

DRAFT

AGULHAS AND SOMALI CURRENT LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS PROJECT

REPORT OF THE FIRST STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING AND INCEPTION WORKSHOP

Seaworld Education Centre, uShaka, Durban

22nd – 23rd JANUARY 2008

Table of Contents

Summary of the First Steering Committee and Inception Workshop for the ASCLME Project.....	2
Proceedings of the ASCLME First Steering Committee Meeting - January 22 nd 2008.....	11
Proceedings of the ASCLME Inception Workshop - January 23 rd 2008.....	38

Attached Annexes

- Annex 1: Acronyms and Abbreviations
- Annex 2: Attendance List and Contacts
- Annex 3: Agendas for Meetings
- Annex 4: Approved Work-Plans
- Annex 5: Approved Budget

List of additional Annexes and Links

(click links below to download and view)

- [Annex 6: Inception Workshop Briefing Document](#)
- [Annex 7: Inception Report to the Project Steering Committee](#)
- [Annex 8: Summary of Implementation Progress](#)
- [Annex 9: Review of Revised Outputs and Deliverables](#)
- [Annex 10: Governance and Policy Needs](#)
- [Annex 11: Management Structure for Project](#)
- [Annex 12: Summary and Update of the ASCLME Programme and Project](#)
- [Annex 13: Update on Implementation Progress](#)
- [Annex 14: Review of TDA and SAP Delivery Requirements for the ASCLME Project/Programme](#)
- [Annex 15: Offshore Data Capture within LME coastal zones](#)
- [Annex 16: Priorities for Social and Economics assessments that are required to support TDA and SAP process](#)
- [Annex 17: Expected inputs from ASCLME Projects into TDA Process](#)
- [Annex 18: Mechanisms for National and Regional Coordination for Data Capture and Management](#)
- [Annex 19: Communications Strategy](#)
- [Annex 20: Partnership, Coordination and Stakeholder Participation](#)
- [Annex 21: The Sustainable Seas Trust](#)
- [Annex 22: Next Steps](#)

[All these files are available in a single zipped file from [here](#) (5.65MB)]

Summary of the First Steering Committee and Inception Workshop for the ASCLME Project

OVERVIEW

This was the first meeting of the Steering Committee for the ASCLME Project and constituted the first time since the preparatory phase that the representatives of the countries had gathered to discuss project issues and implementation. As per UNDP requirements this meeting of national representatives, agency partners and observers was also used to inaugurate the Project through a formal Inception Workshop.

The first day of the meeting included the permanent members of the Steering Committee which are the countries, the executing and implementing agencies and the direct partners/co-funders as identified in the Project Document. The agenda focused more on issues related to policy, protocol and management of the Project as well as internal Project issues related to budget and delivery, monitoring and evaluation.

The second day of the meeting included important national, regional and international observers and expanded the subject matter into technical and scientific issues as well as those relating to the modular approach, and especially long-term governance requirements.

Both meetings were extremely valuable and re-stated the intent for cooperation and understanding between the countries, the PCU, the Sister Projects within the ASCLME Programme, and other partners and observers that promises to evolve into a most effective, supportive and successful partnership for guiding the Project, coordinating outside of the project and delivering the overall objectives and outputs that will ultimately be critical and essential to the sustainable management of these two important LMEs.

The following sections of the summary list some of the specific highlights of discussion and some of the agreed actions to be taken (the latter in red). The full proceedings of each day's meeting follow this summary.

SPECIFIC CONCERNS AND DISCUSSION POINTS

The Steering Committee discussed the need for long-term sustainability and ownership of the Project and concluded that governance and policy issues and support would be critically important to the long-term success of any LME Project and that these needed to be factored in at the earliest stages in the ASCLME Project and Programme. There was discussion regarding the expansion of the project from what was a more 'blue-water' oceanographic research effort to what is now more equally balanced with coastal issues. This has been generally welcomed by the countries and it was noted that most of politicians and decision-makers in the countries (esp. Continental Africa) are more concerned with the near-shore issues than the offshore concerns so that these additions

will tend to encourage policy-level support for the Project. Artisanal fisheries are very important in this respect and should be the subject of clear policy briefings. However, policy briefings are not the only requirements to achieve stakeholder buy-in and, at the other end of the spectrum, there is a clear need for community outreach and a need to forge links between Policy and Community. In this context it was pointed out that the former may expect/require the latter to forego fishing rights in the interest of overall LME management

It was noted that the ASCLME Project was taking the correct approach in recognising that the TDAs and SAPs may represent the end deliverables from this project but actually represent the beginning of the overall LME management process and that this is an on-going and long-term process that will need sustainability in terms of financing, long-term capacity, on-going monitoring and data/information collection, and political support. It was agreed that there was a need for a clear work programme for the SAP development at national and regional level with defined focal points, working groups, tasks, deliveries, etc. The Committee also noted that it was important that the SAP documents also identified the national structures, mechanisms and long-term resources to implement the SAPs.

The committee discussed and endorsed the importance of the socioeconomic and cost-benefit analyses and how these would be vital to ‘selling’ the project and capturing senior level ‘buy-in’ from policy makers, who are more likely to appreciate the importance of the LME approach when supported by such information on benefits and advantages in terms of long-term economic and social value. ASCLME should build on what WIO-LaB and the Nairobi Convention are doing at the national level also. It was considered to be important therefore to explore their activities and achievements. It was also noted that the EU have undertaken a number of economic assessments and studies in the region and that these would be valuable for ASCLME. Further information should also be available from IOTC.

There was general support from the Steering Committee for an ASCLME Programme Approach incorporating close coordination between the three sister projects (ASCLME, SWIOFP and WIO-LaB) but this needs to be understood, accepted and ‘sold’ by engaging people and national institutions which are cross-cutting in the region, as well as regional organisations.

The Committee reviewed the revised structure for project administration and management as presented. This is as follows:

1. A Programme Policy Committee (PPC): This will be a higher level committee advising all three ASCLME Programme projects (ASCLME, SWIOFP, WIO-LaB) and providing guidance at the policy level towards the development of effective TDAs and SAPs. The level of representation on this PCC should be at the DDG or PS level or above.

2. A Programme Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC): This will be a technical level group comprised of the 3 project managers and key experts from the region, coordinating action across projects. Although not originally foreseen in the Project Document the Steering Committee recommended inclusion of ReCoMaP on this Committee as well as other relevant regional initiatives.
3. A Project Steering Committee (PSC): This would consist of
 - 3.A. A core membership including one representative from each GEF eligible Country, one representative from each of ACEP, UNDP, NEPAD, GEF, UNOPS and the Nairobi Convention, and the Project Managers of the other regional Sister projects under the ASCLME Programme (WIO-LaB, SWIOFP) as well as ReCoMaP The Steering Committee also agreed that Somalia should have a special status as a Country Observer.
 - 3.B. A stakeholder membership of additional observer members as agreed by the PSC Core Membership. This would include donor agencies providing co-finance (e.g. France, Norway) as well as technical agencies (e.g. NOAA, FAO)), and anyone else invited by the PSC to attend.
4. A Project Coordination Unit (PCU) – Hosted by the South African Government and based in Grahamstown.
5. A Cruise Coordination Group (CCG): This group would aim to ensure the most efficient use of ship’s time amongst the Projects. It would also coordinate the inputs from the individual national cruise coordinators.
6. Inter-Ministerial Committees (building on existing IMCs in each country as per the WIO-LaB project).
7. TDA/SAP Preparation Teams

A question was raised regarding recruitment procedures within the Project. It was explained that all recruitment processes had to adhere to UNOPS procedures for fair selection and that recruitment of staff would be done on the basis of merit (“the best person for the job”). It was explained that recruitment would need to be primarily ‘local’ wherever possible to avoid the significant additional cost to the Project of relocation and additional benefits for education, medical and pension support. However, the Project would make every effort to balance this by recruiting consultants and experts within individual countries for project activities in an attempt to ensure a more equitable distribution of funding support and capacity building. It was also noted that if there is a source of strong capacity within the region, then this should be exploited wherever possible to provide training and capacity building for the less developed parts of the region, rather than bringing in expertise from outside the region. Counter-parting skilled staff from one country with less experienced trainees from other countries was in line with the practice of using locals to train locals. The aim should always be to use expert capacity

from within the region to build capacity within participating countries wherever it is seen to be weak so that, at the end of the Project, there is clear evidence of transfer of skills and expertise and of increased capacity and more trained personnel where they did not previously exist.

A revised budget and work-plan was presented to the Steering Committee based on a more logical definition and sequence of Project Outcomes and Outputs (as revised from the original Project Document). These were approved by the Committee.

DECISIONS AND ACTIONS

Policy and Governance Issues

The Steering Committee was in clear and strong agreement on how vital the issues of policy and governance are to the success of the LME process. It was noted that this is one of the five LME modules that usually gets the least attention from Projects and Programmes. It was noted that the TDA and SAP need to move forward in concert, together with a simultaneous process of awareness-raising and sensitisation at the policy level, so key decision-makers are aware of the TDA process and the significance of the SAP when it arrives at their desks and does not represent a mysterious and unexpected document. In this context, the Steering Committee discussed the need for a very specific mechanism that would focus on briefing and informing the policy level stakeholders, and it was agreed that there should be a dedicated section and activity within the project coordination unit specifically focused to ensure this vital module receives appropriate attention. Furthermore, the countries supported the need for a clear policy and governance mechanism and structure, not only at regional/PCU level but also at national level – **PCU agreed to develop ToR for a P&G Coordinator, circulate, and hire as a priority. This person would then be responsible for developing guidelines and providing support to implement appropriate national policy organs and focal points.**

Meetings of the Programme Policy Committee and the engagement of the policy-makers could best be achieved through a two tier approach i) through formal meetings of nominated policy representatives from each country and ii) through opportunistic meetings dove-tailed into appropriate regional gatherings of relevant Ministers such as AU meetings. AMCEN or the Nairobi Convention CoPs. It was noted that an AMCEN (African Ministerial Conference on the Environment) was scheduled for June 2008 and this would be an opportunity to initiate this process. **A. PCU to coordinate with Nairobi Convention Secretariat and with countries to attempt to organise a brief side-meeting at AMCEN and to get the ASCLME on the agenda as a brief presentation. B. PCU to develop the necessary ToR and logistics for a Programme Policy Committee (making use of the new Policy and Governance Coordinator)**

Data, Information and TDA Development

The Steering Committee requested that ASCLME should take a central coordinating role on coastal and marine data and information management in the region. The Committee

further requested that consideration should be given to the use of one single regional system for all projects dealing with marine resource data and information management. The ASCLME and other marine and coastal initiatives could then make their data available to wherever this system is based within the region. It was important, in this respect to ensure appropriate accessibility and storage as well as compatibility of formats. **PD said that the PCU would bear this in mind in structuring the entire data and information management mechanism at the national and regional level.**

The Committee also made note of the fact that it would be important for the project to provide some degree of support to the appropriate and selected national institutions for data collection and management as well as to assist and support the setting up of national working groups for such data management and collection. **The PCU respond by stating that it would provide more detail to each country on what such support would represent and what would be expected of such working groups.**

The Steering Committee agreed that, in view of past sensitivities over data capture and ownership, a MoU was needed between the countries and the ASCLME Project regarding access to and storage of data and information used by the Project in defining the TDAs and developing the SAPs. **PCU to draft a MoU using other examples such as SWIOFP. This to be circulated to the countries for review and discussion.**

The ReCoMaP representative noted that there were a lot of areas of similarity reflected in the activities of the ReCoMaP and ASCLME Projects. It was noted that ReCoMaP could provide ASCLME with a lot of its data needs and that the training and capacity building objectives would also have similarities. **It was agreed that the two projects should coordinate closely in these areas and that the Project Director and ReCoMaP representative should develop this requirement.**

The Steering Committee discussed the need to ensure that all data used to develop the TDA should be quality assured. In this context **it was agreed that, wherever possible, any new studies or research carried out or supported by the ASCLME Project should be properly peer-reviewed. In relation to the expected oceanographic research cruises, it was considered to be imperative that any experts or specialists working on or with these cruises should be required to produce peer-reviewed publications from their studies and results.**

Further discussion on the subject of quality control raised the issue for overall peer review of data for the TDA. **It was agreed that the PCU would develop a peer-review mechanism for assessing and quality-assuring data for inclusion in the TDAs.**

The Nairobi Convention Secretariat is working closely with IUCN on development and implementation of MPAs and could thus contribute a lot of information to the TDA development process on Output 1.2.B (*Key knowledge gaps in near-shore (artisanal/subsistence) fisheries updated, nursery areas and other rich biological habitat mapped or otherwise identified using existing information*) and Output 2.2 (*A region wide socio-economic valuation of near-shore marine goods and services is undertaken to gain*

greater understanding of the social and economic importance of these areas). The Secretariat representative will communicate with the PCU on possible areas for collaboration and data sharing.

Following the presentation by ORI on the primary coastal zone issues relating to LME Management, it was noted that there may be some gaps in both the coastal and offshore issues for the LMES (including, but not limited to, mariculture, marine pollution and invasive species) ORI would liaise with IUCN, ReCoMaP and the PCU to provide an expanded list for the PCU to circulate to the countries. The countries would review these and provide comments and agreement. The PCU would include the list of required information to populate the TDA in this circulation.

It was noted that it was now vital that countries confirm their priorities on all LME related issues. In this context, the meeting agreed that a ToR for coastal activities related to ASCLME (along with a list of priorities for the countries to review and amend as necessary) should be drafted and circulated around the SC for comment and to move ahead with an action plan. This document should be drafted through a coordinated effort between EnviroFish Africa, and ORI, CSIR.

It was considered to be equally as important to identify any gaps which were not specifically addressed in any of the Projects through their signed documents (e.g. marine pollution, invasive species, and socio-economic study of industrial fisheries. The PCU would send out a formal request to the countries for feedback on this matter. This would highlight the areas of delivery expected from each project into the TDA/SAP process so the countries could better identify such gaps.

The meeting discussed in some detail the inherent problem of WIO-LaB completing its TDA and SAP on Land-Based Sources (which was planned to be part of the overall LME TDAs) well ahead of the finalisation of the overall TDAs which depend on input from ASCLME and SWIOFP. The concern here is that the TDA and SAP for WIO-LaB will be finalised some 2-3 years before it is possible to implement through the ASCLME SAP structure, yet some of the issues are urgent and should be acted on as soon as possible. It was considered that WIO-LaB should go ahead and implement its LBS SAP through the Nairobi Convention and not wait for the full LME SAPs to be finalised. There will need to be discussion about how this can later be embedded in the overall LME management and Implementation process. In this respect, the meeting decided that the coordination and implementation of the individual outputs from the three projects in terms of the final ASCLME SAPs is an area that will require a specific Agenda Item at the next Steering Committee Meeting.

