhance clarity. In response the PCU explained that a detailed list of project activities funded by GEF was circulated to focal points, and that communication is a two way process. The project website could also be consulted for further enhancement of project awareness. The PCU referred project focal points to the project documentation and needs assessment reports to help raise awareness of country needs originally proposed.

40. The Committee noted the numerous fisheries meetings and the impact this agenda on effective participation. It was suggested that the FFA plan and prioritize the meetings to minimize the undertaking of too many meetings. Members further learnt that the work plan and project itself has allows some flexibility for finances to be carried forward but that at project end all project activities and goals must be met and any unspent funds would no longer be available.

41. SPC asked that members provide comments that identify perceived gaps on fisheries monitoring and related work currently pursued by SPC under the OFM project. Members were also asked to provide comments on the proposal of re-aligning National Tuna Status Reports with the FFA EAFM work.

42. It was noted that several training activities by both FFA and SPC funded from the OFM Project were executed in the last calendar year. This includes stock assessment workshop, WCPFC sub-regional workshops, EAFM in-country consultations and institutional strengthening and reforms. The outputs of these GEF funded activities can be referred to the project web-site or sought directly from PCU.

43. The challenges and issues raised in national reports were concerned with technical assistance to changes in regulations, capacity building, and institutional changes that enable Members to meet their obligations under various arrangements. Some committee members noted the confusion in the effectiveness of National Coordination Committees given the placement of project focal points in either the fisheries or environment administrations. In reponse it was pointed out separate NCCs did not have to be established but existing fisheries bodies in-country such as Tuna management committees could be used for national level oversight of the OFM Project..

44. Several countries requested SPC for further training and workshops on TUFMAN, scientific inputs or reporting of national tuna status report and from the FFA for EAFM consultations and follow-ups.

45. The Deputy Resident Representative from UNDP Fiji noted the wealth of data generated from the project but that the utility activities required better reflection of that actually happening on the ground. It was pointed out that the in-country activities can be better facilitated through a central coordination committee, i.e. the National Consultative Committees. At the same time the regional agencies involved in this project should have consolidated and consultative workplan as minimum step to enable predicability regarding project activities to be implemented.

46. The Committee noted the national reports presented to the Committee and the need to progress national level consultation processes.

Agenda Item 3: Financial Reports

47. Working paper RSC3/WP 6 – 2007 Financial Reports was presented to the Committee. This report contained the acquittal of the 2006 approved Budget and Annual Work Plan, inclusive of the audit report, the approved (revised) 2007 Budget and Annual Work Plan, an interim report on budget expenditures up until 31 August 2007 and the approved 2008 Budget and Annual Work Plan.

48. The total budget for 2006 was 3.2 million, of which 66% had been spent as at the end of the 2006 calendar year, with 34% remaining unspent. Against the individual components of the GEF project for 2006 the following percentages of the actual budgets had been spent: Component 1: 62%, Component 2: 28% and Component 3: 10%.

49. The 2007 financial report up until 31 August 2007 was also presented. The original approved budget for 2007 was \$2,737,105. Added to this budget was the unspent funds carried forward from 2006 (\$1,079,031) less IUCN funds of \$266,741 carried forward to 2008. This left a revised 2007 budget of \$3,549,395. The budget breakdown by individual components of the GEF project were: Component 1: 47%, Component 2: 37% and Component 3: 16%. Expenditure against the 2007 budget, as at 31 August 2007 is \$1,854,963 (or 52%).

50. The approved budget for 2008 of \$2,058,330 was also presented. The proposed expenditure against each component in the budget are presently: Component 1: \$861,040, Component 2: \$801,640 and Component 3: \$395,650

51. The 2008 budget has been approved by the GEF Council and endorsed by RSC1. The meeting was also advised in relation to a number of potential issues that could impact on the 2008 budget. These issues included:

- The implementation of incremental increases in salary approved by CROP agencies; and
- Exchange rate gains and losses, as a result of payments being made in local currencies which are changing against a weakening US dollar (i.e. Pacific Franc).

52. In order to account for these changes it was recommended that the revised 2008 budget be reviewed again in November to ensure it accurately reflects the associated costs of the OFM annual work plan.

53. At the end of the presentation questions were invited. A number of questions were asked in regard to incremental salary increases. The Committee was advised that the 2008 budget had not accounted for a 7% salary increment that was expected to be approved prior to 2008.

54. A number of questions were also asked in regard to unspent funds, as had occurred in 2006, and what would occur in 2010 when the project was due to be completed if all the funds had not been spent. The Committee was advised that the 2007 budget was on track to be spent and to ensure this problem did not occur at the end of the project every attempt would be made to spend all the funds prior to the completion of the project in 2010.

- | | |
|------|--|
| 55. | The Committee: |
| i) | noted and endorsed the audited 2006 financial report year ending 31 December 2006; |
| ii) | noted the interim 2007 Financial Report; and |
| iii) | agreed to review the 2008 Budget and Annual Work Plan in November 2007. |

Agenda Item 4: Mid term Review

56. The representative the Suva UNDP Office presented a brief plan for the mid term review of the OFM Project covering the terms of reference and options for its implementation. The funds for this work will be sourced from the project budget and, any extra/ additional funding required to fully implement the review would be sourced from elsewhere. The TOR will include one or two Consultants that will be engaged for the work and, that it is possible to merge the options to arrive at the best option. The presentation made by UNDP is appended at **Attachment F**.

57. Committee members discussed the pros and cons of the options and agreed to an option that does not impinge on funding allocated for other project activities. There was further agreement that national consultations require prior planning for national coordinators, and to ensure that selective list of target stakeholders are available for in-country consultations.

58. The stakeholder consultations will align with current FFA in-country work as not to burden countries. All the stakeholders or at least key people in the countries would need to be available during the consultations.

59. Members asked to go through TOR first before deciding on the options, particularly in regard to the indicators used for assessing the review. Members also suggested that options 2 and 4 would be a best combined. Members further suggested that the two regional consultants be hired for this work and to negotiate a package for the entire consultancy.

60. In planning ahead, the two consultants should be present in the margins of another fisheries meeting, and as well organised meetings with focal points. The visits should be strategic in order to report on activities that have profound impact on the ground. For the remaining countries consultations would be undertaken electronically.

61. UNDP called for the exchange of information between countries on project related activities. The meeting agreed on the combination of options 2 and 4 presented by UNDP for the review. The Chair sought approval and confirmation of countries visited from the meeting. The assessment will also use national reports presented to the Steering the Committee in its annual meetings.

- | | |
|------|---|
| 62. | The Committee: |
| i) | noted that the project budget made allocations for the mid-term review of the project and that options for its implementation should not impinge on the funding allocated for other project activities; |
| ii) | agreed that two regional consultants could be recruited but that the work should be negotiated as a package; |
| iii) | agreed that options 2 and 4 in the UNDP presentation should be combined; and |
| iv) | agreed that the consultants would undertake visits to some project FFA |

member countries.

Agenda Item 5: Other Matters

63. The Committee asked if there are funds available to support National Consultative Committees. The PCU confirmed that there were limited funds available on request to support this process in smaller countries but noted some countries with functioning tuna advisory committees and active industry participation did not require this assistance.