Coordination and Cooperation

ASCLME needs to coordinate with WIO-LaB, SWIOFP and other organisations (e.g. ReCoMaP) and initiatives regarding training needs and activities. WIO-LaB already has some ongoing and planned activities in this area and has identified stakeholders and institutions through an Education Needs Assessment. An early joint workshop would

probably be appropriate. **The Capacity Building and Training Coordinator to liaise with WIO-LaB and SWIOFP, and identify other groups for coordination.**

WIO-LaB is also undertaking some similar activities to those listed in ASCLME Output 4.1 *Effective and frequent communication and coordination established among the IAs, the various projects under the programme and other related initiatives and institutions in the region, including linkages with other GEF supported projects in Sub-Saharan Africa and globally* and these should also be closely coordinated between the two Projects – **PD, Communications and IT Coordinator and Policy and Governance Coordinator to identify specifics and liaise with WIO-LaB and SWIOFP Project Managers.**

WIO-LaB specifically requested to work very closely with ASCLME in development of their ToR for Coastal and Socioeconomic Studies in view of high potential for overlap but also for valuable coordination – **PD to ensure that Warwick Sauer, ORI and IKM coordinate closely with Peter Scheren on this.**

ASCLME needs to coordinate with WIO-LaB over POPS – **POPs Coordinator (DAL) to liaise with appropriate WIO-LaB people via Peter Scheren.**

The Committee noted that there were overlaps between WIO-LaBs activities in relation to IW Coordination and those of ASCLME. **WIO-LaB and ASCLME to coordinate on amalgamating the IW Coordination Meetings (WIO-LaB responsibility) and the Sub-Saharan Africa LME Coordination Meetings (ASCLME responsibility).**

Project Management and Steering Committee Functions

The Committee discussed in detail the role of Somalia in the Project. It was clarified by UNDP that the Project could not send people to work in Somalia or schedule research vessels into Somalian waters, but that it could support them financial through payments to Somalian experts for provision of data and information (particularly existing data and the development and capture of RS and modelling data), and for attendance at workshops and at the Steering Committee meetings if the Committee so desired. **The Committee agreed to create a specific membership category for Somalia as Country Observers on the Steering Committee and also agreed that the Project should fund the attendance of an appropriate representative.**

Countries requested some guidance on the practicalities of initiating and implementing the project activities in each country – **PCU to provide the countries with a clear national work-plan and resource requirements ASAP. This to include information on appropriate level of Steering Committee representation and the requirement for a National Coordinator, requirements for an Inter-Ministerial Committee (In coordination with WIO-LaB), required working groups for TDA and SAP development, Cruise Coordination, Capacity Building and Training, etc. This will also identify the sort of financial support each country can expect.**

The Steering Committee discussed the set up of ASCLME Project and Programme websites and identified the possibility of keeping independent websites but sharing a common portal at the Programme level. It was felt that a meeting of IT experts from the countries/region would be appropriate to develop recommendations and mechanisms for such website coordination between the ASCLME Sister Projects – PCU to task the new Communications and IT Coordinator with this coordination role and with setting up such a meeting/workshop when that person comes on-board hopefully in April.

The Steering Committee felt that there was a requirement for a continuous process of monitoring and evaluation of activities and deliverables to ‘progress-chase’ the Project Outputs which would be an on-going, project-driven process separate from the scheduled Independent Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluations. The PCU agreed to develop a mechanism to this effect with consideration given to identifying a specific activity.

The meeting considered the proposed new organisational structure related to the Outcomes and Outputs as presented by the PCU and requested that a new organigram be developed that would clarify this structure at the national, regional and PCU level, as well as defining the linkages between the Sister Projects and the ASCLME Programme. The Project Director agreed to circulate such an Organigram as soon as it was feasible to finalise this structure, and before the next Steering Committee meeting.

The Committee discussed the format for future meetings. It was agreed that in future there would be an overall ASCLME stakeholder meeting with all Steering Committee members and Observers present plus any appropriate additional invitees. This would be followed by a meeting of the Permanent Steering Committee members as required and consisting of the countries, the ASCLME Sister projects, ACEP and UNOPS. This Permanent Steering Committee Member’s meeting would provide an opportunity to discuss more sensitive and diplomatic issues affecting the countries or the agencies.

The meeting noted that there had been very little discussion of the role of the private sector in the ASCLME Project and it was agreed that this should be a specific Agenda Item for the next Steering Committee Meeting.

The Steering Committee discussed the timing of its next meeting. It was agreed that, if feasible, the next meeting would be held consecutive to the next WIO-LaB Steering Committee meeting, unless the latter was too early in which case a separate meeting would be scheduled for later in the year.

Capacity Building and Training

In discussing the planned training and capacity building for oceanographic and ecosystem monitoring skills, it was agreed that the ‘trained’ personnel should be encouraged to present peer-reviewed publications from their cruise work to WIOMSA.

It was recognised that wherever possible the project would use local and regional expertise in accordance with the policy to train from within. However, it was agreed that if it where

necessary to use expertise from outside of the region, it would be a policy of the Project to ensure that there was a contractual obligation on the part of such external expertise for counter-parting and to undertake training of local capacity.

Sea-Going Research and Data Collection

The priorities for oceanographic and ecosystem assessment/monitoring cruises was presented to the Steering Committee with the clarification that this annex from the project Document was now several years old. It was agreed that A. the proposed cruise schedule for use of available ships in 2008 (training in the first part of the year followed by an ecosystem monitoring cruise off East Madagascar) would be adopted as the initial schedule and B. the priorities list would be reviewed by regional oceanographic experts(s) and circulated back to the countries and C. a regional cruise coordination workshop would be arranged by the PCU to discuss this and adopt the schedule for the remainder of the Project (with the proviso that this could be amended as necessary to fit in with vessel availability).

In order to ensure effective use of vessels it was agreed that the countries would provide a list of A. Oceanographic expertise available for the various cruises and B. a list of appropriate trainee scientists based on criteria provided by the PCU and agreed by the Steering Committee members.

The Committee also discussed the need for national level cruise coordination as well as regional level. It was agreed that each country would nominate a focal institute and person for cruise coordination within country to provide the information on expertise and potential trainees available as well as to assist in securing permits for vessels and personnel to enter and work in the countries.

The Committee discussed the subject of sea-going allowances. It was considered by some to be an unnecessary expense as A. all expenses on the vessel were already covered by the Project and B. most oceanographers would consider it a professional privilege and an excellent opportunity to be able to get research time on good research vessels. Others noted that a precedent had been set through the BCLME project and that some government departments in the participating countries also paid sea-going allowances. No conclusion was reached on this and a decision will need to be made by the Steering Committee before the Nansen cruises start later this year. The PCU will lobby members for their input and opinion.

The Committee noted that The R.V Nansen had undertaken a number of cruises through the region in the 1970's. It was felt that this data would be of significant value to the preparation of the TDA and particularly as a comparative data set for assessing ecosystem level changes. The Committee therefore requested that the ASCLME PCU should clarify the available data from these cruises and take whatever measures necessary to repatriate this data into the region for use by the Project and the countries.

Proceedings of the ASCLME First Steering Committee Meeting - January 22nd 2008

See Annex 2 (attached below) for Attendance List

8:35 Start of Meeting

Dr. David Vousden, ASCLME Project Director (PD), welcomed the attendees, and thanked David LaRoche in particular for all his work during the Implementation Phase of the Project.

The Project Director explained that the reasoning behind the two-day format (which had been adopted on the basis of comments and requests from several countries) was so that core Project Steering Committee (PSC) consisting of the countries and close partners (ACEP, SWIOFP, WIO-LaB) could first discuss issues of policy and procedure in private, whilst the second day allowed inputs from a broader stakeholder community, particularly those of a technical nature. He reminded those present that the purpose of the PSC is to provide long-term oversight and guidance of the Project from the countries themselves. He then gave a brief overview of the purpose of the two day Inception meeting, namely to:

- Review the overall Objective and Outcomes of the project and introduce its main decision-making participants (i.e. the Steering Committee),
- To present a revised work-plan for approval which more appropriately reflects the increased demands that had been added immediately prior to submission in terms of Outcomes and Outputs (noting that this was done using the same overall level of funding).
- To define how the TDA and SAP development process would work
- To review the Project management structure and requirements
- To confirm how coordination would be achieved at the programme level (between the Sister Projects)
- To open the floor to any further discussions on policy or technical issues that the participants felt should be addressed at this stage

The Project Director (PD) stressed that the Steering Committee is a forum where the Project countries take ownership and give the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) input, convey their thoughts and highlight priorities. Ultimately, the Project belongs to the countries and their feedback is vital. The PCU exists to work for the countries within the mandate of the Project Document. To this effect, several presentations would be provided to the participants on the current state and plans of the Project, primarily to give the countries opportunity to give their input on the future of the Project, and also to report back on work done to date.

It was clarified that the PCU is hosted by the South African Institute for Aquatic Biodiversity in Grahamstown, South Africa and the UNDP lead country office is in Mauritius.

Mr. Claudio Caldarone, the UNDP Resident Representative for Mauritius/Seychelles delivered formal opening remarks. He stated that he was pleased to be at the meeting and very excited for the future of the Project. He noted that it is a complex and ambitious project with many stakeholders and challenges, representing two large LMEs spanning the territorial waters of nine countries as well as high seas areas. He reminded all present that the project can not be effective unless it is anchored in the eight participating countries. Furthermore, there are Policy implications for participating countries, particularly through the SAP process. Mechanisms of Governance and Policy-level ownership will need to be created early on in close consultation with participating countries to ensure successful implementation of the SAP. UNDP Mauritius/Seychelles Country Office are committed to their role in supporting the ASCLME project, the TDA and SAP process, the Project Director and staff of the PCU, the Steering Committee and all Project stakeholders.

Dr. Johann Augustyn, Chief Director, MCM/DEAT, representing South Africa as the host country, then welcomed all partner countries to South Africa, and expressed pride at hosting the first ASCLME workshop. He hoped that South Africa would be playing a prominent role in implementation of the Project, along with the other country partners and broader stakeholder community. He remarked that in the development of this project, other regional projects, such as BCLME, were used as examples of how to implement an ultimately successful project. Indeed BCLME has been successful already. However, ASCLME presents a far greater challenge than the BCLME did. He went on to state that if the participating countries and stakeholders work together, he is convinced that this project will also work very well. Dr. Augustyn echoed Mr. Caldarone's feelings of excitement at the launch of this Project. Scientists in the region were particularly excited by the BCLME project, and expected that this would be repeated in the ASCLME. The management of fisheries and the ecosystem requires a strong scientific basis that would provide information to the SAP. He noted that in the BCLME project, the SAP was done prior to project implementation, but that the method being followed by the ASCLME of data collection informing the SAP was more exciting still. He remarked that, for the benefit of the participants, Durban is an important tourism destination within South Africa, and that the hosting organisation, uShaka, was a fantastic facility and that DEAT were very grateful to them for offering this facility and support to the First PSC and Inception Workshop.

Akiko Yamamoto, UNDP Pretoria, Regional Portfolio Manager then spoke on behalf of GEF International Waters, Eastern and Southern Africa. She has recently taken over from Nik Sekhran on the 1st of January 2008. She was very pleased to be at this meeting, and expressed a hope that the impacts of the ASCLME would last far longer than the Implementation Phase. She noted that this is an International Waters project involving environmental issues. UNDP would like to mainstream shared transboundary water resource management by the implementation of appropriate policies in the participating countries. The project will be cross-cutting across sectors, and effects could be felt in poverty reduction, in helping countries to meet Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), particularly in the management of coastal fisheries and the socio-economic impacts these have on communities. Impacts would be identified with a view to identifying solutions by following GEF's TDA/SAP approach. The SAP directly assists countries in reaching this

vision, whilst the TDA provides the baseline information that guides the management and policy detailed in the SAP. The UNDP is committed to the successful development of 2 TDAs and 2 SAPs, for the Agulhas and Somali Current LMEs. UNDP will also ensure effective coordination between ASCLME, WIO-LaB, SWIOFP and ACEP. The coordination between these related projects is very important and ASCLME has been assigned this role. The Steering Committee will play a vital role in this process both regionally and nationally. Furthermore, effective coordination between all IW projects and other projects, particularly environmental GEF projects is essential. As the GEF implementation agency, UNDP aims to maximise synergies and minimize or eliminate duplication between projects. BCLME is a success story from which we can take useful lessons. UNDP would like to ensure that this sister project and the successful implementation in the countries shown by BCLME will be reflected in ASCLME. Ms. Yamamoto then conveyed greetings to the Steering Committee from her predecessor Nik Sekhran, who had anxiously awaited this day to come, that this was an exciting but challenging project; we are fortunate in that we are working with dedicated and committed people from the countries, and that he was almost sad to be handing this project over. Finally, Ms. Yamamoto said she looked forward to working with the various project partners in the future.

Next, the election of a Chair for the meeting was held; David Vousden suggested that it might be appropriate if one of the Country representatives were nominated and invited proposals. The floor proposed Johann Augustyn (South Africa) to take the chair and this received general support, so Johann Augustyn (the Chair) was elected to Chair the rest of the Steering Committee meeting.

The Chair again welcomed delegates to the meeting, and stated that if his first impressions were anything to go by, Akiko Yamamoto was at least as enthusiastic as Nik Sekhran and is looking forward to similar inputs from Akiko in future as those that Nik had given in the past.

Next, the attendees briefly introduced themselves to the other delegates.

Adoption of Agenda

The Chair asked if there were additions to or suggested changes in the proposed agenda. As none were received the proposed Agenda was **formally adopted**.

Summary of Implementation Progress

The PD reviewed actions taken since preparation of the project had been completed. These included:

- Steps that had already been taken to establish the PCU in Grahamstown, including an outline of the process to establish the PCU,

- A review of procurement, progress with staff recruitment, and project activities to date. He explained to the PSC that data are absolutely vital to the Project, so a fairly heavy investment in suitable IT infrastructure had been made.

The PD expressed thanks to UNOPS for their help with procurement of this infrastructure and other invaluable assistance during the establishment of the PCU. He also briefly outlined the planned staff complement for the PCU, pointing out that most of the posts were under recruitment through approved and transparent UNOPS procedures. He noted that Claire Atwood had been contracted as a Media Outreach consultant, with strong recommendation by UNDP partly on the strength of her previous work on BCLME. He briefly mentioned a new post for consideration by the Steering Committee that he would be presenting for discussion during the meeting, namely that of a Policy and Governance Coordinator. Dr. Vousden drew attention to the fact that, given the additional tasks assigned to the ASCLME, a detailed review of Project Outputs, Activities and Deliverables was undertaken to ensure that all the required outcomes could be met on the original budget. Several opportunities for representation and awareness-raising about the project had been taken in various international meetings, including a launch of the Project at the Joint Abidjan and Nairobi Convention CoP in Johannesburg in late 2007. Finally it was noted that, in view of the urgency for booking ship's time, several meetings on vessel logistics and deployment have already taken place specifically with the agencies responsible for scheduling the vessels, particularly the FAO/Nansen and the MCM/ACEP partnerships. IRD has also expressed an interest in possibly providing ships. *Details of his presentation are available as [Annex 8](#).*

The Chair remarked that it was clear the Project Director had made significant and positive progress since his appointment in September. He mentioned that ASCLME should look at establishing partnerships and linkages with other organisations collecting data, for example SAEON, which plays a pivotal role in South Africa in long-term environmental data storage, and have expressed interest in collecting data more broadly than just within South Africa. He suggested making Project data available through websites and so on, and that it would be important to gain access to existing databases in the region held by other organisations, such as the CSIR. He also stressed that the Project should slot in with existing data initiatives in the region rather than duplicating them.

With further regard to project data and creation of synergies with other partners it was noted that:

- In the *Report to the First Project Steering Committee and Inception Workshop* ([Annex 7](#)) supplied to delegates, there was an item concerning samples for KMFRI for an ACEP cruise, which he was not aware of having been sent to KMFRI.
- Caution should be exercised in making strong linkages with other organisations where not all countries are involved, such as ACEP; such relationships should be examined by the Steering Committee. The PD noted the sensitivities around data, and said that in later presentations, data handling would be discussed, and the

Steering Committee would ensure that appropriate policies and procedures would be created to ensure data security and safeguard ownership.

- That there were many avenues for synergies and collaboration between ASCLME and WIO-LaB. WIO-LaB has been waiting for ASCLME to begin for quite some time; synergies will be particularly strong in the data and information fields. He suggested that one single regional system should be used for data and information management. The Nairobi Convention Clearinghouse Mechanism already exists, with designation national focal institutions in each of the countries, aside from South Africa, which is the only country not yet fully involved. The PD responded that he would be examining these and other potential avenues for collaboration and regional data-sharing and management.
- It was stressed that within the region there are a number of projects already collecting extensive amounts of data, and that the ASCLME documentation called for further data-gathering. In order to avoid duplication of research effort, the question was whether there would be collaboration between these projects, mentioning the Nairobi Convention Clearinghouse Mechanism and ReCoMaP specifically. The PD replied that this was indeed an important issue. He agreed that there were a number of initiatives, not all of whom are working closely together. He felt it that it is essential that all the projects working in the region should aim to cooperate in order to maximise synergies and eliminate duplication of effort. He added that he would like to offer the ASCLME as a major regional project that could act as a catalyst to facilitate this process of greater inter-project collaboration. He did not, however, necessarily see ASCLME as the ultimate data repository and would welcome opportunities to collaborate with any regional initiatives on this. This point was noted by the Committee and it was agreed that ASCLME should play a catalytic role in coordinating appropriate data collection and management initiatives in the region where feasible, and where related to the LME management concept.
- It was stressed that it would be important to examine issues around how access should be granted and what data formats information should be stored in to ensure compatibility between the various projects.

Dr. Angus Paterson, the Executive Director of SAEON, outlined SAEON's involvement in Long Term Ecological Research. In the last 18 months, the organisation has tried to coordinate all relevant data within South Africa across all data stakeholders. Within the marine context, SAEON is broken into two nodes, an inshore, coastal node, called Elwandle, based in Grahamstown, and an offshore node based at MCM in Cape Town. SAEON has already opened a dialogue with ASCLME through both nodes. Issues of data ownership have been carefully considered, with clearinghouse mechanisms established, ensuring that data ownership is maintained, but that up-to-date information is available to suitable partners such as management agencies.

Dr. Paul Skelton of SAIAB noted that SAEON is an incipient National Facility of the NRF, a central government institution of the South African Government. Its function was to generate and store long term environmental monitoring data, with regional and global relevance and linkages. In the past, ACEP has been working in the data and information fields much more broadly than just the areas in which it has been directly researching, particularly through involvement in major regional initiatives such as the African Marine Atlas.

Review of Revised Outputs, Activities and Deliverables

The PD presented a review of the revised Project Outputs and Deliverables. He reminded the Meeting that the Project Documentation was signed over two years ago. As this is a dynamic region, it was appropriate to revisit the Project Outputs to ensure that they were still relevant. Project Documentation is sometimes delivered very quickly without as much stakeholder involvement as might be wished for and, in this context, the GEF and Steering Committee added additional requirements to the Project Document almost at the last minute before the document was signed. Whilst the documentation was suitable to pass through the GEF process, it is not necessarily an appropriate framework to work from. Dr. Vousden explained that, working closely with Manager from the project preparation phase (David Laroche), he had now reviewed the logic of the process the Project expected to follow in the coming years. Whilst the process has been revised, the overall Objectives and associated Outcomes from the original Project Document have not changed but have simply been refined to be more streamlined and logical to follow and, in line with this, had devised a more efficient work plan for Steering Committee approval.

He stated that it was very important to ensure steps were taken towards quality assurance and one of the most appropriate mechanisms would be to ensure a flow of peer-reviewed publications arising from cruises.

Given the urgent need to claim ship time, the PCU had reserved time on the *Nansen*, with training early in 2008 in the Cape Town region, and a survey of the East Coast of Madagascar later in the year. Some ship time would likely be available through ACEP, but this was not yet finalised and would depend on the imminent review of proposals to ACEP; MCM's generosity in providing ship's time to ACEP was mentioned, as was the developing partnership between ASCLME and ACEP which would allow a significant amount of this time to focus on ASCLME related activities which are, in any case, closely aligned with ACEP's plans and objectives. In this context it was noted that a high proportion of ACEP ship-time was most likely to be concentrated in South African and adjacent waters, although it may be feasible to venture further afield in pursuit of some research activities. With this in mind ASCLME was planning to try and coordinate a balance of ship scheduling whereby the *Nansen* could be focused more on work further up the east coast of the continent and out over the Mascarene Plateau. While the MCM vessel(s) could be scheduled for work closer to South African waters so as to effect necessary economies in fuel and steaming time.

Under Output 2.1, he suggested that the LME Indicator Specialist would identify key ecosystem-level indicators for ecological processes, governance issues, ecosystem stress reduction, and environmental status indicators such as water quality parameters, etc.

He stressed the need to ensure that appropriate information and knowledge collected through the ASCLME Project needed to be processed and packaged in such a manner that it could be directed to Policy-makers in the participating country. This would help to build ownership as well as to provide the necessary briefings and lead-in sensitisation prior to drafting of the SAPs. He reminded the participants that the TDAs would be factual documents that would reflect the real-time situation within the LMEs whereas the SAPs would be negotiated policy and governance responses to the TDAs to resolve issues and impacts and to implement an effect long-term management programme. The SAPs would need to be signed by Ministers hence the need for packaging of appropriate information into policy-level briefing documents during the TDA process and building up to the SAP development phase.

Finally, Dr, Vousden and noted that this was the largest GEF LME project in terms of it actually covering two LMEs (Agulhas and Somali) as well as the Southern Equatorial current and the Mascarene Plateau (as per the Objective wording of the project Document). This, in effect, meant that the overall focus was the western Indian Ocean.

The full presentation is available as Annex 4 below, and [Annex 9](#).

Following a refreshment break, there was a discussion of matters arising from the previous presentation. The following points and observations were made:

Re. existing studies such as *Nansen* cruises in the regions from the 1970s, the Project should obtain the resulting data to be used as a baseline; perhaps the data might also make a comparative dataset for assessing ecosystem level change. In the context of the need to brief policy-makers on the aims, objectives and achievements of the ASCLME Project, he noted that with the BCLME project, reporting on the measurable socio-economic benefits of transboundary, ecosystem-level management was vital in selling the project to politicians, thereby lead to the establishment of the Benguela Current Commission.

The offshore component of BCLME was strong, but that the near-shore or onshore components were less obvious; political support, especially in the context of East Africa and the western Indian Ocean, requires a near-shore component. Short policy statements should be extended into more detailed documents that would help to ensure that the policy makers understand the issues, not just at a senior governance level but right down to the local level. MPAs, local community impacts of fishery closures and restrictions would be key issues in which to sensitise policy makers. It was further noted that national institutions for data collection and management have often been established, but we need to make sure they still retain such a capacity to manage data, and give them support where capacity, either infrastructural or human, has been eroded. This could be a very valuable contribution from the ASCLME Project.

That there should be formation of a working group on information management. It was noted that Mr. Harrison Ong'anda of Kenya is also Chairman of information management for SWIOFP, and that SWIOFP and ASCLME could work together in this areas. He It was mentioned that an arrangement between ASCLME Project and ACEP whereby ACEP would extend the activities of their new Coordinator to work closely with ASCLME for Cruise Coordination and ship scheduling. It was further noted that a Cruise Coordinator was supposed to be based in SWIOFP, but that ASCLME takes up this role as it is already up and running unlike SWIOFP, and that in this context SWIOFP would wish to be included in this new arrangement. On the issue of Data sharing and ownership, countries have signed a specific MoU within SWIOFP around these issues. He promised to give a copy of this document to the PD. As a point of information it was noted that SWIOFP was intended to start in 2007, but this has not been possible as all country signatures have not been forthcoming.

A representative of the ASCLME Project noted that the intention of the agreement for shared cruise coordination mentioned in the preceding presentation was for ASCLME/ACEP cruises, not to assume responsibility for all regional cruises including SWIOFP. This arrangement had been made in an attempt to overcome the shortfall left by the absence of the shared Cruise Coordinator (between SWIOFP and ASCLME) which was supposed to be funded by SWIOFP. THE ASCLME project could not afford to postpone arrangements for cruise and ships scheduling any longer and had thus reached this useful agreement with ACEP. However, financially, it would not be viable for ASCLME/ACEP to assume such an overall coordination role at the ASCLME Programme level for all 3 Sister Projects. Nevertheless, SWIOFP's processes and needs would be taken into account where appropriate within ASCLME/ACEP planning processes.

It was observed that there was a need to think of priorities and cost effectiveness, including cruises which would lead to development of TDA and SAP. The Project is ultimately assessed on these; \$12.2m is a small amount given the geographical scope and 5 years of the project. Information for TDA and SAP development must be the priority. Due to the risks associated with operating in Somalia, it is not really possible at this stage for UN staff or consultants to actively operate within this country's waters or on the ground but that the Project will do what ever it can to include pertinent knowledge within the relevant TDA using existing data sources, remote sensing and modelling.

It was confirmed that the Project will focus on use of specialists from the region wherever possible, but will bring in outside experts if this is considered to be necessary and appropriate. However, such personnel will come in not only as experts but also to build regional capacity.

It was discussed and noted that a TDA is not a negotiable document inasmuch as it represents factual statements regarding the LME and its well-being. However, these facts should be verifiable and this verification agreed. The SAP, on the other hand, is a negotiated document as it represents an agreement between the countries regarding policy and action to address the concerns identified within the TDA. The SAP must be signed at senior policy level. In this context there is a clear need for sensitisation and awareness-

raising at the policy level during the TDA development, and direct involvement from policy-makers and their representatives during the evolution of the SAP in order to build understanding and ownership of this document

An observation was made that the Committee members now had a better overview of what is expected. However, he noted that the Somali LME would need further work, possibly beyond the lifecycle of the current project, and that Project should be careful about not giving the impression that it had fully addressed the Somali LME by way of detailed input to the TDA during this first Project. It was also felt that more effort was now needed to promote the overall ASCLME Programme. It may be the perception within UN/GEF that there is a programme, but this is not necessarily the case within the countries. One way to redress this situation might be to more closely engage institutions in the countries themselves as part of the Project/Programme so that they can sell the programme approach to the countries. These institutions would become Project “salesmen”. It would be dangerous, even if we had the best SAP in the world, if we do not have policy-level ‘buy-in’ and therefore it is vital to ‘kick-start’ the actual implementation of the SAP at the policy level as early as possible during the TDA phase.

The Chair strongly supported this last point and stated that political buy-in was absolutely crucial. The existing process identifies national initiatives which are bought into at the national level. Some issues may change with changes in government etc, but in general, the engagement of the policy level is essential for the long-term success of the SAPs. These SAPS do not stand alone but have to be implemented through national institutions and entities and these bodies must be on-board and supportive.

The PD agreed and noted that an integral part of the SAP would be to identify the national structures, mechanisms and long term resources to implement the SAPs. He added that the SAP negotiation stage would hopefully allow countries to negotiate at the policy level to ensure an effective route for implementation is actually identified, agreed and captured as part of the final documents.

Timeframe concerns were expressed. If the Project is starting off with identifying data gaps, cruise plans, etc. have the priority (research/data) areas been identified to any degree that allows one to discuss cruise scheduling and priority areas for targeting oceanographic and coastal studies? The TDA process can only follow when any gaps have been identified and actions agreed to address these gaps.

The PD responded that in the proposed time schedule, cruise/oceanographic work is limited to 3 years, mainly due to funding constraints. Also, by end of the 4th year, the TDAs should have been developed so that negotiations are underway for the SAPs. The TDAs may not be all-encompassing or perfect, but will represent the best job that can be done with the available resources. It must be remembered that the LME management approach is a dynamic process; it does not stand still but is constantly being fine-tuned to take into account changes in knowledge of the region. Although we are starting the process now, it should be seen as a long-term commitment. So, as it will almost certainly not be possible to capture all the requisite data for the TDA within this period (in view of

all the gaps), the countries therefore need to agree on priorities for this first stage and understand that the TDAs and SAPs will need updating as more information becomes available.

It was further noted that the BCLME Project started is implementation phase with a TDA and SAP already approved. This is the first time the GEF has supported a project where TDA/SAP is being developed during implementation and this is therefore an experimental pilot project in many ways. We have identified as best we can the priorities that must be taken into account within the SAP. Need to build in provisions to take into account research priorities of the countries. Note that we are not just talking about ASCLME; need to include WIO-LaB and SWIOFP into an over-arching TDA/SAP as final product. Given the uncertainties he felt that it was difficult to say to what degree the Project Document had included a definitive list of issues that the countries need to address at regional level, and that these should be reviewed and updated.

Dr. Skelton explained a little about ACEP's anticipated research programme. He noted that the programme is funded for 5 years, and that the first financial year is nearly over. ACEP is currently planning and developing its research programme for the next 4 years through a research proposal process. In terms of dovetailing ACEP with ASCLME, it was important to have a very clear idea of the priorities for ASCLME. He felt that the research processes being proposed and decided in the next 2 months by ACEP would be highly relevant to ASCLME.

It was noted that Professor Johann Lutjeharms has already done some work on elaborating possible joint cruises with SWIOFP. However, he accepted that these were not definitive as the Steering Committee and the countries would need to agree that these suggested cruises are their priorities.

The PD informed the meeting that the following day there would be more time for open discussion around some of these issues. He noted that the Committee and the Project needed to come forward with a *process* to agree what these priorities would be.

The WIO-LaB project director stated that there was a lot of scope for synergy between the projects related to the Programme. In fact, he noted that there were a lot of synergies already in the activities and structure, and that there existed 3 years of WIO-LaB implementation that could be used to support this. He noted that considerable work has been done on Data management, Capacity Building and a Training Needs Assessment while similar assessments have also been undertaken by ReCoMaP. The results of further work on stakeholder involvement and education also exists. During its early stages, WIO-LaB created a stakeholder list, which they would be willing to share with ASCLME. As well as WIO-LaB, he noted that both FARI and WIOSEA operate at the regional level and that the methods used by all of these entities could provide useful lessons and practices that ASCLME might be able to employ. At the national level, he noted the importance for WIO-LaB of the inter-ministerial committees and how it may be appropriate for ASCLME to use the same structures here as developed by WIO-LaB. He also noted that a number of educational needs assessments had been done and that it would make sense to align these

between the Projects. Under Output 4.1 dealing with IW Coordination he was pleased to note the intent to coordinate between the projects at the technical level which he felt was an important requirement. He noted that the LMEs Coordination Meeting set up by Nairobi Convention secretariat had proved to be a useful method of cooperation. So, clearly structures have been evolving in the region and it would make sense to build on these. He felt that it might be worth considering combining the socio-economic assessment and the fisheries research. He further offered his assistance in working with the ASCLME Project to develop the associated ToRs. In terms of WIO-LaB, he noted that they had identified more gaps than existing data so far. He also felt that WIO-LaB was clearly more involved in near-shore work whereas ASCLME was generally focusing on offshore and that a linkage needed to be developed.