64. The Committee agreed:
- i) the next annual meeting of the Regional Steering Committee shall be held in conjunction with the 5th Management Options workshop in 2008;
 - ii) that the national Co-Chair for the fourth Regional Steering Committee in 2007 would be from the Cook Islands; and
 - iii) that the Summary Record will be made available for comment within 7 days. The PCU will make available the final version for endorsement by the Committee inter-sessionally within 30 days.

The UNDP Deputy Resident closed the meeting with closing remarks and the meeting concluded with a closing prayer.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Cook Islands

Mr Ian Bertram
Secretary
Ministry of Marine Resources
Box 85, Rarotonga
i.bertram@mmr.gov.ck

Mr Peter Graham
Legal Advisor/ Focal Point
Ministry of Marine Resources
Box 85, Rarotonga
P.W.Graham@mmr.gov.ck

Federated States of Micronesia

Mr Bernard Thoulag
Executive Director
NORMA
P O Box PS122
Palikir, Pohnpei, FSM
bthoulag@mail.fm

Ms Patricia Jack
NORMA
P O Box PS122
Palikir, Pohnpei, FSM
keestracy@yahoo.com

Fiji

Mr Sanaila Naqau
Director
Fisheries Department
Ministry of Fisheries, Forestry &
Agriculture
P O Box 2218
Government Building, Suva
naqali@hotmail.com

Mr Anare Raiwalui
Principle Fisheries Officer
Fisheries Department
Ministry of Fisheries, Forestry &
Agriculture
P O Box 2218, Government Building
Suva
Anare_raiwalui@yahoo.com

Kiribati

Mr Kintoba Tearo
Principle Fisheries Officer
Oceanic Fisheries Program
Fisheries Department
P O Box 64
Bairiki, Tarawa
kintobat@yahoo.co.uk

Mr Takuia Uakeia
Deputy Secretary
Ministry of Fisheries & Marine Resources
Development
P O Box 64
Bairiki, Tarawa
takuiau@fmr.gov.ki

Nauru

Mr Terry Amram
Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources
Authority
Aiwo District, Nauru Island
tamramnr@yahoo.cm

Mr Darryl Tom
Nauru Fisheries & Marine Resources
Authority
Aiwo District, Nauru Island
dtom@yahoo.com

Papua New Guinea

Mr Ludwig Kumoru
Manager-Tuna
National Fisheries Authority
P O Box 2016, Port Moresby, NCD, PNG
lkumoru@fisheries.gov.pg

Mr Augustine Morgan
National Fisheries Authority
P O Box 2016, Port Moresby, NCS, PNG
amorgan@fisheries.gov.pg

Palau

Ms Nannette Malsol
National Focal Point
Bureau of Fisheries

P O Box 385
Koror

Ms Kathleen Sisor
Bureau of Fisheries
P O Box 385
Koror

FFA

Ms Barbara Hanchard
OFM/GEF Project Coordinator
barbara.hanchard@ffa.int

Mr Royden
Finance Officer
Royden. @ffa.int

Mr Dan Sua
Director General
dan.sua@ffa.int

Dr Transform Aqorau
Deputy Director General
transform.aqorau@ffa.int

Ms Jean Gordon
Legal Officer
jean.gordon@ffa.int

Mr Moses Amos
Director, Fisheries Management Division
moses.amose@ffa.int

Mr Samasoni Sauni
Fisheries Management Adviser
samasoni.sauni@ffa.int

Mr Steve Shanks
Fisheries Management Adviser
samasoni.sauni@ffa.int

Mr Kaburoro Tuai
Manager, US Treaty

Mr Anton Jimiwerey
PNA Coordinator

Secretariat of the Pacific Community

Dr John Hampton
Manager
Oceanic Fisheries Programme

United Nations Development Programme

Toily Kurbanov
Deputy Resident Representative
UNDP Suva Country Office
Suva, Fiji
Toily.kurbanov@undp.org

Alvin Chandra
Programme Officer
UNDP Suva Country Office
Suva, Fiji
alvin.chandra@undp.org

World Wildlife Fund Pacific

Mr. Seremia Tuqiri
Oceans Policy Officer
WWF SPPO
Suva
Fiji
stuqiri@wwfpacific.org.fj

UNDP OPENING REMARKS

**Mr. Toily Kurbanov, Deputy Resident Representative
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Fiji**

Pacific Island Oceanic Fisheries Management Project

Rarotonga, Cook Islands
Saturday 06 October 2007

Honourable representatives from Pacific governments,
Director General of the Forum Fisheries Agency,
Representatives of the CROP agencies,
Development partners,
Ladies and gentlemen,

It is a great honour and distinct privilege to greet you on behalf of UNDP at the Third Regional Steering Committee (RSC) meeting of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Programme.

United Nations agencies are committed to strengthening partnership with the Pacific governments and regional organizations to support national development strategies and attainment of Millennium Development Goals (MDG). Since RSC meeting last year, UN organizations, led by UNDP, have developed joint UN Development Assistance Framework in the Pacific, covering 5 years from 2008 to 2012. In this Framework, the UN team has come together with Pacific Island Countries to forge partnership in 4 outcome areas, 4 strategic pillars: economic growth, good governance, sustainable environmental management, and social services. These goals have been further reinforced in UNDP's own multi-country programme in the Pacific for 2008-2012, which last month has been presented for approval of our Executive Board in New York.

According to this strategic document, we will continue to support national capacity development in the area of sustainable environmental management, including fisheries management, in the years to come. UNDP's efforts will be guided, among other, by the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) plan of implementation and the Convention on the Conservation and Management of Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPF). Working closely with you, we will strive for creating enabling environment and strengthening capacities for fisheries management through establishment of regional and national monitoring systems and the use of ecosystem models to assess management options, as well as through training of policy-makers. In this regard, we acknowledge tremendous potential value of the Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Programme, which is uniting us around this table today.

We in UNDP are pleased to note that this potential is beginning to be realized, as is highlighted in the progress of the Programme during the year under review. Against the background of extremely complex tasks and multiple priorities, the Programme implementation exhibited inclusiveness and strong communication strategies to initiate change and to strengthen support for fisheries management. Above all, the results of the Programme to date would not have been possible without hard work and commendable dedication of the three executing agencies (Forum Fisheries Agency, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, and the World Conservation Union) and, of course, without strong efforts of the Programme Coordination Unit, led by our able Programme Coordinator Barbara Hanchard.

As the Programme evolves, and the objectives are being pursued, and first results are being generated, changing realities and new issues may arise. This is natural for the Programme of this scope and complexity. One of the main purposes of this meeting is to get an update as to where we are, what can be our new horizons, and what are the steps that need to be taken in order to open those horizons. In this regard, UNDP is looking forward to the presentation and discussion of the Annual Programme progress report and the Executing agencies' presentations, as well as of the financial reports on work plan and budget. Just as important we see National Project reports to be presented by National Programme Focal Points, which will give us indications of actual impact on the ground and some of the lessons learned already. Last but not least, for the Programme of this scope and multi-year duration, it will be important that we get the benefit of independent, external assessment of the implementation. My UNDP colleague Alvin Chandra will present us proposed approach to Mid-term Programme evaluation.