The PD agreed that such a linkage between near-shore and offshore data within the TDAs was important. Although ASCLME has been tasked with overall coordination he wanted to make it clear that ASCLME was not the lead project but that all 3 Sister Projects were equal partners. He agreed that a lot of things were already running which the ASCLME project could build on. Many partnerships are already underway. ASCLME, SWIOFP and WIO-LaB need to discuss what has already been done, not only by the three Projects, but by other programmes and organisations in the region.

A question was asked of what would now be the practical steps to kick off the project in the respective countries. There are a number of committees referred to in the Project Document. It was noted that Inter-ministerial Committees for the ASCLMEs Programme were to be created. What the terms of reference were for these and other committees. Further the question was asked whether government employees would be eligible when sourcing regional and national experts. The representative of Kenya noted that in Kenya there was a concern that they were not sure of the demands of the project which they considered to be worrying in view of it having gone through its Inception Phase. This also related to human resources and to how they would address any inadequacies in personnel in terms of meeting their national commitments to the Project. He also felt that they needed a clearer understanding of the role of the focal institutions. He referred specifically to the outcome dealing with the training of oceanographers and wondered (as an issue of capacity building) at what level they would be trained? He also felt that it was becoming increasingly clear that the Project and its aims would need a policy organ of some kind, similar to a Commission. He noted that the arrangements for dealing with the countries are very different as far as SWIOFP and ASCLME are concerned and that the way funding is allocated is also different. If money will be going to countries then what accounting processes will UNDP/GEF require? He was also concerned that if the project were to rely too much on consultants to steer activities then this might compromise capacity building.

The PD responded to the various concerns raised by Kenyan member. He noted that a lot of practical steps would need to be taken next in order to move ahead with the various activities. Over the next 6-8 weeks he intended to prepare a draft national work plan for the countries so that they could see what would be expected of them at the national level. This would not initially be a detailed plan, but it would define what needs to happen sequentially, and would lead to the identification of national focal agencies. With regard to

the inter-ministerial committees, he was aware that such committees may already exist through other projects or national requirements. Now they would need to find if these might be appropriate for ASCLME? Would they need to add some different representation from other Ministries? Clearly some priority national activities would be to identify what national data already exists. The countries need to identify where they feel there are gaps in the available data. Data and information working groups will work to identify these. Cruise coordination groups will decide on what the priority oceanographic information is. Further questions would include 'What capacity do the countries have for oceanography and what do they need to build'? How are students for training selected for the research cruises and how will we ensure they get the right training? If there are students, how do we get them on the ships with the right training to be productive on board? The PCU will have to coordinate closely with each of the countries to address this. Continuous communication will be essential and there will need to be dialogue between meetings. He noted that another speaker would be providing details on the various committees mentioned in the Project Document in a later presentation. The overall structure of these committees and working groups is in review, but he wants to be sure that they will respond to country needs by identifying what level of person would be needed on these committees and groups. In response to the question on the use of consultants, he mentioned that the project would be focusing on using local and national consultants whenever possible. However, for specialist skills that might be needed occasionally on research cruises, etc. then it may be appropriate to seek outside expertise. Whenever this was the case, this would be done in concert with regional people to ensure training and skills transfer. Any use of external consultants would be undertaken on a capacity-building basis.

The PD continued to explain that in terms of capacity for supporting the Project, each of the countries have different levels of preparedness. It will be important to set up national working groups to identify capacity building needs, so these can be adopted and acted on fairly fast. In terms of which focal institutions would be appropriate for the project, it would be valuable to find out from WIO-LaB which institutions they use but they may not always be appropriate to a Project that extends into deeper waters. To some extent, the SC members represent some of the institutes already. Even though there may be sensitivities, he noted that it would be valuable to review what institutions should be represented on the Steering Committee and in other committees and working groups. He further noted the support of the Steering Committee for a project policy organ. He pointed out that it would not, at this stage, be realistic to attempt to identify how much money will be going to which country. It may have been that the SWIOFP project was developed in such a manner that each country was given a specific grant of money, but the ASCLME project does not work in the same way. As a regional project, the idea is to build capacity so that there is an equal level built across all the countries. This may mean that some countries require more assistance than others.

The UNOPS SC member responded to the Kenyan member's question on necessary in-country arrangements for accounting for any funds provided by the Project. He confirmed that government officials could be engaged provided that they obtain written authority from their government in the form of a release letter from government service for the

period. In line with what the PD had said, UNOPS did not envisage per country disbursements as such. Funds will be channelled through individual travel allowances and individual consultancies with the appropriate regional people. There will be different forms of contracting on a case-by-case basis, so he did not foresee a need for any special financial or auditing arrangements.

The SC representative of the Nairobi Convention Clarified for clarification of section 1.2.B of the work-plan (*Key knowledge gaps in near-shore (artisanal/subsistence) fisheries updated, nursery areas and other rich biological habitat mapped or otherwise identified using existing information*), that the Nairobi Convention could contribute as they had been involved with IUCN MPAs and could therefore provide a link to this on-going processes. He agreed to stay in touch with the PCU on this issue. Furthermore, on 2.2, (*A region wide socio-economic valuation of near-shore marine goods and services is undertaken to gain greater understanding of the social and economic importance of these areas*) he would also like to add his own offer to assist with drafting the ToR alongside that of the WIO-LaB project director. He also noted that some of the time schedules were a little optimistic in the work-plan in that the identification of a person, getting them on-board and then getting the activity started appears to require only one month.

The PD responded by noting the need to get some of the more urgent activities fully up and running in months. He pointed out that one of the reasons for selecting UNOPS as the Executing Agency is that they are very skilled at fast-tracking contracting and recruitment and generally have very effective and rapid procedures that still meet all the required rules and regulations for the Implementing Agency (UNDP). He pointed out that he would rather set a tight deadline and try to stick to it (and maybe slip a little) than to allow things to become too relaxed and find that the project has fallen too far behind.

There followed some general discussions about the need to align the timing of certain meetings between various projects and even combine some, particularly those looking at best lessons and practices which might possibly be expanded into a combined forum for regional IW coordination. There was also discussion regarding the design of the website and whether this would be a Programme website for all the projects. It was agreed that each of the projects would need to have independent websites but that a common portal at the programme level would be the most appropriate way to go. This would allow all of the Projects to see what was happening across the Programme in terms of meetings and activities. This should lead to better coordination of meetings to save people time and to cut down on costs. One suggestion was to link this to a common portal through the Nairobi Convention.

This then led to a discussion about the sort of information that might be on the website and general views on information dissemination. One question raised was whether there would be a specific workshop to discuss data and how countries would cooperate on information sharing. It was agreed that there would be workshops of this nature and one avenue that should be explored would be the use of the Nairobi Convention Clearing House rather than creating a new system of information handling and distribution.

It was observed that both discussions on website design and information handling would need input from technical people. In the case of the website(s), experts on information technology would need to hold discussions on the best solution, given the objectives of each project.

It was pointed out that SWIOFP's data coordinator is Harrison and that the ASCLME Project could deal directly with him on matters relating to data handling within SWIOFP.

Review of Budget and Approval of Work Programme

The PD presented a review and update of the Project Budget [Annex 5, below]. He pointed out that the budget in the Project Document was presented as a UN ATLAS spreadsheet which can be rather confusing for those not used to it. He therefore presented a more straightforward version based on actual expenditure levels. This demonstrated clearly that a high percentage of the GEF funds would be delivered at the national level or to recruit expertise locally and regionally. The overall budget was still US\$12.2m but the distribution had been improved so that over 60% of the funding would be going to countries. Only about 1% would be allocated to international experts and specialists as the emphasis was intentionally on using people from the region.

The PD presented a table showing the Project expenditure to date but clarified that this was not 100% accurate and could need fine-tuning by around 5% as the PCU does not have access to the ATLAS budget at present and will not have until the new Administration and Financer Officer comes on-board in February. However, discussions with UNOPS show that the figures are very close.

An enquiry was made under Work Programme point 1.4, ECOMAR, as to why ECOMAR had been specifically chosen and questioned the budget associated with that item. The question was whether there would be a ship-time allowance for technicians and scientists, similar to a DSA? The PD said it was not unusual for GEF to identify pre-selected groups within a Project Document where there were outstanding reasons or criteria for their selection. These reasons and criteria should be elaborated within the document and accepted by the countries by virtue of their formal signature to the document. However, he referred this question to the Project Preparation Consultant for further clarification. It was further noted that ECOMAR represents a co-financing agreement with a French research group concerning heavy metals in seabirds/shorebirds; ASCLME can use data and assistance from this as co-financing; and can build on their work simply by putting in some money into POP research, so it represents a valuable opportunity to piggy-back on an existing research project to accommodate the POPs activity in ASCLME. He then mentioned that the Stockholm Convention financial organ is the GEF, and that GEF want to satisfy more than one of their portfolio interests, in this case POPs in addition to International Waters.

There was an enquiry as to ship board allowances as some governments give such allowances to nationals joining research vessels; if it is not clear whether or not such allowances are payable by Projects, then governments will not provide it.

The PD responded that the Project had budgeted a figure of US\$25 per day as a “per diem” on board the research vessels; but that he was not entirely happy with that. He elaborated on this point, as he did not see why ship-board participants should be paid to get trained, or for scientists to gather career-enhancing data; furthermore, all out-of-pocket expenses are covered aboard the ship. He mentioned that it had been explained to him that precedents had been set by other projects; ASCLME has tried to keep the level down, but would prefer to eliminate such allowances entirely. The PCU would like to ensure people join vessels for research interests and training, rather than as a mercenary interest in making money on the vessel, which is a problem some projects who give ship-board allowances have experienced. The estimated expenditure of US\$25 per day over the five years is around US\$45,000. He then suggested that if the Steering Committee wishes to revise this allowance, then it is within their power to do so.

It was pointed out that BCLME and BENEFIT had set precedents for this on the West Coast. MCM/DEAT pay a sea-going allowance to their scientists and technicians as part of their salary package, and that experienced people expect to be paid for their time.

It was also noted that although not directly about shipboard allowances in terms of attending meetings, different agencies have different regulations. UNDP does not pay a sitting allowance to participants at meetings. There was an enquiry as to whether a manual or guidelines as to what is and is not acceptable could be provided so all can understand. The UNOPS representative replied that guidelines already exist. The UN financial rules and regulations are quite complex, however, UNOPS will always guide the participating countries. No seating allowances are provided although DSAs can be provided. He stated that the procedure can be elaborated in writing if countries insist or this is unclear. Essentially, DSAs are paid for every night spent outside the participant’s home location; if food and accommodation are provided by the organisers, then this amount is subtracted from the DSA, with the balance going to the meeting participant. DSA amounts vary depending on the destination, even within countries, to take into account the actual costs associated with spending time there.

Clarification was requested of how DSAs differ from a sea-going allowance? The PD responded that the sea-going allowance is an extra budget item requested by the Steering Committee during the project planning phase at one of the SC meetings.

APPROVAL OF THE BUDGET

The PD noted that the agenda required approval from the Steering Committee on the work-plan and budget, at which point the Chair asked if there were any clarifications, objections or suggestions for amendment to the Budget, of which there were none.

The Budget was therefore **approved**.

Presentation on Governance and Policy Needs for the ASCLME Project/Programme

The PD noted that ideally that the SC member from Tanzania, Dr. Magnus Ngoile, would have been at the meeting to give this presentation, but that he unfortunately didn't manage to get out of Tanzania due to difficulties with his travel arrangements, for which he sent apologies. He was expected to arrive that evening. Fortunately the PD and Dr. Ngoile had discussed this issue in some detail and therefore the PD (having consulted with Dr. Ngoile that morning) was in a position to provide the Steering Committee with a brief overview outlining some of the issues ([Annex 10](#)) in Dr. Ngoile's absence, as it was felt that there were important points for the Steering Committee to consider and decide upon. The presentation concluded that there was a strong need for a full time governance and policy person to work with the Project and, indeed to coordinate and liaise across the entire ASCLME Programme.

In the presentation, the PD also noted that within the early stages of the LME approach, scientists and technicians are generally well engaged. Now, within the ASCLME Project, steps are increasingly being taken to involve senior decision-makers at the "Policy level", but sometimes the Directors [of Institutes and other bodies] and Private Sector decision-makers can be unintentionally excluded or ignored, which can be dangerous to the long term sustainability of the process; it was felt to be essential that one does not miss the "Directive level".

In terms of engaging the policy-makers at an early stage to encourage ownership and political support, he emphasised that there may be existing Policy level meeting(s) upon which this process can dovetail; such meetings should be identified and the appropriate connections in order to engage all those involved in Policy-level decision-making and acting upon Policy.

The Chair enquired whether "Policy level" referred to Permanent Secretary/ or Director-General level involvement? He noted that it would be important to engage at the higher Ministerial level at least once or twice in the duration of the Programme. He stated that SADC ministers get together once a year, and that as most project signatory countries are SADC members, perhaps those meetings represent a potential avenue of opportunity for the Project?

The PD responded that from his experience, it is essential to engage at Minister or Deputy Minister level in order to ensure that the LME process is truly effective. He suggested that a body like the African Union could be a possible avenue through which this might be achieved as well as through SADC as suggested. He noted that one potential problem is that there are so many Ministers, not only from all the countries, but also different Ministries within the countries whose jurisdictions may overlap on the LME SAP implementation; getting all these Ministers together at once seems very unlikely.

The Chair remarked that this issue should be addressed early on and enquired as to what level did the Steering Committee think it appropriate to engage?

It was suggested that the Nairobi Convention is a biannual event which could be used; it brings together Ministers of the Environment from all the Project countries. It was noted, however, that in terms of the overall ASCLME Programme objectives, that meeting is not attended by Fisheries Ministers.

The PD noted that if the Steering Committee approved the hire of a Policy Coordinator, he envisaged that one of that person's primary functions would be to identify where this policy level group would sit, across ministries, if necessary through multiple avenues.

It was noted that the Programme must engage with the Policy level early on. What details should be given to Ministers, and at what time? A suggestion was made that a two-tier approach was taken with regards to engaging the Policy Level. Firstly, the Programme should engage with the Permanent Secretary/Director-General (PS/DG) level right throughout the Programme's life. At some time during the lifespan of the Programme, the Ministers must also be engaged. He noted that getting all nine country Ministers in one gathering, let alone across all the relevant ministries would be virtually impossible. It was observed that if communication is maintained with PS/DGs throughout the Programme, then there is a good chance the document [SAP] will be accepted. Another tier of engagement was suggested, at the ministerial level, which would be more 'opportunistic'. Two existing forums were suggested: Firstly, Ministers of the Environment could be engaged during a Bureau of the Nairobi Convention, particularly if one or two ministers are available for a focussed meeting. Alternatively, the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMSEN) could be used to brief environment ministers on the process of the ASCLME Programme, and this would keep all the ministers involved. A caveat was that it would be very hard to get all Ministers in one go, so several approaches would likely be needed. Two examples of important policy level meetings, where the policy director of ASCLMEs should engage, were given:

African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (ASMEN)

It was noted that the AMSEN meeting was coming up in June. It was suggested that there might be options for making use of that meeting. Both the Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions would also be present and reporting to it. He felt that this could present the Project with opportunities.

The PD asked who should be approached to organise ASCLME Programme representation of some kind at AMSEN and either the Nairobi Convention (Dixon Waruinge) or the WIO-LaB (Peter Scheren) were proposed as possible contacts by the Committee.

Meeting of the Southwest Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission

It was noted that another important ministerial forum would be the South Western Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (SWIOFC). The next meeting would be in Madagascar

sometime in October or November, but not yet finalised and would offer good opportunity to raise awareness in the countries, particularly in the fisheries sector.

The PD noted he had been unable to attend the previous SWIOFC meeting due to other commitments and a lack of support staff which he noted would shortly be resolved.

An enquiry was made as to the availability of funding for the policy level position and the PD responded by assuring that such provision had been made through staff priority shuffling, noting that despite this re-organisation since the original Project Document suggestions, the new suggested staff complement would now better enable the Programme/Project to fulfil outcomes.

The Chair called for objections; none were received; the creation of the post and circulation of a draft ToR were **AGREED** with the following additional observations:

- It would be vital that someone who has a very good knowledge of the region would be able to contribute to the Programme in this capacity.
- It would be useful if the SC member from the Nairobi Convention were to be prepared to assist in the preparations of a ToR for this position. The SC member from the Nairobi Convention agreed.
- It was also suggested that the TOR be circulated to all of the SC for approval and/or amendment. He suggested the title of the position would be *Policy and Governance Coordinator (P&G C)*.
- It was further suggested that a more diffuse network of national people based in the countries might be warranted. Whilst the ToR would be developed for a regional position, there should be local equivalent to translate the information and approach to the local conditions existing in the countries. The Coordinator could also visit the countries and direct efforts on the ground. Potentially, this approach could be complimented by having a team at national level within each country. A particular person or an institution as some kind of focal point for this in-country activity might be required. The PD noted this was an excellent suggestion and would only serve to improve country 'buy-in'. He requested that this Policy and Governance should have a focal point in each country to for the Coordinator to 'coordinate' with, whether this was an individual, committee or institution.

Administration and Management Procedures

Dr. David LaRoche, who had been the Project Manager during preparation of the ASCLMEs project, noted that some areas of his requested presentation ([Annex 11](#)) had already been covered by the PD and that the Steering Committee had already raised and considered many of the points he was going to discuss. He summarised what the PD had suggested as the ASCLME Project structure as being:

8. A Programme Policy Committee (PPC): This will be a higher level committee advising all three ASCLME Programme projects (ASCLME, SWIOFP, WIO-LaB) and providing guidance at the policy level towards the development of effective TDAs and SAPs.
9. A Programme Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC): This will be a technical level group comprised of the 3 project managers and key invited experts, coordinating action across projects. Although not originally foreseen in the Project Document the Steering Committee recommended inclusion of ReCoMaP on this Committee as well as other relevant regional initiatives.
10. A Project Steering Committee (PSC): This would consist of
 - 3.A. A core membership including one representative from each GEF eligible Country, one representative from each of ACEP, UNDP, NEPAD, GEF, UNOPS and the Nairobi Convention, and the Project Managers of the other regional Sister Projects under the ASCLME Programme (WIO-LaB, SWIOFP) as well as ReCoMaP The Steering Committee also agreed that Somalia should have a special status as a Country Observer.
 - 3.B. A stakeholder membership of additional observer members as agreed by the PSC Core Membership. This would include donor agencies providing co-finance (e.g. France, Norway) as well as technical agencies (e.g. NOAA, FAO)), and anyone else invited by the PSC to attend.
11. Project Coordination Unit (PCU) – based in Grahamstown.
12. Cruise Coordination Group (CCG) (Subset of PCC): This group would aim to ensure the most efficient use of ship’s time amongst the Projects. It would also coordinate the inputs from the individual national cruise coordinators.
13. Inter-Ministerial Committees (building on existing IMCs in each country as per the WIO-LaB project).
14. TDA/SAP Preparation Teams

He noted that the Project needs a policy coordinator, who would be able to naturally communicate at the right time with the right people to turn good science into good policy.

The Project Steering Committee’s composition was decided upon by the Project Steering Committee in the preparation phase of the Project. The PSC can control membership of SC as required. Some members invited as observer status; Donor and technical agencies, private sector, NGOs etc. are to be invited as necessary.

ASCLME PSC meetings should be aligned with other project SC meetings at the same time, so that they can best use Steering Committee members time, and to serve as a

stimulus to attend, so that members don't have to spend so much time in meetings or travelling to them. ASCLME will need to work very closely with SWIOFP, WIO-LaB, maybe RECOMAP and others.

Dr. LaRoche recommended the adoption of the two day meeting format which this meeting followed, with the first day as a SC meeting, with a second day, encompassing the broader stakeholder community. Countries will need to drive the project, and gain a real sense of ownership. If no country ownership is evident, the Programme is not going to work. The suggestion was to make day one a narrow version comprising the SC with just a few observers or sister projects and others as warranted, whilst the second day would be at a more technical level based on previous days discussions, and be more inclusive of the stakeholder community.

The PD remarked that he was very interested to hear the Steering Committee's opinions on this matter, as the reason this format was adopted was because the countries specifically requested that they would prefer a meeting first without observers to discuss procedural issues, country ownership and so on, in the comfort of a small group without so many outside observers. The Project Director received a formal communication from Kenya on this, requesting a meeting as the countries and Permanent Steering Committee members only. This meeting represented the countries and the Programmes; all attendees were either country representatives or part of the ASCLME Programme or its management structures. Dr Vousden expressed his comfort in being able to speak candidly with the countries in this format; whilst some outside people might have useful inputs, they aren't in a position to make *decisions* on the same basis as the countries, and potential for agenda-pushing by outside agencies should be eliminated. He noted a concern that it would be difficult to decide this in the following day's meeting when observers would be present.

Discussion of this suggestion followed, and the following points or suggestions were made.

It was suggested that it would be prudent to go through the two days and see if the PSC liked this format; and, if successful, this decision could be made following the close of the meeting and while there was some support for the two day meeting to begin with the smaller SC meeting without observers, it was generally agreed that the two day format would be suitable for reasons outlined by the PD, who summarized that the dedicated SC meeting on the second day would ensure that issues raised in larger format could be discussed by the SC.

The Status of Somalia within the Project

The PD asked the steering committee what their stance on the status of Somalia should be. Somalia was to be represented at this meeting as an Observer, but the Steering Committee must decide if they wish to include Somalia as full members of the Steering Committee. If the steering committee did not feel it would be appropriate to have Somalia as a full member of the core Steering Committee, then perhaps another status could be created. He

said this was just a suggestion, not a proposal, and would like to hear the Steering Committee's opinions and decision on this matter.

It was recalled similar discussions took place in SWIOFP during the preparation phase. Most of the time they relied on the World Bank position on Somalia. The World Bank advised that they couldn't recognise Somalia as part of projects. If that was still the case, then he stated his objection to them being full members of the Steering Committee.

After considerable discussion it was concluded that Somalia could have "Observer Country" status, a role in which it had been invited to the present SC meeting. Some additional points that were made on this question included:

- That the position taken by the CoP [Nairobi Convention] requested UNEP to support Somalia in its efforts to improve environmental management. This point was made very forcefully by the Minister from Somalia at a meeting.
- That the logistical problems surrounding Somalia's involvement were fairly simple. Firstly, UNDP *cannot* engage in work within Somalia; and cannot put funding or risk the welfare of its people in Somalia; he thought the Somalis understood this position and the reasons for it, but that he agreed that all wished to assist the country however possible.
- That it is very clear that UNDP cannot send *people* into Somalia.
- That funding can be provided for a delegate from Somalia to attend SC meetings as observers.
- That ASCLMEs projects could spend money in Somalia in a way that would enable a Somalian organisation to then collect data with local employees on behalf of the Project(s), as long as it could be demonstrated that the funds were being used correctly.
- That rendering Somalia Observer Status would greatly benefit to development of a TDA/SAP that was more representative of the Somali Current, rather than just the East African sub-LME.

The presentation of Dr. LaRoche was continued. He noted that SWIOFP still needs a few last signatures before that project can be launched, but then the 3 projects can blend the creation of these inter-ministerial committees and meld with work done by WIO-LaB to implement overall Programme-level Policy and Coordination frameworks.

As a next part of the presentation/discussion it was noted that there have been complaints from some countries about research ships coming into their territorial waters, and not sharing data; this was considered to be a serious problem. The Cruise Coordination Group

should try to minimize – and if possible eliminate – this, and ensure countries get data and/or participate in cruises, and that country data needs will be met by cruises coming into the region wherever feasible.

A question was asked about the composition of the cruise committee, enquiring as to why the Sustainable Seas Trust (SST) was not represented. It was his understanding that SST was a likely vehicle for long term sustainability in the region, and asked why they were also not a member of the Steering Committee. It was noted that SST is not currently represented on the CCG, however, but the CCG will liaise with all other relevant parties and coordinate with anyone, including SST. It was further noted that SST is intended to represent more than just cruises, but that a formal presentation by the SST would be given later in the meeting.

Mr. Laroche noted that following an initial request from Mauritius, it had been suggested that ASCLME needs an MoU on data secrecy to safeguard “proprietary”, or otherwise sensitive data obtained within the respective EEZs; countries should have right to hide sensitive data. If the SC is happy with this, then a document should be drafted for circulation and agreement. Comment from several SC members reinforced that a request such as that from Mauritius has clear basis in existing international law.

Additional discussion on the issue of the CCG included:

- That there should be more representation within the CCG on behalf of each participating country. If a MoU were to be signed, it would only be fair that each country be a member of the group.
- That the intention is to hold a small cruise workshop in each country, with scientific and technical inputs (and representation of a nominated representative from that in-country cruise group on the Project/Programme CCG).
- That any cruise emerging from the CCG should be sent to PSC for approval and input on expected datasets and cruise/station plans. Cruise planning and coordination represents a significant and complex process. This should involve country representatives.

Special note was taken of the key word *process*, mentioned by Prof. Skelton; a process for cruise planning and coordination must be created. It may not be the appropriate time to resolve this now. But the country contact point works with cruise planners and helps to govern how data will be used. This can be worked out, there needs to be a process that goes from macro to micro. In-country cruise working groups should also assist the CCG with appropriate and timely granting of research cruise permits across all relevant government departments. Previous projects have sometimes had difficulties in this regard, notably ACEP. Such permitting procedures represent a vital step in the overall cruise planning process which is often neglected until quite late in the process. Perhaps such in-country working groups should ensure appropriate representation by research permitting bodies within their membership.

The SC Observer representing SWIOFP remarked that he recently gave the PD a copy of the MoU developed by SWIOFP to cover data sharing and access. ASCLME may be able to learn from the SWIOFP experience; he suggested that ASCLME can now go through it, and borrow what the Project Director thinks is suitable. It took a long time for the countries to agree on the SWIOFP MoU on this topic.

Other observations and comments regarding Mr. Laroche's presentation included:

- A notation that WIO-LaB only has two remaining active years, so it would be important to coordinate very closely in terms of TDA/SAP preparation as soon as possible.
- A request was made to see an organigram for the Project, which was then displayed. It was noted that the organigram he represented is old. A feature worth noting was the science review process. During implementation, people involved in science need to review the science, both for political "saleability" and implementation, it should be peer-reviewed and published. The ASCLME timeframe was increased from 4 to 5 years to assure that all of the work that comes out of the cruises and workshops will have to go through peer review and allow time for publication of work.

There were questions about the Project SC (PSC) versus a Programme Advisory Committee (PAC). In the medium or long term, would there be a move from PSC to just PAC meetings? Right now, what was suggested is to have a Programme Coordination layer, which just adds complexity and more meetings. It would be worthwhile to economise time, as the various Project Steering Committees and their members need to meet so many times already. Effectively, the PAC and PSC are very similar, so could they not be combined/merged? Was it considered important by the SC to keep the PSC as it is, with an additional PAC?

The Chair shared his experience, that through the various projects and programmes he had been involved in, it would be worthwhile collapsing management structures as far as possible. If major policy issues are being dealt with a dedicated policy meeting can be called, but in the past, there was usually very little need for that.

The PD recommended that holding meetings back to back to save money and time makes a great deal of sense as many of the delegates attend more than one of the Project meetings. If, for example, a WIO-LaB, meeting is held, a day before or after a meeting for ASCLME would be held and before or after that, one for SWIOFP and so on. The PCU are always looking to make things logistically simpler and cheaper. He noted that a final decision could not be made at the present time as only one Project SC was fully represented. However, if many of the same people are represented in all 3 PSC meetings, then it would be worth amalgamating the steering committees. He suspected, however, that there will be differences between what would have to be discussed by the different PSC meetings i.e. Land Based issues and Oceanography are quite different; fisheries

management issues at the commercial level, are very different issues from those at the artisanal level, let alone relative to oceanography or land based sources of pollution. Although in some of the IW programmes it may work, his recommendation was to go with “plan A”, namely holding meetings on back-to-back basis, so that the projects can save money and share interests.

The WIO-LaB project manager noted that about 2 WIO-LaB SC meetings remained in the anticipated lifespan of his project. There would be some sense in overlapping the meetings, particularly in observers, and some of the NGOs; their next meeting was scheduled sometime in May, in that regard he didn't see any point in discussing this with only one full SC. He noted that the function of policy level coordination is rather different than working with the Programme at the technical level, where they have been working up until now; these have very different needs. A distinction should be made between technical and policy levels. On the subject of science validation, he felt that one of the functions of the SC was usually validation of the TDA and SAP; he felt it necessary to discuss this further after tea, as this group (Steering Committee) might not be the most appropriate one for validation.

Dr. LaRoche noted that validation was not a good choice of word in this context. But yes, the TDA and SAP need to be approved.

After a refreshment break, the meeting resumed discussion of the previous presentation. It was noted that in the presentation of Mr. LaRoche, the CCG will submit cruise plans to the SC. Now this SC meeting is nearly finished, and the next one would only be in June/July, would there have to have meetings between then and now, or would business be carried out through e-mail?

The Chair recommended that as there will be times when matters arise in between meetings, there should be regular emails between SC members and other relevant parties.

The PD strongly agreed and went on to say that he would have communication with all SC members between meetings. He noted that matters inevitably arise in between formal meetings which should undergo Steering Committee review, agreement and comment. Bigger and particularly complex policy decisions may have to wait, but day-to-day management decisions, at his discretion, must go to the SC regularly in order to give the SC opportunity to comment and be involved.