Ladies and gentlemen,

These are main agenda topics in front of us. On behalf of UNDP, I wish most productive deliberations of the Regional Steering Committee. We have no doubt that the meeting will help to strengthen our partnership – partnership that is aimed at ensuring sustainable environmental management of natural resources for our future generations.

Thank you

**Brief Opening Remarks by the FFA Director General, Mr. Tanielu Su'a to the
Third Meeting of the Pacific Island Oceanic
Fisheries Management Project**

At Rarotonga, Cook Islands; 06 October 2007

Kia Orana and good morning,

Firstly let me thank the Cook Islands, especially the Ministry of Marine Resources for the warm and garlanded welcome on arrival. You will all have no doubt, in the short time you have been here witnessed the efficiency and a warm hospitality of the Cook Islands and I am sure you will agree with me in saying that it's a pretty hard act to follow.

Please let me acknowledge the co-chairs of today's meeting; the Deputy Resident Representative from UNDP Suva, Mr. Toily Kurbanov and for Fiji Fisheries, Lieutenant Commander Sanaila Naqali. I wish them well in their roles today. Welcome also to project focal points and other members of your country delegation. We are also joined by project associates from the SPC, FFA, IUCN, UNDP, WWF and PITIA and I also understand we will be joined by the GEF focal point for the Cooks Islands.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to make some brief opening remarks for the third meeting of the Regional Steering Committee for the Global Environment Facility (GEF) funded Oceanic Fisheries Management Project. But before I make those remarks, let me first thank you for your attendance recognising that not only have many of you come from afar, but that you may have also come directly from the Technical and Compliance Committee meeting in Pohnpei and other meetings held there and that must be tiring. Those of you that have submitted written annual project reports for this year, mention that there are just too many fisheries meetings and workshops. I readily acknowledge that the fisheries meeting agenda in the Pacific is punishing and it does not look as though it will become less intense any time soon. We do need to prioritise and explore other ways in which to exchange views and make decisions on fisheries issues and matters of importance so as not to overly tax what limited resources we have available. In some ways we really are 'spreading things a little thin'.

One of the floats that allow us to keep our heads above water in the rapidly paced oceanic fisheries management regime that we have designed and established for the Pacific, is the GEF OFM Project for which we must be extremely grateful. GEF and the project have provided Pacific island countries with the support attributed to incremental costs associated with our efforts to be responsible and effective regional and national fisheries managers for the benefit of not only our own development but the global community.

The project is now two years old. While we have measured progress on an annual basis through monitoring, soon it will be time to ask ourselves the real question, 'what have we really gained and what progress have we really made?' Next year UNDP as the project's implementing agency will coordinate a mid-term review of the project. Let me urge all of you to remain engaged in the progress we making with GEF's help under this project and also to be vigilant in seeing that fisheries is rightfully acknowledge at all opportunities a national and regional priority.

I don't wish to delay the commencement of the meeting proper so let me conclude by thanking you for participating in the project and the regional steering committee. Please be frank and fair in your contributions today and I wish the meeting well.

Finally, for those of you that are ardent rugby fans our apologies for double booking the time slot with the world cup quarter finals.

Thank you.

 <p>PACIFIC ISLANDS OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT</p>	<p>REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE</p>
	<p><i>2nd Meeting of the RSC Honiara, Solomon Islands 10 October 2006</i></p>

Paper Number	RSC2/WP.2
Title	ADOPTED AGENDA

- a. Opening of Meeting
- b. Apologies
- c. Adoption of Agenda
- d. Regional Steering Committee Representation
 - 1. Pacific Islands Oceanic Fisheries Management Project Annual Report - (UNDP/GEF Annual Project Report /Project Implementation Report)
 - 2. Financial Reports
 - 3. National Annual Project Reports
 - 4. Other Matters
- e. Next Meeting
- f. Records of Proceeding
- g. Close of the Meeting

NATIONAL REPORTS

NATIONAL REPORT

*NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT
TO THE
OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)*

Reporting Period, October 2006 – June 2007

1. **Country:** COOK ISLANDS

2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)

3. **Period Covered:** 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007

4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**

The Cook Islands pleased with the progress of the project to date. The activities supported by the project have assisted in capacity building at the National Level as well as at the regional level. The assistance has enabled the Cook Islands and other FFA Member countries to participate effectively at the meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies – the Science Committee and Technical and Compliance Committee.

5. **Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):**

National level activities

- TUFMAN Database development – System up and running smoothly, regular upgrades made with assistance of SPC.
- National Tuna Fishery Status Report for the Cook Islands completed.
- Observer Sampling – Bio samples collected and forwarded to SPC
- Scientific Papers for WCPFC – valuable assistance in preparation of the Science Committee meetings.

Regional level activities

- Stock Assessment Workshop - MMR Data Management Coordinator participated in Stock Assessment Workshop, SPC
- Seamount Analysis – the Assessment was a valuable piece of information that we were able to use during the SPRFMO Meetings.

- Management Options Workshop – Cook Islands participated in the MOW 06 held in Nadi, Fiji.
- OFMP Regional Steering Committee – Cook Islands National Focal Point attended RSC 2 in Nadi, Fiji.
- Regional Judicial Officers Seminar – MMR Legal Adviser participated in the Regional Judicial Officers Seminar in Palau, April 2007.
- MCS Working Group meeting – MMR Legal Adviser and one of its' MCS Officer participated in the 9th MCS working Group meeting in Brisbane, October 2006.

6. Challenges/Issues Encountered

The Cook Islands is very grateful for the assistance provided enabling us to develop and build our capacity. However, having someone available to attend all the meetings, workshops and training is sometimes difficult to meet. With limited staff numbers, it can at times be very demanding on the particular staff attending. In order to maintain consistency, we prefer no to just send anyone that is available.

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

The Cook Islands believes more planning amongst FFA Members and other Regional Organizations is required when considering dates for meetings and workshops.

9. Recommendations for Future Action

Visits by the Project Coordinator have in the past been very useful, and we believe they should continue on a more regular basis.

We also believe that the Work Plan should be a living document and evolve with time, and where planned activities are not undertaken, then the Plan should be flexible enough for them to be conducted/implemented in the following years activities.

10. Report Prepared By: Peter W Graham, National (OFM Project) Focal Point.

NATIONAL REPORT

NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT TO THE OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)

Reporting Period, October 2006 – June 2007

1. **Country:** Federated States of Micronesia
2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Program of the Pacific SIDS (Pacific SAP II)
3. **Period Covered:** 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007
4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**

The Federated States of Micronesia is pleased with the overall progress of the project and project activities delivery. As the project document was done sometimes back, some flexibility should be exercised to be able to shift funds to other areas as new challenges arise.

The project activities have been most useful in capacity building at the country level as well as at the regional level. Without the project, most of the small administrations in the region will have been ill-prepared to effectively participate in the meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies and in meeting their various obligations under the Commission. The two components (SPC and FFA) of the project have gone a long way in assisting the Small Island Developing States (SIDS) of the region, not only to participate, but to participate effectively in the work of the Commission and in meeting their obligations under the Commission.

The FSM through NORMA has particularly benefited from both components of the project. Under Component One of the project, the TUFMAN database has been set up in country with some training on its use. This is work in progress and more work is still being carried out to further develop the program to produce the reports that are required. Assistance and support have also been extended to the FSM in data quality improvements and collections through various guides, workshops and attachments. The FSM National Fishery Status Report has also been worked on and a short version has been presented and fuller version will be delivered at the planned EAFM Consultation workshop in November. The Stock Assessment Workshops have also been most useful to the FSM in understanding the scientific concepts involved in stock assessments and comprehend the scientific reports better and participate more in discussing these issues as they come up at the Scientific Committee and the Commission itself. The scientific papers developed for the Commission have also been very useful for the FSM's effective participation in the Commission.

Project activities under Component Two of the project have been most useful for the FSM in several areas. On the legal side, on-going effort and advice in the review and assistance in drafting fisheries legislation to be compliant with regional and international requirements have been graciously extended and very much appreciated. Assistance has also been extended in port state enforcement through workshops and legal attachments. The regional judicial seminar is another useful legal seminar that assists countries in the region to prosecute fisheries cases more efficiently and successfully in the on-going effort to curtail IUU fishing.

In conservation and management, the FSM has greatly benefited from the WCPFC Workshops, the pre-WCPFC meeting (including TCC and the SC) FFC caucuses. These have helped prepare us for more effective participation at the meetings of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies. The on-going Management Options Workshop is viewed by the FSM as one of the most useful undertakings of the Project in terms of the Region's response to the need to conserve and manage the resources in a sustainable manner for our generation and future generations of our Pacific peoples. This workshop is most useful in getting the region to strategically prepare to take on the *delay* tactics and attempts by the distant water fishing nations to continue fishing as usual despite the scientific advice to cut back effort. The reports on the mitigations of seabirds, turtles, sharks and the use of fish aggregating devices (FADS) in the fisheries assist as well in developing our strategies on these issues as they come in the Commission meetings (including SC and TCC).

Monitoring, Control and Surveillance (MCS) workshops and attachments that have been held in the region as well as the annual MCS Working Group meeting funded by the project have also gone a long way in preparing the region in tackling the MCS aspects of the Commission's work.

5. Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):

National level activities

- TUFMAN Database was installed at the NORMA Office with some training
- The National Tuna Fishery Status Report (Short Version) was delivered
- In-country data coordinator support was provided
- A port state enforcement workshop was held in country

Regional level activities

- The FSM participated in the first stock assessment workshop
- Scientific papers provided for the WCPFC benefited the FSM
- The FSM participated in two WCPFC workshops (West and North)
- The FSM participated in the Management Option Workshop last year
- The FSM participated in all FFC caucuses pre-WCPFC (including SC and TCC)
- The FSM was involved in the EAFM Training Workshop
- The FSM participated in the annual MCS Working Group meeting
- The FSM participated in the Regional Judicial Seminar
- The FSM benefited from the draft guideline for fisheries legislation and advice on its on-going activities with Palau and the Marshall Islands on our subsidiary arrangement under the Niue Treaty.

6. Challenges/Issues Encountered

This region is overloaded with meetings and for small administrations as most of the fisheries offices in the region, it is very difficult to keep up with all these meetings. This is not saying that the activities undertaken under the project are of less importance. They are very important for us to meet our obligations under the Commission and we need to have them. We need to make more time for these meetings and workshops so participants can really absorb the materials and concepts and cut down other meetings.

Challenges are an continuing thing. As the Commission develops, new challenges arise; as new measures are taken, new challenges are developed especially for the SIDS with small fisheries administration and limited capacity put the mechanisms in place necessary to implement new decisions by the Commission.

Getting the necessary mechanisms and procedures in place at the Commission so that the Commission can effectively meet its mandates in the Convention continue to be a challenge. We will continue to talk while the resources are being depleted.

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

The above are regional issues that perhaps should be addressed by the region and not the individual country level. The FSM is keen to discuss these further with others and seek regional solutions to them.

8. Recommendations for Future Action

As a region, which will be impacted most if no agreement is reached at the Commission level on procedures and mechanisms to effectively conserve and manage the tuna resources, we should be greatly concern about the lack of progress on the development and implementation of these procedures and mechanisms. No management measures can be effective without these procedures and mechanism. We should seek ways to make some head-ways on some of these issues.

9. Report Prepared By: Bernard Thoulag, National (OFM Project) Focal Point.

NATIONAL REPORT

NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT TO THE OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)

Reporting Period – 1 Oct 2006 – 30 June 2007

1. Country: MARSHALL ISLANDS

2. Project Title: Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)

3. Period Covered: 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007

4. Summary of Overall Project Progress: As in the previous reporting period, the RMI continued to benefit from various projects under the overall project progress. A few of the highlights from this current reporting period include:

1. Deputy Director attended 3rd Management Options Workshop (MOW3) in Nadi, Fiji in October 2006 as well as 2nd Regional Steering Committee (RSC2) which also took place in Nadi. RMI national progress report was tabled at the RSC2 alongside those submitted by Cook Islands, FSM, Solomon Islands, and Tonga.
2. Key MIMRA staff along with RMI Attorney General and industry representative attended pre-WCPFC (FFA briefing) and WCPFC meetings in Apia, Samoa in December 2006; Director attended Joint RFMO Meeting in Kobe, Japan in late January 2007. It is well understood that the project contributes significantly in the form of assisting with FFA briefs for such meetings.
3. The TUFMAN database at MIMRA was upgraded to version 3.0 during this reporting period; in addition, the RMI also benefited from the availability of the CES database system which was provided to all member countries throughout this period.
4. ‘National Tuna Data Procedures Documents’ (NTDPD) progressed with program visit to RMI during this reporting period. These were later routinely reviewed and updated. National monitoring capacity in the RMI was reviewed and funding requirements under GEF were established during this time.

5. Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):

National level activities:

- A basic observer training course was conducted in Majuro in late February / early March 2007. Considerable effort was undertaken by SPC staff in successfully putting the pre-selection test procedures in place for the course. It was agreed that these procedures would become standardized for future courses. A debriefer course was successfully completed along with port sampling refresher course earlier in August 2006 with senior RMI observers getting full port sampling certification.

- A very timely in-country visit by the PCU was more than welcomed. Details of said visit will comprise part of the highlights for next reporting period as the visit only commenced a little after the end of current reporting period which this report entails.

Regional level activities:

- Deputy Director and VMS Officer from RMI Sea Patrol attended 10th MCS Working Group meeting held at FFA Headquarters in March 2007.
- MIMRA Data Specialist and Sea Patrol VMS Officer attended VMS Training in Canberra, April 2007.
- RMI hosted first WCPFC sub-regional workshop (Northern Group) in Majuro from 23 to 27 June 2007. Participants from Palau, FSM, Kiribati, and Nauru were well-represented and the workshop deemed successful. As with the other WCPFC sub-regional workshops, it is envisaged that key national and regional issues discussed at the Majuro workshop will be taken up considerably at the forthcoming Management Options Workshop (MOW4) scheduled to be held in Rarotonga in October 2007.
- Chief Fisheries Officer for the Oceanic & Industrial Affairs Division, MIMRA attended stock assessment workshops at SPC, Noumea in late June / early July 2007.

6. Challenges/Issues Encountered

Challenges and issues encountered with project activities during this reporting period include:

- Ongoing lack of familiarity with the Project; specifically, which projects fall under or are entitled to GEF funding, etc.
- Inability to keep track or up to date on overall progress of Project.
- Ongoing lack of local/national coordination in formally establishing a national project coordinator at this juncture. In all likelihood, this is further complicated by the fact that another RMI government agency is GEF focal point and there is minimal interaction and/or coordination at the national level when it comes to seeking out who is entitled to what and how.