Review of Agenda for Tomorrow's Workshop

After brief discussion the Chair called for any objections by members of the Steering Committee to the Agenda that had been covered so far, and for the upcoming agenda for the second day of meetings? None were received and the agenda for the second day was **approved**.

The PD stated that a date for the next Steering Committee Meeting needed to be decided.

A question was raised as to whether there would be a closed core SC meeting at the end of the ongoing meeting. The PD replied that this should be decided later; he did not think it was needed at the moment, but if the members of the core Steering Committee felt that they wanted such a meeting, they should pass that request to the Chair before close of business. He then called for a date for the next meeting.

TDA Outputs

The WIO-LaB project manager wanted to raise one more point before scheduling the next meeting - validation of scientific outputs including the TDA, where or when was that being discussed, and the PM stated that it should be discussed immediately.

The Chair noted that there had been review processes on other programmes; this programme can learn from those. He did not consider these reviews as true scientific reviews, but there were scientists involved. The UNDP/GEF review process does not seem to be primarily a science review, but as this first phase will be very scientific, he thought that a specific scientific review process was warranted. He enquired whether this needed to be combined with or separate from a conventional UNDP/GEF Project review, and directed his reply to

The PD sought clarification on whether the Chair was proposing a review of the SAP at the same time as the Project Evaluation? He noted that there would be both the midterm and final review, as standard for projects like this. He could foresee perhaps holding a scientific symposium that brings the stakeholder community up to speed with the Project/Programme findings. As far as SAP review, this requires a specific review process.

The following additional comments were noted:

That a specific scientific peer review process was a novel approach in addition to Project Evaluation, a standard UNDP requirement.

That the Technical Advisory Committee [PCC] should look at outputs and do peer review on a scientific basis. For the TDA, WIO-LaB has convened a Scientific and Technical Committee. The review would take place not only by them but also by scientists from their institutions not represented on the Committee.

That the panel approach had merit in that pieces of the TDA would have already have been peer reviewed; the socio-economic study, for example, would have been peer-reviewed before acceptance. The idea of a panel to review the whole TDA makes sense.

The PM noted that almost every piece of data would go through a quality review process. Clarification was sought as to who would carry out this quality review process. The PM replied that the Steering Committee would select appropriate people. For the oceanography component(s), for example, the SC would select the right people, regionally and/or internationally. He recommended that the PCU of ASCLME talk to WIO-LaB

about a suitable Peer Reviewer selection process and present a proposal for Steering Committee consideration.

The Chair noted that one could either appoint a panel from eminent scientists, or you appoint a BENEFIT-style panel. He stressed the need to be aware of regional concerns like transformation and this should be kept in mind when considering a proposal for the Steering Committee.

It was further suggested that the SC should reflect on why this process was undertaken, namely to enable governments to implement the SAP. As was discussed early on, governments must have the feeling that that is indeed what the projects are doing, so the people doing the review must be people that the governments feel will supply appropriate science from people they trust. He considered that scientifically correct documents would no doubt come out of the process, but are they *politically correct*? He noted that FARI represented a forum of eminent Directors of Institutions who are scientifically and politically sensitive in the regional context.

The PM concluded the discussion by observing that the TDA needs to be agreed as fact, and could not really be swayed by political concerns; such concerns were perhaps better addressed in the SAP process.

The Chair called for Any Other Business.

Next Steering Committee Meeting

It was noted that during May in Mauritius, WIO-LaB was to hold a meeting. The possibility of holding the next Steering Committee meeting at that time was discussed but the SC felt that might be too early. The possibility to have WIO-LaB postpone their meeting to a slightly later date was discussed.

It was noted that in terms of May/June, the dates were provisionally set. Dates had been sent to the government of Mauritius, but no feedback had yet been received. The UNDP Resident Representative for Mauritius and the Mauritius SC member thought that a May/June timeframe for a joint SC meeting was a good suggestion.

After considerable further discussion it was decided that if it were feasible to have the next Steering Committee as early as June then the PCU should aim to have the next meeting just before the AMSEN meeting in June, and inform the Steering Committee in due course. It was further agreed that the projects within the ASCLMEs Programme would consult on this, and that perhaps a slot at the MSEN meeting should be sought to give Ministers an overview of the Programme. Last, it was agreed that in a two day SC meeting the first day would be committed to stakeholder participation and comment and the second day to a PSC meeting of SC members.

With that, the Chair called on the Mauritius Resident Representative (RR) to close the meeting.

The RR thanked the Chair, and David for his presentations. He wished to underline two points of reflection he had during the meeting, but before doing that thanked the participants who had contributed, not only on how to pronounce some difficult acronyms, but for their other invaluable input as well. He saw two major nexuses, one being the region/country nexus. He noted that one tends to emphasise projects as being anchored to a country, making them more effective. But beyond that, without the countries acting together, it makes no sense. Regional issues need regional input; it is vital to ensure regional issues are reflected at country level. He saw the second nexus as being the science/policy one. He stressed that science without policy will not go far; but noted that policy also required science to make informed decisions. He considered that a dichotomy between these two spheres was not needed. These projects should try to be on the forefront of influencing policy through sound information, and see how it is feasible to do so. He noted that there had been many propositions for collaboration between organisations; he considered the Steering Committee as a group should feel comfortable with the results of this day. He finally thanked all for their inputs, and looked forward to the next day's meeting.

Proceedings of the ASCLME Inception Workshop - January 23rd 2008

See Annex 2 (below) for Attendance List

The Project Director (PD) opened the proceedings with a brief welcome and introduced Mr. Claudio Caldarone, the Resident Representative of the UNDP for Mauritius and Seychelles, who welcomed the delegates and thanked the host country, South Africa.

The Steering Committee (SC) representative from South Africa, Dr. Johann Augustyn, then welcomed the delegates on behalf of South Africa. He noted that the BCLME Project enjoyed political success early on, and that the ASCLME should seek this support early in its life. He stated that collaboration between countries would lead to better and more effective management of regional and transboundary concerns.

Ms. Akiko Yamamoto, Regional Portfolio Manager, IW Projects, Eastern and Southern Africa (UNDP) welcomed delegates on behalf of the UNDP-GEF. She stated that UNDP are accountable to GEF to ensure that the funding received from GEF will show results and ensure that effects will last beyond the implementation phase, by “mainstreaming” the SAP into country policy across the region. There exists an established TDA/SAP process. 2 TDAs and 2 SAPs for this Programme will be created across the three sister projects. She stressed that it would be important to avoid duplication and maximise synergies between all regional GEF projects that affect MPAs, CZM and LME management. UNDP would like to ensure the success of BCLME is duplicated, and that prior lessons learnt would be reflected in this workshop.

She described two objectives for this part of the ASCLME project meeting: first, in terms of the overall Objective, there is a need to review outcomes and outputs with expertise in the region; second, there is a need to review the total work-plan and budget, taking into consideration that the Project Document was finalised some time ago and may therefore need changes in order to make delivery more rational. Much of this review has already been accomplished on the first day of the meetings by the core Steering Committee members.

The PD then gave a brief overview of the core Steering Committee meeting on the previous day, which had been called for by the countries themselves, primarily to discuss procedural matters, which he said was successful, informative and useful. He remarked on the good cooperation evident between countries and Programme sister agencies. The Work Programme was reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee, the budget discussed, and the meeting reached a successful conclusion. He noted that one point emerged clearly as being of particular importance, namely how vital the issues of policy and governance are to the success of the LME process; this one of the five LME modules usually gets the least attention from Projects and Programmes. He remarked that the TDA and SAP need to move forward in concert, together with a simultaneous process of awareness-raising and sensitisation at the policy level, so key decision-makers are aware

of the TDA process and so that when the SAP arrives, it does not represent a mysterious and unexpected document. He stated that a very specific mechanism that would focus on briefing and informing the policy level stakeholders was discussed and provisionally agreed upon, namely that there should be a dedicated section and activity within the project coordination unit specifically to ensure this vital module receives appropriate attention. He expressed his opinion that it would be appropriate for a member country to take the chair for the day's proceedings, and proposed that the country participants should select a chair for the meeting.

Election of Chair-Person

The SC member from Kenya, Mr. Harrison On'ganda welcomed the new participants, and proposed that Magnus Ngoile from Tanzania should be elected as Chair. As there were no objections to this proposal, Mr Ngoile assumed the Chair.

The PD offered apologies on behalf of Ali Mohammed from NEPAD, who had recently sent notice that he would be unable to attend either day of the meetings.

The Chair apologized for having missed the first day of the meeting due to travel difficulties, and hoped the Chair from the previous day, Johann Augustyn, would provide input and guidance where necessary.

The delegates then briefly introduced themselves to the meeting.

The PD mentioned that Claire Attwood, who was tasked with developing media press releases and so on, would be circulating around the delegates and may have discussions with delegates, and requested their cooperation. He then stressed that there was a great deal of ground to cover in this workshop. In this context pointed out that he had a number of presentations which it was necessary for him to give in order to define the current status of the project and its future needs and deliverables but that he wanted to emphasise that his presentations were not to be taken as being proscriptive and were very much open to discussion, debate and review within the overall context and objective of the Project Document. If changes had to be made for the sake of achieving a more rational work-plan and set of deliverables then now was the time to address this. He requested that delegates particularly mention areas where they feel gaps may be present within the proposed plan, and what actions might be needed to address these.

Summary and Update of the ASCLME Programme and Project

The PD began with a presentation summarising and updating the current status of the ASCLME Programme and Project [[Annex 12](#)] One particular point that was stressed during this presentation was the critical importance of capturing the support of policy-makers at an early stage and how the development of clear socio-economic indicators will be particularly important in engaging such policy-level support for the LME approach in the region. Ho noted that the previous day's Steering Committee had discussed this and agreed on some specific actions to support this requirement.

The SC member from the Comoros enquired why under the Data Management area, it had been said that data will be stored by the Project until a repository was agreed. Why not in country now? He also mentioned the existence of the clearing-house mechanism. He felt that a true sense of ownership of the Project would only be felt if the countries had ownership of the data. In the event of its being stored somewhere in South Africa, he didn't feel a sense of ownership. He mentioned a perception that ACEP/SAIAB had done cruises in Comoros and that the data were apparently not repatriated to the Comoros. He felt it important to change the tendency of outside agencies to collect data and not repatriate it; a true sense of ownership would only be instilled once countries have access and house their own data.

The PD fully endorsed and sympathised with the concerns raised and sought to allay these concerns by better clarification of the intent. He said that by "storing" data in the PCU, he did not wish to imply that new project data would be exclusively housed within the PCU and only be accessible through the PCU. All data would be shared with the appropriate countries and would be accessible to the LME management process as a whole. He clarified that the initial responsibility rests with the country to provide country-level data to the Project for use in gaps analysis and in development of the TDA. He wanted to emphasise that such data sent by the countries to the PCU will be safely and appropriately stored by the project. However, the sovereign rights of the countries to proprietary or sensitive data would be retained. Where applicable to the various countries, and under appropriate agreements, it will be shared, but ultimately, the data will belong to the countries and will be stored in the countries as well as in the PCU.

The Observer from the NOAA, which he noted had been involved in the LME process for a long time, wanted to commend the PD on an outstanding presentation, and identifying the key issues that make an LME project different from many other project types that have a clearly defined start and an end. He particularly supported the concept as presented that LME projects instead have a start (in terms of work) and a beginning (in terms of actual implementation). The importance of governance is paramount from the earliest stages of the project process; however, the end of the project phase that creates the TDAs and the SAPs is not the end of the overall process, as the LME approach is intended to be a long-term, country-based management approach to resource management. Policy-level engagement and involvement in the Guinea Current LME has gone through two political parties successfully (in Ghana). In this context he noted with some interest that the opposition presidential candidate for Ghana will already know about GCLME if he comes into power. This point was made to highlight the importance of policy level 'buy-in' at an early stage and the identification of governance processes as a high priority.

The Chair enquired as to whether all the deliverables were achievable given the resources had remained the same but the scope of the project had increased. Discussion followed and a number of observations and comments were made. It was noted that it was not entirely accurate to state that the resources remained the same. They are, however, insufficient for comprehensive data-gathering at the field level, particularly from coastal areas. In this context it was seen as important to understand that the TDA and SAP process was not a 'one-off' approach but should be seen as a dynamic and continuous

process that would need to be improved and expanded as resources and time allowed. The TDA and SAP process therefore transcend the life of the initial ASCLME Project and can and should be added to and improved as part of the on-going LME management approach. In order to respond to this need it was therefore important to design a sustainable LME management approach that included appropriate mechanisms for reviewing gaps and needs, and addressing those gaps and needs (i.e. through on-going monitoring and data analyses)

It was also noted that the extra inclusions in the delivery from the project (e.g. coastal artisanal fisheries, larval transport, socio-economics, etc) had addressed critical gaps which would be vital to the development of effective TDAs and SAPs and thus critical to the overall success of the Project. The inclusion of the inshore, coastal fisheries modules also made the Project more appropriate to the needs of the coastal communities and thus more relevant to the concerns of policy-makers and would result in stronger support than a purely 'blue-water' oceanography project might have received. Ultimately, they have brought the project a human aspect, and far from being a strain on the budget, will be integral to its success.

The PD recognised, however, that the budgetary concerns were very valid and had been an issue since the Project started. In order to address this concern, the PD and the PCU had undertaken a revision of the project, whilst still staying within the guidelines of the Project Document. This had been presented to the Steering Committee and approved by them the previous day. The changes are not huge, as the outcomes remain the same. However, a more appropriate and logical set of activities and deliverables have been put forward which now serve to address many of the concerns raised regarding the expanded requirements for information capture for the TDA process.

There was some discussion of previous LME projects, particularly the BCLME. It was noted that this project will be very different to BCLME, primarily due to the importance and impacts of artisanal and subsistence fisheries on the east coast of Africa and within the western Indian Ocean. The other GEF projects (WIO-LaB & SWIOFP) are missing this component, despite its importance, and therefore the responsibility has fallen to the ASCLME project to fill this gap. But in view of the limited resources given by GEF, it is now vital to prioritise on information capture and much of the information used for populating the TDAs will, as a matter of financial constraint, have to come from existing data. The improvements and streamlining done to the project activities should help considerably but we will still need to go back to the experts in the region and ask what the priorities are and what is most vital to concentrate on, particularly in terms of A. coastal subsistence and artisanal fisheries data and B. offshore within the limits of the 200 or so days of ships time. Also we need to identify what valuable socio-economic information can be gathered on a limited budget? The ultimate goal of the revision to the Project activities was to fill the TDA and the 5 modules of the SAP with the most important management information we can obtain over the lifespan and within the budget of the Project.

The Observer from the RECOMAP commented that the above discussion highlighted the need for regional inter-programme coordination. ReCoMaP, a €10m programme, have a lot of resources to deliver at the coastal level. Activities between these two projects could perhaps be coordinated by partitioning activities or geographical areas. Aside from these two initiatives, there are other regional programmes run by Conservation International and WWF particularly on MPA issues, and many other important sub-national projects doing relevant work. At some stage it should be defined what projects work on what issues.

The Chair summarized the discussion and concluded that the various comments and feedback indicated that people understood the issues at hand, and that additions and amendments made since the original project document are extremely important. Funds will be insufficient to do all the work that might be envisaged, so careful strategies will have to be created to do the required work. It will be important to build and maintain the correct perceptions of the Project and LME process in the region, as the wrong perceptions can be very damaging. The Monitoring and Evaluation process needs to be strong. Ultimately, a practical TDA and SAP are required. It should be a target to coordinate with and make best use of existing funding in the region by communicating with the other projects in the region, find synergies and avoid duplication.

The Chair called upon the PD to continue with the second part of his presentation. (*Update on Implementation Progress during Inception Phase (October – December 2007)*) [[Annex 13](#)]. The presentation covered the various activities undertaken related to project Inception and Implementation (including office procurement, recruitment, attendance at regional meetings, etc). On conclusion of the presentation, the PD echoed Dr. Ngoile's sentiment that the lack of questions from the floor did not indicate a lack of interest, but was more a reflection of the fact that the room was already well informed and had already discussed many of the issues on the previous day.

The PD concluded his remarks related to the presentation by noting that the point raised earlier by ReCoMaP regarding the need for close coordination between the various national and regional initiatives related to the coastal and marine environment was particularly important. He suggested that there is often a lot of talk about coordination, but that it rarely happens effectively. If a way can be found to link project activities in the region, this may be a way of addressing many shortcomings in the financial situations of various initiatives. He stated that he would be in touch with ReCoMaP and other regional projects in due course to examine potential partnerships.

The Chair commended the PD on project progress made to date,

A question was raised as to whether an attempt was being made to reflect the different nations involved in the Project through the staffing of the project, particularly as it can help in long-term sustainability of the LME process.

The PD responded that in any recruitment process, the best and most appropriate person should be appointed to the job on the basis of merit. Efforts were being made to ensure the recruitment and selection process is done throughout the region. The selection process is

done independently by more than one person based on responses to advertisement. So far, there has been very close agreement on short-listings for suitable candidates. However, it is not easy to find suitably qualified candidates within the region and this reflects the fact that one of the aims of the project is to address the lack of regional capacity in these fields. He noted that there were more trained, qualified and experienced people in South Africa than in the other countries, and applicants from there usually have stronger backgrounds and CVs. In this context he felt it was appropriate to use expert skills from the region to build capacity rather than to bring such expertise in from outside the region, and that using experts from one participating country to capacity build trainees from other participating countries seemed both appropriate and desirable. The UNDP ensures that there is transparency and correct procedures are followed in the recruitment process. Other criteria could also be used to assess candidates. These included language capacity in the regional languages. In terms of the Policy and Governance Coordinator's post, the relationship with key policy makers in the region would also be a critical selection requirement.

The PD also pointed out that the limited project budget meant that generally local recruitment could only be considered, which does not allow for relocations costs and other international recruitment bonuses. This meant that there was an inevitability that a high proportion of the recruitment resources would be going into South Africa, which was a reflection of the fact that South Africa was making the largest contribution in terms of in-kind funding, particularly in hosting the PCU and providing research vessels. In order to balance this, it was suggested that more activities and resources should be mobilised at the country level thus providing important capacity building funds to other participating countries. This could include having designated support staff in various countries. Steering Committee members are generally busy people and having some level of support staff in-country, even temporary or short-term, would be valuable.

Following a short break, Dr. David Laroche, the Project Manager during the preparation phase of the ASCLME project then gave a presentation on a *Review of the TDA and SAP Delivery Requirements for the ASCLME Project/Programme*. [[Annex 14](#)]

He noted that the ASCLME Programme was originally going to be four projects; the fourth was going to address issues in the coastal zone, but never materialised. Issues of coastal fisheries, communities and socio-economics were not therefore really addressed in the three projects. Realising this oversight, GEF and the participating countries added these important issues to the ASCLME Project.

The Chair commented that the region has previously acted in concert through mechanisms such as SWIOFC and the Nairobi Convention, spanning both LMEs. By doing 2 TDA/SAPs, would this not break continuity? It was pointed out that this was the approach agreed by the countries with GEF. The SWIOFC and the Nairobi Convention were more political in nature and spanned two LMEs not one so it was not a matter of continuity but more one of the ecosystem approach being addressed within the wider political sphere.

The WIO-LaB Project Manager expressed concern about the Programme-level creation and implementation of the TDA/SAP process, as WIO-LaB has already been going for

several years, whilst the other two projects are only starting now. It was noted that the purpose of the three projects was to produce a combined TDA and SAP delivery and that the delays in implementation between the three projects had not been expected. However it was not the intention that the delay in delivery from ASCLME and SWIOFP should hold back the countries from implementing the TDA/SAP findings and requirements resulting from WIO-LaB and that the implementation of that specific Land-Based SAP could feasibly go ahead prior to adoption and implementation of the overall LME SAP, most probably through the Nairobi Convention.

Concern was also raised regarding the inclusion of another level of bureaucracy in the Programme by way of a Programme level Steering Committee. It was clarified that this Committee was not supposed to be a Steering Committee as such but was supposed to be a Policy level guidance and advisory Committee made up of policy level country representatives (e.g. Permanent Secretaries, Director-generals, etc). The intention was not to create an additional level of bureaucracy, but to ensure that policy issues are dealt with at the programmatic level (i.e. at the level of the full LME TDAs and SAPs)

The PD noted that this had been discussed at the previous day's Steering Committee meeting. He clarified that the proposal was essentially two Programme level groups, a **Programme Technical Advisory Committee**, which would deal with inter-Project coordination, and a **Policy Coordination Committee** (although the names can be amended as appropriate) and the latter was essentially targeted at Permanent Secretary level and intended to engage the Policy-level in the TDA/SAP process. It would meet perhaps once a year, if possible. He also mentioned that the Steering Committee had proposed a two-tier approach for this Committee to try and target the ministerial level, as well as through opportunistic meetings linked to ministerial meetings of the AU or to AMCEN. This group was not intended as a Programme-level Steering Committee, usurping the Project-level Steering Committee functions. It was further explained that this needed to be viewed in the context of long-term sustainability. There probably would not be any Project-level Committees still existing in 15 years time, but a Programme level body should still be functional as part of the ongoing LME process.

It was suggested that it would be useful to see updated organigrams to examine linkages between the various projects and the programme level as it would give better insight into implementation. The PD agreed that these would be developed from the now-amended originals following the changes made by this Steering Committee, and would be circulated as soon as possible but certainly before the next Steering Committee meeting.

It was further noted that on the West Coast, the Benguela Current Commission (BCC) deals with LME issues. He enquired what the vision was for the East Coast in terms of long-term LME oversight. The South West Indian Ocean Commission exists to which SWIOFP will report, but that only covers fisheries. Will something similar to the BCC be implemented for the east coast LMEs? In response to this and other comments Dr. Laroche replied that this issue had been raised repeatedly during the preparation phase. Many people had questioned the need for a new body, when several, like IOC, IOTC, Nairobi Convention, exist, and could perhaps be slightly modified to fulfil this need. Two

very different LMEs are being covered here, and the only body that encompasses all the member countries is the Nairobi Convention, but this may not be an entirely suitable body, as the member institutions don't have the mandate to address all the Programme-level issues.

The PD added that the structure is being developed to negotiate at high level how the implementation of the SAP will happen; whilst discussions could carry on for a long time, ultimately, the decision-makers make the final choices. This is another strong justification for strengthening the policy and governance activities of the ASCLME Project and for the need for a coordinated Policy level Programme Committee.

Dr. Laroche returned to the issue of timetabling the TDA/SAP process mentioned by Peter Scheren. He suggested that there may be problems, but the greatest problem might be placing multiple TDA/SAPs in front of Ministers for their signatures. Explaining the multiple-project approach to the Minister and making them understand the whole suite of projects might be impossible in the short contact time usually granted by Ministers.

The floor noted that what Ministers really want is options for potential models from which to work. These models can then be debated for their good and bad points and feasibility when the PSs or Ministers get together. It was also noted that there seemed to be some confusion regarding the SAP. The SAP is not a proscriptive and fixed process but is negotiable. Each country has an opportunity to adjust the SAP to their local conditions. The SAP must take into consideration existing processes and strategies at both the regional and national level. UNDP emphasises that implementation must mainstream the SAP into national development policies and strategies, whilst remaining consistent with national policy. If it does not do this, the TDA/SAP process will face challenges.

It was suggested that the structure and delivery of the TDAs and SAPs within the context of the three Projects and the overall Programme could be made an agenda item for the next Steering Committee Meeting as these issues clearly needed more time for debate and so as to allow the current meeting to move ahead.

The SC member from the Nairobi Convention questioned why, if WIO-LaB products could be ready in 2009, should they wait until 2013 for implementation?

The Chair stressed the importance of careful planning to incorporate what could have been done in 6 TDA/SAPs into only two. Early engagement of the Policy level to foster understanding will be critical, and it will be important to show delivery and positive impacts within the countries if the SAP is to be signed. He suggested if WIO-LaB had found urgent and pressing problems, a means to implement corrective measures before 2013 should be found. Creation of a long-term mechanism for SAP implementation and monitoring is something that can be considered in the future. Steering Committee members should foster understanding within their countries.

Offshore data capture for the LMEs - The Oceanographic Component of the ASCLME Project

Johann Lutjeharms then gave a presentation entitled *Offshore Data Capture for LMEs – Priority areas within the two LMEs requiring further knowledge on biological, chemical and physical parameters using an ecosystem monitoring approach*. [[Annex 15](#)]. This constituted a brief overview of the oceanography of the region and the planned oceanographic work during the ASCLME project based on the priorities defined in the Project Document.

In summary, this region is one of the most poorly studied in the world; existing data sets show large gaps. A full-scale understanding of what is happening will take at least 30 years, and a great deal of resources. A prioritisation exercise has been conducted to try and decide what are the most critical areas for management-related understanding. One high priority must be a full survey of the east coast of Madagascar, which has not been done in the past; information will go right up to the coast and will be pertinent to inshore management and is therefore not just ‘blue water’ oceanography. Another priority is the Agulhas Bank which needs a synoptic survey that includes oceanography. Whilst a lot of fisheries work has been done on this Bank, the oceanography is relatively poorly studied. Kenya and Tanzania also have priority survey stations to be addressed through the Project and which also extend right up to the coast. It was noted, however, that the CSIR has been undertaking studies and research in Durban related to the movement of effluent discharged from pipelines (they wish to avoid pollution on the tourist beaches) showed that there was no way to understand inshore currents without a comprehensive understanding of the offshore currents and this needed to be taken into account when planning cruises. A study of at least one island system within the region is also proposed. Mauritius had been selected but the choice is flexible and it may be possible to include another island system, but there is no way to do all the islands or even one island in each country. The intention then would be to use this as a case study, and bring other island-based oceanographers onto the expedition to take part therefore building capacity in most of the islands.

So the first research cruise proposed would be for east Madagascar. Here it is important to do CTDs for the whole coastline in one cruise and this would represent the first time in the history of oceanographic research that this area would be surveyed. This should provide a whole new perspective on this ecosystem, defining what is there and allowing discussion to begin on how best to manage it. The fact that the survey is designed so that a lot of the stations go right to the coast is highly pertinent to the management of artisanal fisheries.

Professor Lutjeharms closed with the comment that this Project brings with it the promise of tremendous regional capacity in oceanography and understanding of the region’s oceanography. He believes that when we look back in 10 years time, we will be able to look back and say that the whole process of understanding has changed immeasurably due to the ASCLME.

The Chair enquired if sufficient ship time was available for all of the proposed work, and what was proposed for the Mascarene Plateau. Prof. Lutjeharms replied that he had examined the available ship’s time versus the survey needs and was confident that the proposed cruises could be scheduled fit into the currently available ship time. He repeated

that there is no way the entire region can be covered, and surveys on the Mascarene Plateau would constitute enormous distances for the ships to travel. He felt that proper modelling linked in with remote sensing information will be the only way the entire region can be covered at any level.

The SC member from South Africa enquired what ACEP's contributions had been and what it would contribute. Prof. Lutjeharms said that it was his understanding that ACEP was the mechanism by which South Africans would get involved in the ASCLME research and represented the bulk of South Africa's co-financing for the ASCLME.

The PD stated that this really stressed the importance of cruise coordination. Some ship's time from ACEP has been proposed, and it was understood that MCM will be allocating a number of days per annum for research in South African waters. The PCU is working hard to build relationships with ACEP and MCM so that we can more effectively access this time, particularly that which is directly relevant to the ASCLME priorities. It would seem sensible to deploy South African vessel(s) close to home, and the RV *Fridtjof Nansen* further afield, perhaps operating out of other ports along the eastern seaboard such as Maputo, Dar es Salaam and Mombasa. He addressed the issue of the Mascarene Plateau, noting that whilst cruises there would be ideal, in reality there are significant limitations by way of funds for purchasing ship's time that effectively means that a lot of the 'survey' effort for this area will have to be dealt with using Remote Sensing and Modelling, but he did emphasise that a greater understanding of this area will be vital in view of its forcing function for the ecosystems to the West. The addition of the Mascarene Plateau has been ratified by the countries and included by GEF, so it has to be addressed somehow. There is a table in the Project with a prioritised 'wish-list' of oceanographic research. Realistically it would not be possible to complete all of this research through the ASCLME Project. Therefore there needs to be further prioritisation in order to ensure capture of the key and critical information for development of the TDA. It was necessary to make a commitment to the East Madagascar cruise in order to ensure that ASCLME did not lose ships' time with the Nansen for 2008 (as this vessel is in great demand). The PCU will circulate a list of the proposed priorities for surveys to the countries for their consideration and approval.

It was suggested that another regional project to work with could be AMESD, which provides satellite imagery to African countries with EU funding. They could use cruise data to ground-truth their RS data.

A question was asked on how often CTD lines would be done; a true understanding of processes would realistically require repeat visits or other long-term data. Prof. Lutjeharms replied that this was a good solid scientific question; within the funding and availability of ship's time, repeat visits within the lifetime of the Project were not foreseen; Information gathered through RS data has not shown particularly large seasonality in many areas. Where there are known differences in seasons, more than one cruise is planned. In terms of deploying long-term instrumentation, this would be appropriate and desirable, but we would need a way of retrieving the instrumentation and data. Whether this is feasible or not would be easier to decide once there is a fuller cruise schedule.

The need for careful coordination of cruises between SWIOFP and ASCLME was stressed with a note that it is not always easy to share a ship for different functions. Prof. Lutjeharms replied that this had already been examined and SWIOFP intends to mainly use rented trawlers and was not planning to use the *Algoa* or the *Nansen*. However, where possible, sequential cruises should be to similar geographical areas in order to collect ecosystem level data that is directly compatible.

It was observed that the animation of the model shown by Prof. Lutjeharms showed the influence of eddies in the region and was it therefore planned to examine these features? Prof. Lutjeharms replied that they were blue-water oceanography, and not a priority within the bigger picture, at least for now. However, there is a cruise planned along the coastal areas of Mozambique which would cover some of eddies and their inshore effects. Again, modelling could be a very cost-effective way to gain a better understanding of these features and functions.

The Observer from THETIS added that their group (IRD/THETIS) planned to do observations concerning eddy productivity in the Mozambique Channel. Perhaps there can be some cooperation on cruise planning and data sharing.