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

Solutions applied to address the issues and challenges included:

- Need for increased and effective coordination with relevant agencies at the national level.
- Increased awareness and up to date liaison with PCU. Establishment of routine contact with PCU via email has been well-received and very responsive. RMI considers this to be a big plus and thus very positive engagement.
- More frequent liaison with PCU. In-country visit has really helped RMI in ongoing efforts at familiarization of the project and related cross-cutting issues at the national and regional levels.

9. Recommendations for Future Action

The RMI will continue to support in-country visits by the PCU. Effective engagement with PCU will continue to form an integral part of our efforts. As such, continued future correspondence with PCU will remain essential.

10. **Report Prepared By:** Samuel K. Lanwi, Jr. [*for* RMI National (OFM Project) Focal Point]

NATIONAL REPORT

*NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT
TO THE
OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)*

Reporting Period, October 2006 – June 2007

1. **Country:** NAURU

2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)

3. **Period Covered:** 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007

4. Summary of Overall Project Progress

A restructuring of the Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority (NFMRA) GEF Oceanic Fisheries Management project was undertaken with the appointment of a new national focal point to better focus and coordinate the increasing activities under the project. A national consultative committee is being selected from relevant stakeholders within the broader community to work closely with the national focal point in achieving the objectives of the project in an effective and transparent manner.

Other initiatives which will improve the capacity of NFMRA to carry out the implementation of its projects include the receipt of three high end laptop pc's for the Oceanic Section and two desktop computers to be used by the catch data and licensing officers from the same section.

5. Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):

National level activities

Component 1: Scientific Assessment and Monitoring Enhancement:

- a) Staff officer from the Oceanic Section attended 1 month training attachment at OFP SPC in Noumea which included modules on TUFMAN, basic preparation for NTSFR and as a participant in the regional Stock Assessment Workshop (Introductory)
- b) IT Support – Data reporting capacity enhanced with the delivery of two desktop pc's to the licensing and catch data desks at Oceanic Section; and three laptops to Oceanic management staff and the NFMRA Board Policy advisor.
- c) NTSFR/EAFM – preparatory work on a draft NTSFR commenced in the first quarter of 2007. In-country EAFM Scoping workshop was held in the second quarter of 2007 followed by another in-country stakeholder consultation last month to follow up on the output of the scoping workshop and progress the stages of the EAFM process.

Component 2: Law, Policy and Institutional Reform, Realignment and Strengthening

- a) A Scoping study on Institutional Strengthening for the NFMRA requested by the Government of Nauru through NFMRA was conducted in the final quarter of 2006 culminating in the delivery of a final report that was accepted and submitted for donor funding earlier this year. Proposal was given high priority by Government and is now in the final process of review by one of Nauru's main

donor partners. Additionally, some key components of the report have been prioritized and will receive additional funding from other donors prior to commencement of the main project.

- b) A proposed in-country analysis of national legal issues and structures was replaced by a sub-regional workshop in June 2007 in RMI.

Component 3: Coordination, Participation and Information Services

- a) National GEF OFM Focal point restructured and finalized to be followed by the formation of a National Consultative Committee.

Regional level activities

- a) Training opportunities which were available under Sub-regional programs included the Stock Assessment Workshop in Noumea, and the WCPFC Sub regional workshops to review national legislations with respect to WCPFC obligations. Nauru sent two participants to the Train Sea Coast/ USP Policy training course held at USP Suva in July 2007.
- b) Assistance received for draft Niue Treaty Subsidiary agreement.

6. Challenges/Issues Encountered:

- a) Departure of key legal personnel from Nauru means greater reliance on FFA Secretariat for legal advice on ensuring compatibility between national legal instruments and WCPFC Obligations.
- c) former focal points were from NFMRA executive management and were not able to effectively carry out GEF project activities under pressing national and regional work commitments. This had implications towards the implementation of projects under the work plan.
- d) demanding meeting agenda and oceanic regional fisheries commitments has placed burden on a small administration with limited capacity and budget.

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

- a) restructuring of focal points to ensure that a dedicated officer can accord priority and focus on project commitments and their implementation. Additionally the impending formation of a National Consultative Committee will enhance the status of the project.
- b) in – country visit by FFA GEF Coordinator was very useful in providing guidance and advise to national authorities and clarified many of the uncertainties that plagued management.

9. Recommendations for Future Action

- a) Liaison with FFA GEF National Coordinator is very useful and should be maintained. The dedicated website and subscription to the GEF OFM mailing lists has also provided useful information and should be maintained and enhanced where possible,.. i.e. updated circulars distributed on a regular schedule.

10. Report Prepared By: DARRYL TOM, National (OFM Project) Focal Point.

NATIONAL REPORT

*NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT
TO THE
OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)*

Reporting Period, October 2006 – June 2007

1. **Country:** PALAU

2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)

3. **Period Covered:** 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007

4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**

- A number of Sub-regional workshops were held during this period where Palau was able to send at least 7 participants to attend namely, on the VDS and WCPFC issues. Palau is grateful and pleased of the outcome of these meetings. In terms of awareness and capacity building issues, Palau was able to clearly express the need for inter-agency cooperation to fulfill the numerous measures and obligations required under the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission.

5. **Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):**

National level activities

- An Assistant National Tuna Data Coordinator (local) was recruited in November 2006 through the SPC-OFP with funding arrangements of up 2-4 years.
- A scanner was purchased and installed to assist the Palau Bureau of Marine Resource/Oceanic Fisheries Management Section and to be utilized by the Palau National Tuna Data Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator.
- Some projects and assistance were made to the assist the BMR-OFP (Palau), but the source of funding is unclear whether GEF made any contribution at the time of writing this report.
- A need to review the existing Palau National Tuna Management Plan was endorsed by the Palau Fisheries Advisory Committee, the oceanic fisheries governing body. At the request of the Director of Marine Resource to the Forum Fisheries Agency, it was further approved that an Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management (EAFM) would be used as a framework to review the Tuna Management Plan. EAFM preliminary talks and stakeholders consultation was held in Palau in mid-August of 2006 at the request of Palau to the Forum Fisheries Agency. Because this was not reported at last year's RSC, please note that further work needs to be done to further this project.

Regional level activities

- Sub-Regional Judicial Workshop was held in Palau in early 2007 to address and discuss the legal issues relating to the Western & Central Pacific Fisheries Commission.
- North Pacific Sub-Regional Workshop on WCPFC issues held in Majuro, RMI in June 2007

- Several workshops and meetings were held during this period, but the source of funding is still unclear at the time of writing this report.

6. Challenges/Issues Encountered

- Visit to Palau by Barbara Hanchard, Project Coordinator, was scheduled to take place in mid-June 2007. Unfortunately, this trip was not made possible as Palau sent all its resource people, including the Director of the Bureau of Marine Resources, to attend the series of workshops on the WCPFC issues in Majuro, RMI during the same week of the scheduled visit. (As has always been the case for Palau, severe capacity issues should now be seriously addressed) Attempts were made to request another visit by the Project Coordinator before the RSC Meeting, but due to other commitments, regional meetings, and tight schedules, this request for visit before the RSC Meeting was not possible.
- The GEF National Focal Point for Palau is currently tasked with several objectives and when preparing this report, it was realized that most GEF contributed projects should be closely monitored and a system (among many others) should be created to address this.

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

Solution to address the above issues and challenges:

- A need for the Project Coordinator to visit Palau before the end of 2007.
- National Focal Points need to be aware of all GEF contributed projects on a monthly basis on regional and national programs. This will fully support and assist the National Focal Points to comprehensively and accurately prepare and timely submit annual reports.

9. Recommendations for Future Action

- As reported above, the need for visit to Palau by the Project Coordinator will be very helpful. I believe it will narrow down many questions relating to the GEF issue.
- I also believe that national focal points should to meet at least once a year (exclusive of the RSC) prior to the RSC to effectively develop and plan the needs and priorities of each country.

10. Report Prepared By: NANNETTE D. MALSOL, National (OFM Project) Focal Point.

NATIONAL REPORT

*NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT
TO THE
OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)*

Reporting Period, October 2006 – June 2007

1. **Country:** Papua New Guinea

2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)

3. **Period Covered:** 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007

4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**

In the period covered by this report, Papua New Guinea benefited through funding mainly to participate in regional workshops and meeting. PNG however didn't have any in country projects during this period and before than. The only project which is in-country thought forms part of the regional project partly funded by GEF is the tuna tagging project which ended in June 2007.

As for workshops, GEF funded PNG's participation at the second stock assessment workshop in Noumea, New Caledonia in July 2007 as well as attend the briefing and planning of the second stage of the tuna tagging project also in Noumea in July, 2007. GEF also funded PNG's participation in the Management options workshop held in Nadi in October, 2006. PNG also participated in the annual MCS working group meeting and also participated in the Sub regional workshop leading up to this year's management Options workshop. GEF also co-funded PNG's participation at the FFA science meeting, which was held before the WCPFC science meeting in Hawaii in August 2007.

5. **Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):**

National level activities

- GEF through SPC is co funding the tuna tagging project in Papua new Guinea which started in February 2006 and ended in June 2007.
- Mr. Augustine Mobiha and Ludwig Kumoru attended the Briefing on the tuna tagging project and eventual planning for Pacific wide Tuna tagging project in Noumea, July, 2007.

Regional level activities

- Mr. Ludwig Kumoru , attended the 2nd stock Assessment workshop in Noumea in 2007.
- Mr. Augustine Mibiha and Gisa Komangin participated in the Sub regional workshop, in Honiara a lead up to this year's Management Options Workshop.
- Mr. Ludwig Kumoru was co funded to attend the FFA science meeting in Hawaii August, 2007.

6. **Challenges/Issues Encountered**

Papua New Guinea has no specific in country project and in a way is not very active in this project. This is due to a lack of knowledge on the project itself.

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

PNG will needs a round table discussion with GEF personnel on this project overall, but in particular where the project applies to in-country projects.

9. Recommendations for Future Action

PNG will very much appreciate a round table discussion with GEF personnel. Only than can we find our way to fully participate, especially in some in country projects.

10. Report Prepared By: Ludwig Kumoru, National (OFM Project) Focal Point.

NATIONAL REPORT

NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT TO THE OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)

Reporting Period, October 2006 – June 2007

1. Country: Samoa

2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)

3. **Period Covered:** 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007

4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**

List of OFM Project Activities 2007

(i) **Component one (SPC)**

- **Stock Assessment Workshop** – provide assistances allowing SFO to attend a stock assessment training at SPC twice.
- **Observer sampling** and analysis – Samoa involved in the collection of gut contents of tuna fishes caught locally to scientifically determine the trophic relationship of pelagic species in the WTP LME.

(ii) **Component Two (FFA)**

- **WCPFC Workshops** - provide supports for Fisheries staff and member of the industry to attend management options (Solomon and Cook islands), legislative gap analysis in Tonga, dockside inspection and monitoring national workshop training, VMS training, etc. East sub-regional workshop in Tonga 2007
- **Port State Enforcement Workshops (co-funded)** – will be held for national Fisheries Compliance staff, Police Maritime Officers and Quarantine officers on October 2007.
- **Management Options Workshop** – Senior staffs of the Fisheries and a representative from the tuna industry participated in the WCPFC management related workshop in Tonga, July 2007.
- **Support for FFC caucus pre WCPFC meetings (including TCC & SC)** – Fisheries staff attending both the SC3 in Hawaii and TCC3 in Pohnpei participated in FFA arranged meetings to discuss and formulate positions on important science, and technical and compliance issues.
- **Annual MCS Working Group meeting (fully project funded)** – a Principal Fisheries Officer responsible for the Compliance and Enforcement of the Fisheries attended a 9th MCS working Group meeting in Brisbane October 2006 which included substantial TCC preparation for Pacific SIDs. Moreover, a Fisheries Officer also participated in the 10th MCS working group workshop in Solomon, March 2007.
- **Attachments (MCS, Legal)** – provide attachment for our Legal Officer to attend the drafting process of Samoa's Legislative Framework in FFA.
- **Draft guidelines for fisheries legislation** – assist in the first consultation for the Fisheries Legislative Framework with key stakeholder reps (CFMAC)

- **Assistance with fisheries legislation** – Provide support for the Review of Samoa Fisheries Legislative Framework as to incorporate Convention conservation and management measures.
- **MSC Surveillance cooperation** – Samoa also participated in regional surveillance operation (*Tuimoana and Kurukuru*) in 2006-2007 period where planning and coordination of surface and aerial surveillance in conjunction with Police Patrol Boat undertaken.
- **Strengthen Compliance**– provide equipment assistances (computers) to improve services of the Compliance programmes in regards to data management and documentation.

5. Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):

National level activities

(i) *Fisheries legislative framework review*

was undertaken first with the analysis of gaps existed in the existing Fisheries Act 1988. Two consultation meetings were held with the Fisheries staff and key representatives of the domestic tuna commercial fisheries held in July 2007. Professor Martin Tsamenyi, Legal Consultant of the FFA facilitated both workshops. Key issues relating to matters to further strengthen the fisheries legal framework were gathered as outcomes of these consultations.

(ii) *Fisheries legislative Attachment*

The Legal Officer for MAF joined the legislative drafting team at the FFA to draft Samoa Fisheries new legislative framework in September 2007 for two weeks. It is anticipate that the first draft of the Samoa Fisheries Legislation will be completed by the year end.

Regional level activities

(i) Stock Assessment Workshop I (SAW I) - Samoa participated in SAW I conducted by OFP- SPC. Critical knowledge was gained in understanding stock assessment principles and interpretation of stock assessment results.

(ii) Tuna Data Workshop (TDW) - Samoa participated in the first TDW conducted by OFP-SPC in 2006.

(iii) SC and TCC meetings – participated in the pre-SC3 and TCC3 meetings in 2007

(iv) Observer Coordinators workshop. – Samoa participated to this workshop in 2006 at Solomon Is.

6. Challenges/Issues Encountered

(i) Low level of understanding on the PI OFM project especially to know the assistances that the project can provide to countries. However, with the country visit undertaken by the Project Coordinator in March 2007, thus provided a understanding of the project objectives, activities, expected targets and supports can provided as per the workplan.

(ii) Clarity on the type of project assistances and procedures to gain access to these assistances from the GEF regional project.

(iv) Given new developments in the WCPFC, it is envisage that the project should not only focused on capacity building purposes for the fisheries personal from each Pacific island country, but should also be focusing in facilitating recruitment process as to the intensity of the work involve. To some least develop Pacific Island countries,

coming into force of the Commission means additional work for the already limited staff and possibly will affect the work on both the national and regional level

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

Round table discussion between project coordinators on the mentioned issues and challenges

8. Recommendations for Future Action

(i) Great awareness and improve understanding on the objectives of the project and provide clarity on the accessibility of financial assistance from this project

(ii) Taken into consideration and address issues and challenges from each Pacific Island countries.

9. Report Prepared By: Mulipola Atonio Mulipola, National (OFM Project) Focal Point.

NATIONAL REPORT

NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT TO THE OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)

Reporting Period, July 2006 – June 2007

1. **Country :** TONGA
2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)
3. **Period Covered:** 01 JULY 2006 – 30 JUNE 2007
4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**
Tonga, like all FFA member countries participated in all regional workshops and meetings where GEF OFM Project had made contributions.

5. **Specific Outputs/Results Achieved** **National Level Activities**

- TUFMAN – The TUFMAN database for Tonga was updated during the 3rd quarter of 2006, and also to version 3.0 on first quarter of 2007 and version 4.0 on second quarter of 2007. Tuna Data Procedures Document's were also drawn up and trial of the Longline Logbook started with the logbook delivered to Tonga and taken onboard by one of fishing companies. These trial logbooks were retrieved back for review.
- Observer Program - National observer program, for Tonga, was also established during the 3rd quarter of 2006. Observer workbook and waterproof sampling pads with debriefing forms were received by Tonga during this period. Debriefing work was carried out by SPC staff in Tonga with the primary aim of selecting experienced observers to become in-country observer debriefers.
- Operations 'Kurukuru' and 'Islands Chief' was held on 3rd quarter 2006 This was supported by Australian Defence with contributions from FFA MCS Division, to undertake coordinated surveillance operations between and across national jurisdictions.
- Attachments - An attachment undertaken by one fisheries officer from Tonga, (SPC/OFP), during this reporting period. Also Tonga Fisheries Legal officer attended an attachment in FFA during 1st quarter 2007. An MCS two week attachment was also taken around March 2007 by one Fisheries staff from Tonga.
- National Status Report - An in-country workshop undertaken during first quarter of 2007 for delivery of National Status Report prepared around the same quarter.
- EAFM - During the first quarter of 2007, a consultation was undertaken to progress EAFM on Tuna Fisheries in Tonga, mainly for senior staffs of Tonga Fisheries. Tonga also participated on a training workshop on the delivery of the EAFM process which was conducted by Dr. Rick Fletcher in Vanuatu in 1st quarter or 2007.

6. Regional Level

- MCS – Tonga MCS staff participated in regional operations, (Kurukuru 06), held in Tonga 3rd quarter 2006, undertaking planning and coordination of air and Sea patrols in conjunction with the Pacific Patrol boat program.
- Stock Assessment - Tonga participated in the first OFMP stock assessment workshop that was held at SPC Headquarters in Noumea in early July 2006.
- Tonga also participated on the 9th MCS working Group meeting in Brisbane, October 2006 which included substantial TCC preparations for Pacific SIDS and also the 10th MCS working group meeting in Honiara, March 2007.
- Tonga participated in the National Consultative Committee meeting, October 2006.

7. Challenges/Issues Encountered

Challenges and issues encountered with the project activities within this reporting period (July 2006 – June 2007) included the following:

- One of the main issues encountered by Tonga is that the National Focal Point finds it hard to follow projects assisted by GEF, however, the quarterly reports are of great assistance and the country visit by the Project Coordinator in May 2007.

8. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

- National Focal Point to follow through quarterly reports and coordinator the activities related to GEF contributions. This can be done when coordinator is sending invitations to member countries and good communications with coordinator.

9. Recommendation

More frequent visits by Project Coordinator will be very useful in addition to keeping better communications between focal points and coordinator.

Prepared by: Siliveinusi M. Ha'unga,

National (OFM Project) Focal Point of Contact, TONGA

NATIONAL REPORT

Oceanic Fisheries Management Project Regional Steering Committee (OFM, RSC)

1. **Country:** Tuvalu
2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP 11).
3. **Project Covered:** October 01, 2006 – June 30, 2007
4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**

A number of activities where Tuvalu was benefited from were resourced and covered under the overall project progress. The following is a list of programmes and activities where Tuvalu received financial assistance from the programme and was participated in during the period.

National Level Activities

- a) Financial Support for Mr Feleti Teo's participation as a Technical Advisor to the Tuvalu delegation to the WCPFC 3 meeting in Apia, Samoa in December 2006.
- b) Prosecution and Dockside Workshop for in Tuvalu, May 2007.

Regional Level Activities

- a) Tuvalu participation in the Management Option Workshop in Nadi 2006
- b) Tuvalu participation in the 9th MCS working group meeting in Brisbane, Australia, October 22-27, 2006
- c) Workshop on IUU in Vanuatu, 2006
- d) Tuvalu participation in the VDS Workshop in PNG, June 2007.
- e) Tuvalu participation in the West – WCPFC Workshop in Honiara, 2007.

Challenges and Issues Encountered

As part of Tuvalu fisheries development priorities, Tuvalu is seeking GEF assistance in the development of National Management Framework as well as assistance in areas of management plan review.

Ongoing institutional support is also an area that Tuvalu needed technical and financial support from GEF. Continued support from the project is also needed for the provision of technical support to develop our national policies issues on emerging WCPFC issues and challenges.

During this period, Tuvalu is already struggling and slowly coming to terms with the enormity of its obligations and responsibilities under the Commission emerging issues. In the same token and more critically, Tuvalu has come to experience the pressure and strain these issues are placing on Tuvalu.

As a SIDs, Tuvalu does not have the capacity to discharge these obligations. There is an urgent need of assistance from GEF in order for Tuvalu to be able to discharge its conventional obligations.

Solution Applied (to address issues and challenges)

As part of our proposed institutional review in our National Fisheries Master Plan, Tuvalu is proposing to establish a National Project Coordinator that coordinates all the WCPFC issues.

It is envisaged that the establishment of this new position within the Tuvalu Fisheries Department would provide a better coordination on our obligations to keep track on the GEF overall progress and WCPFC issues and at the same time facilitate and better coordinates national programmes that are funded under the project.

Recommendations for Future Action

There is a need for a better coordination between the Project Coordinator and National Project Focal in identifying critical areas that needed support for Tuvalu from GEF.

Prepared by: Sam Finikaso (OFM Project) National Focal Point of Contact, TUVALU

NATIONAL REPORT

*NATIONAL LEVEL ANNUAL REPORT
TO THE
OCEANIC FISHERIES MANAGEMENT PROJECT
REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE (OFM RSC)*

Reporting Period, October 2006 – June 2007

1. **Country:** VANUATU

2. **Project Title:** Oceanic Fisheries Management: Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Pacific SIDs (Pacific SAP II)

3. **Period Covered:** 1 October 2006 – 30 June 2007

4. **Summary of Overall Project Progress**

5. **Specific Outputs/Results Achieved (as per annual work-plan):**

National level activities

- Still No progress on the establishment of a National Consultative Committee
- Consultations with Stakeholders with concerning the review of the Vanuatu tuna management plan
- Appointment of a NTDC was made and is now employed full-time.
- NTDC was attachment with OFP/SPC to assist in developing NTFR
- Training of NTDC and industry rep (VU Flag) in TUFMAN planned for 2 weeks in July 2007.
- Consulted with OFP/SPC on schedule for TUFMAN installation in VFD and further training for NTDC and VFD licencing & surveillance officer in operating TUFMAN database system. To take place hopefully in early 2008.
- Investigation & Prosecution 2 wks workshop for law enforcement agencies (VFD, PMW, SLO, PO) on Dockside boarding, Identification and Investigation of IUU activities, and prosecution, in doing so some major gaps in legislation were identified for further analysis in pending legislation reviews, December 2006, Luganville, Santo.
- During a tuna management plan review stakeholder workshop work that comprised part of the Vanuatu NTFSR was also presented to the meeting by the OFP/SPC.
- A national legal workshop relating to the obligations under the WCPF Convention and the Commission's decisions, was held in August 2006.
- As part of the Vanuatu tuna management plan review, Dr. Fletcher consulted with national stakeholders (including local ENGOS and INGOS) on the Vanuatu Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries Management.
- Vanuatu Tuna (Fisheries) Management Plan still not finalized following further consultations with stakeholders, in 2007.
- An OFP/SPC staff held a meeting with the Head of Fisheries for the final sign off.
- A country visit was undertaken by the Project in 2006of the Vanuatu NTFSR.

Regional level activities

- Vanuatu participated in SC2. The SC2 and SC3 reports were completed and delivered thanks to the effective technical support of OFP/SPC in terms of providing data summaries and annual catch estimates
- Vanuatu participated in TCC2. The technical support of the Forum Fisheries Agency in the MCS meeting prior to TCC2 was appreciated.
- **Request for assistance with FAD management plan????.....**
- One participant from Vanuatu, participated in the first 2 week stock assessment workshop, in early July 2006, OFP/SPC, Noumea, New Caledonia.
- Two participants from Vanuatu participated in the regional workshop in Fiji on Port States Enforcement in August 2006.
- The Vanuatu NTDC participated in the first 'Tuna Data Workshop' at the end of October 2006, SPC, Noumea, New Caledonia.
- Vanuatu confirmed its candidate for the Regional Workshop on stock assessment for 2007.
- Vanuatu participated in a training workshop (2 days) on the delivery of the EAFM process that was conducted by Dr. Rick Fletcher.
- Vanuatu participated in the 9th MCS working group meeting, 22-27 October, 2006, Brisbane, Australia.
- The Vanuatu NTDC as the national monitoring personnel was attached to the OFP/SPC in early November 2006, for further training which resulted in the officer producing drafts of chapters to be included in the final Vanuatu NTFSR.
- Vanuatu participated in the Regional Tenth MCS WG meeting held at FFA Secretariat from 26-30 March 2006.
- Vanuatu confirmed its candidate for the Policy Training Course on responsible fisheries course to take place 9-20 July 2007.
- Vanuatu continued to utilize the opportunities of regionally coordinated surveillance patrols while these foreign patrol assets operated in Vanuatu.

6. Challenges/Issues Encountered

- No efforts to establish NCC.
- Tight datelines for submissions of WCFC reports.
- Delayed implementation of an efficient data management system.
- WCPFC data requirements still poorly coordinated and maintained.

7. Solutions Applied (to address issues and challenges)

- Small laptop provide to NTDC.
- Funding to establish a computer network is in the pipeline to facilitate establish an operational and effective computer network before end of 2007.
- TUFMAN should be installed by first half of 2008 to enhance Vanuatu fish catch and effort data as well as vessel licencing information.
- Enhanced tasking of responsibilities for individual staff.
- Received valuable technical support from OFP/SPC and FFA for the production of the WCPFC reports i.e data and information obligations.
- Currently working on a ministerial paper to formerly establish a NCC.

9. Recommendations for Future Action

Annual Project visits need

10. Report Prepared By: William Naviti, National (OFM Project) Focal Point.

UNDP PRESENTATION ON THE MID TERM REVIEW

United Nations Development Programme



PIOFM Mid-Term Review

Regional Steering Committee
6th October 2007



1

United Nations Development Programme



Background

- Better access of information at national & regional level
- Stakeholders have a say on project implementation
- Improved understanding of the results of the PIOFM
- Monitoring systems tied into the LFA targets and indicators
- Provide recommendations for future project focus
- Early opportunity to address gaps & shortfalls

2



Evaluation – MTR & Final

- UNDP evaluation policy: Defines standards for evaluation
- Major responsibilities of UNDP COs :
 - Draft and review ToR
 - Selects consultants
 - Circulates to government and major stakeholders
 - Follows up on management actions
- MTR and FE reports sent to GEF M&E for review and quality control

3



Objectives of OFM MTR

1. Assessment of the progress made towards the OFM project's objectives and outputs (results & impact)

2. Identify potential project design problems (if any)

3. Promote accountability for resource use

4. Document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned

5. Provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements



4



Scope

- Project Impact (Results) & Design
- Project Management and Administration
- Project Implementation
- Project Finances
- Lessons learned

Evaluation Report

5



Evaluation Approach

- Baseline data and statistics - desk study review of all relevant OFM Project documentation
- Fiji-based consultations
- Solomon Island & New Caledonia based consultations
- Selected visits to countries for national and regional impact analysis
- Validation through the Regional Steering Committee/Multipartite Review Meeting

6



Evaluation Team

- Will comprise of 2 consultants - 1 team leader and 1 Resource Specialist
- Team leader will be responsible for the overall evaluation exercise & take lead in preparation of the expected outputs
- Regional resource specialist will assist the Team leader & in stakeholder consultations
- Overall supervision of the MTR will rest with the UNDP-CO & UNDP RBAP

7



Timeline

Schedule	
January	Call for expressions of Interests
February	Application submission deadline
February – April	Selection process, contract
June	Evaluators commence evaluation
June	Evaluators assemble in Suva, Fiji for briefing by UNDP and undertake Fiji based consultations
June	Evaluators assemble in Honiara, Solomon Islands for consultations
July	Travel to New Caledonia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru and/or Samoa
10 August*	Draft Report completed
10 September*	Final report completed
October (early)	Report presentation at RSC4, Solomon Islands by Evaluation Team Leader

8



MTR Options

1. 1 Consultant to lead the MTR, with some country consultations happening via telecom;
2. 2 regional consultants where a package is negotiated for entire consultancy;
3. Budget for MTE increased by 20K to cover costs of 2 consultants & travel;
4. Consultants to be present in the margins of another fisheries meeting & organise meetings with focal points; and
5. Proceed as per current TOR where visits to countries are strategised and most consultations happen via video and telconf.

9



Recommendations

- Consider options for MTR
- Consider the Terms of Reference for consultants that will be engaged in the review; and
- Endorse the evaluation approach, context and timeframe.

10