The PD responded that he had developed a revised set of priorities based on time and available funds but that he was conscious of the fact that he had not yet had a chance to share with the countries, but have been discussing with the Platform (vessel) owners, as this requires early coordination. The next important step will be a cruise coordination workshop which would include SWIOFP. He noted that he had already spoken initially with Jean-Francois about THETIS and IRD, would certainly like data from the project, but if they have ship's time available, that would be even better. This also led him to note that there was originally a Cruise Coordinator in the agreement between ASCLME and SWIOFP, but this seems to have lapsed. ACEP may be able to assist ASCLME with their cruise coordination to some degree, but this would probably only be a temporary measure.

The Chair mentioned that in the past, data ownership had been a highly contentious issue, with most international cruises not repatriating data from the territorial waters in question. Countries have not felt ownership of cruises or data. It will be important to change the mindset from informing the countries that a ship will be there to having the countries inviting and welcoming the ships into their waters. He recommended the creation of a mechanism to quickly inform countries of the results of cruises. He said that there was sometimes too much of an emphasis on "capacity building" which ended up with qualified professors on board ships; instead have them aboard as true participants. "Working Groups" have often actually ended up as "Talking Groups". He felt it was time to change this approach and to try to ensure that participants have their names on the resulting documents and a sense of ownership. He stressed the need to make use of potential inter-project links like AMESD and THETIS.

The Observer from the Sustainable Seas Trust added that the technical expertise of the countries is often not represented on the Steering Committee. Yet such people should be

involved in the planning, not just receiving the documentation. But in this context there is still a clear need to develop capacity.

The PD replied that the Cruise Coordination Groups will be selected by the countries at the national level and will agree on their representation at the regional level. At the regional level it will include both oceanographers and the owners of the platforms. The intention is to ensure proper process and ownership in each country.

There was a brief session later in the day in which research cruise priorities were shown to the meeting. It was mentioned that ACEP could nearly double the available ships time, so this help would be gratefully received; ASCLME will be closely involved in the ACEP project selection. SWIOFP expressed concern about not being able to attend planning meetings as they were not yet up and running. The PD noted this and welcomed SWIOFP involvement at any stage.

Following the Lunch Break, Dr. Rudy van der Elst of the Durban-based Oceans Research Institute (ORI) gave a presentation entitled *Priorities for Data Capture within the LME Coastal Zones*.

He stressed that South Africa in particular had invested in much research in the Atlantic, due to the greater economic importance of this area to the nation. There is, however, huge under-reporting of artisanal catches in the ASCLME region; estimates suggest that 91% of the total catch in Mozambique is artisanal, and there is much greater economic dependence on this than on large industrialised fisheries such as the West Coast. There has been considerable work in developing small scale fisheries research in Mozambique. A related development is the WIOFISH project, <http://www.wiofish.org>. The socio-economic aspects of these fisheries are poorly understood. Quite a lot of non-peer-reviewed data is available. There is knowledge of what gaps there are, but this is not formally documented. In terms of improving livelihoods, an important aspect is improving delivery of catches to markets in good condition. Fishing is sometimes poor; fishing tourism may be a viable alternative. Until you can put a value on the economic activity, it is difficult to market to the policy level. In terms of governance, some good work is being done on existing legislative frameworks in the region, for instance TRANSMAP, <http://www.transmap.fc.ul.pt/>. Much of the information is available (as metadata) from <http://www.transmap-metadata.org.za/>. The relationship between different sectors is poorly understood; inshore fisheries may harvest juvenile prawns, affecting the industrial fishery, but local communities sometimes utilise trawler by-catch. Dynamite fishing is one destructive method that is often targeted, but there are others that would benefit from better management. HIV/AIDS is having a negative impact on labour-intensive fisheries. Impacts of natural disasters and coastal erosion are poorly understood. He noted that data and information capture for the TDA development process would focus on the standard LME five cross-cutting modules, namely: Productivity, Fish and Fisheries, Pollution and Ecosystem Health, Socio-economics and Governance. It is important that countries give input in these areas so that any gaps can be identified.

Following the presentation, there were a number of comments and responses. It was noted that there were many issues involved in ecosystem-based approaches to fisheries management. The proposed approach was seen to represent an opportunity to examine ecosystem processes and how they operate, which will require input from oceanographers. Also, it was noted that other projects working in LMEs may have useful information such as the Norwegian funded artisanal fishing programme in Angola and that it is vital that other work, such as things being done by e.g. ReCoMaP, is not duplicated but is recognised and captured within the ASCLME process.

Another comment focused on the importance of feeding information back to communities. SWIOFC had a task force to look into artisanal fishery data collection. Most countries now have some mechanism in place for doing this.

The PD welcomed this input and invited any guidance to the PCU on how to proceed. He suggested the preparation of a work plan or ToR on Coastal Zone issues to be circulated to the SC (to include a list of priorities for review and amendment) for comment and agreement. If necessary, this could lead to a separate workshop. He noted that it was now vital that countries confirm their priorities on all LME related issues and not just fisheries. He further pointed out that, in various discussions, there was some confusion over what “Transboundary” meant. Within the GEF LME context, it is the transboundary *effects* that are important and not necessarily specific transnational issues. For example, in the BCLME region, mangroves are only found in Angola, but the fisheries effects of their management affects all three countries, therefore they should be understood and addressed through the TDA, and their welfare should be considered in the SAP. Particular point sources in one country can have far reaching effects, yet the actual management intervention may be required in and by only one country. They still need to be addressed and managed as the issue/effect can be transboundary. With further discussion from the floor, he suggested that the WIOFISH project might be expanded and used as a starting point for the Programme data needs in this area.

Dr. Warwick Sauer then gave a presentation on *Priorities for Social and Economics Assessments that are required to support TDA and advise the SAP process*. [[Annex 16](#)].

He started by noting that Rudy van der Elst seemed to have summed up the artisanal fisheries well. In the context of the BCLME, it was only later on that the importance of understanding the economics of the system was realised. ASCLME should address this issue at an earlier stage to ensure policy-level ‘buy-in’. During the talk, a pause was taken to discuss the relevance and importance of offshore fisheries. SWIOFP has the obvious mandate for this sector in terms of the TDAs and SAPS, whilst ASCLME has a more inshore focus. Discussions covered the interactions between small-scale and industrial activities, and between different small-scale activities, relationships between foreign and local fishing rights, and the revenues and economic benefits associated with that. It was stated that these issues are poorly understood, but will be important for creating policy-level interest and understanding and for development of effective management mechanisms. The concept of resource rent was identified as particularly interesting to policy-level decision-makers, and just how important the fisheries and other ecosystem

services were to the economies of the countries. Both governance and socio-economics were identified as factors which have been neglected in other LME projects. In addition to the more obvious consumptive use of marine resources, an understanding of the tourism industry would also be important. Healthy coastal habitats should also be assessed for economic value, such as mangroves and coral reefs. Showing the economic effects of particular management interventions will be helpful in selling SAP to policy-makers, and in the mainstreaming of the SAP into long-term national policy. It may be worth studying the implementation of alternative livelihoods not dependent on fisheries.

The PD proposed that a document should again be created and circulated around the SC for comment and to kick-start an action plan. The Chair proposed that Warwick Sauer (EnviroFish Africa and Rhodes University), Rudy van der Elst (ORI) and Neville Sweijd (CSIR) should coordinate with each other to develop such a ToR for coastal activities related to ASCLME along with a list of priorities for the countries to review and amend as necessary.

Gap Identification

The PD then called for gaps to be identified which were not specifically addressed in any of the Projects. It is important to finalise this now and to ensure that nobody points out a glaring omission in three years. Several topics he put forward for consideration which were not in the original Project Documents of any of the ASCLME Programme Projects included:

- Marine Pollution
- Invasive Species
- Socio-economic study of industrial fisheries.

He stated that ASCLME only has \$12.2m, but these critical issues must be addressed in order to develop a comprehensive SAP, and mechanisms to enable this to happen must be sought. He called for additional input on gaps between the coverage by the various projects in the Programme. The PD noted that he would send out a formal request to each country to review the intended data collection focus and to ask for feed-back on any gaps in the overall TDA information collection process.

Many of the activities are worded specifically “using existing information”, which does not imply collection of novel data/fieldwork, but rather, analysis of existing data sources to provide at least some management information. Some gaps may have no available data, in which case some mechanism, perhaps a RAP, must be envisaged. This is an unfortunate reflection of the limited funds available for the Project. The scale of the problem is somewhat daunting – a very broad range of stakeholders, including local communities and the private sector, as well as governments and research organisations, and a massive geographical area. With the additional requirement by GEF (endorsed by the countries) to understand the forcing functions of the current across the Mascarene Plateau, the ASCLME Project is now essentially dealing with most of the western Indian Ocean.

Some critical gaps may require outside expertise to be brought in to assist with studies. However, this should always be done in a manner whereby we can ensure capacity is built within the region and this must be a routine part of any contracts with outside agencies or individuals. Wherever possible local and regional expertise will be used.

Input from the floor stressed the need to ensure that appropriate capacity is built, and then retained. “Capacity building” has supposedly been happening in the region for a long time, but still there seems to be a need to build it.

The issue of timely delivery and action on the SAP and other outputs from WIO-LaB was raised once again. The Project Manager for the preparation phase of the project (David Laroche) responded that there were two main mechanisms that could be used to expedite implementation; one is to create a separate SAP early on if there is something constructive and actionable, and get it to Government. The second way is to ensure that country members are fully involved in the process. If country-based personnel are truly involved in the TDA/SAP development process, it is likely that what is stated in the SAP will already be actioned on the ground long before the SAP is formally signed and ratified at the country level. As long as there is sufficient involvement of the correct people from the various countries, 2013 will not be the start of the delivery and action from the Programme as it will be implemented sooner.

On the topic of marine pollution and its absence from the mandate of any of the three ASCLME Sister Project, the Project Manager for the WIO-LaB shared his opinion that 80% of pollution in the sea comes from land based sources and therefore any aspect dealing with marine sources of pollution could probably be quite minor. However, the development of indicators to assess coastal resources would be important. He saw identification of spawning and nursery areas as key gaps in knowledge, and linking land-based activities to fisheries.

The PD for ASCLME responded that significant marine traffic travels through the area. Marine pollution may be considered less significant in terms of constant and chronic effect but one-off incidents (such as tankers running aground, etc) can have massive impacts that can last for a long time. It can be possible to mitigate many of the harmful effects and impacts if proper management and contingency plans have already been put in place. To reach this situation it is therefore necessary to include marine pollution in the TDA and SAP process.

Another point raised from the floor was that the inter-linkages between components did not always seem to be fully explored, for instance, how oceanography might tie in with spawning grounds and influence larval transport.

The Chairman decided that the meeting now needed to move on, and additional points should be brought to the PCU’s attention in correspondence.

Following a short break, Rudy van der Elst informed the meeting that a tour of the uShaka aquarium facilities had been arranged for 9.00 am on the next day for any delegates that wished to attend.

Returning to gaps, it was noted that in relation to marine pollution, Madagascar is currently prospecting for oil and this could present a significant threat. Additional information for use in the TDA may be available from the EIA. Development of marine highways may also present potential problems. The marine highways project does not include a long-term monitoring programme.

Community/Stakeholder Participation

The UNDP-GEF representative stated that in terms of community/stakeholder participation, ASCLME was partnering with EcoAfrica. The DLIST programme will function as a channel to bring community opinions to the development of the TDA. This was one of the key aspects when the Project was approved by GEF.

Data and Information

Ms. Lucy Scott then gave a presentation on *Mechanisms for National and Regional Coordination for Data Capture and Management*. [[Annex 18](#)]

Ms. Scott returned to an earlier concern that was raised over data repatriation in the Comoros. ACEP did not have coelacanth data from Comoros, but they were conscious of other foreign teams who took all data back to their country of origin without leaving any copies behind. This same team also worked in South Africa and did not leave copies of all data behind when they worked there, despite being mandated to do so by contract.

Concerns were raised that it appeared that the PCU was planning to create entirely new data warehousing mechanisms, for instance, bypassing the work done on the Clearing-House Mechanism. Linkages between different organisations were considered important, particularly in the sense of sharing data.

Ms. Scott replied to these concerns saying that it was not the intention of the PCU to create entirely new mechanisms, but instead to leverage and enhance existing platforms. She also stressed the need to be aware of those parties that did not have good access to the internet and come up with alternative data dissemination methods. The PCU would of course have in-house data management systems. It will be vital to ensure whatever mechanisms are used, that data custodianship is taken seriously and is sustainable in the long-term.

A need for a MoU on data access and confidentiality was also expressed. The PD replied that it was indeed the intention to have a MoU on appropriate data sharing and safeguards; a copy of the existing SWIOFP one has been obtained and will be used as a model to develop an appropriate document which the countries can ratify.

Media and Communications

Claire Attwood, consultant to the project for communications and media interaction, then gave a brief presentation on her role in Media communication for the Project [[Annex 19](#)]. During the short period of discussion afterwards, the idea of an ASCLME film, similar to the BCLME's *Current of Plenty* was discussed. It was agreed that this could be very informative, and particularly persuasive to decision-makers if aired on national TV. It was proposed that there could be an instructive video developed in the early stages of the Project to advise and to encourage ownership from senior stakeholders. This could be followed up with another such video toward the end of the Project showing what had been achieved and demonstrating the way forward for long-term LME management. Claire stressed the need for dedicated policy briefs in addition to this.

Ms. Attwood continued her presentation stating the need to make public documentation have strong human interest and to directly involve the policy level. It was agreed that steps should be taken to ensure this. It was also asked if there would be local communications activities in each of the countries, which Claire Attwood replied would be the case to some extent. Care would be taken to ensure material production in not only English but also French and Portuguese. Akiko Yamamoto, UNDP, suggested a focus on how the Project is assisting with MDG achievement in the countries; the UNDP country offices would then be excellent channels to distribute information.

It was also mentioned that an entire TV series covering appropriate issues could also be successful. This was done in Zanzibar and has worked well. Malagasy soundtrack films are also desperately needed. It costs relatively little to redo the audio tracks once one considers the initial costs of getting the footage and editing the film. The use of local experts, who are attuned to the political and social sensitivities in each country and who could examine the films, should be taken into careful consideration.

A workshop on a Programme-level web portal was also discussed as per similar discussion under the Steering Committee meeting the previous day and was given support by the meeting.

The observer from the SWIOFP inquired as to the availability of using the communications expert as was agreed in the Project Document. It was explained that Claire Attwood was not the Communications expert but was an Outreach and Media Consultant. It was also explained that this availability was contingent on SWIOFP provision of a full-time cruise coordinator for both projects. The original agreement had been that SWIOFP would provide and fund a joint Cruise Coordinator for the two projects and ASCLME would provide and fund a joint Communications expert.

ACEP and its Relationship to the ASCLME Project

Dr. Paul Skelton then briefly talked about the new phase of ACEP, saying that the coelacanth was an iconic animal for the region, being symbolic of the intense scientific interest in the region. In much the way that the extent of the coelacanth population was

unrealised until recently, the dynamics of its environment are still poorly understood, and have lead to surprising discoveries in recent years.

Phase one of ACEP ended in March 2007; technically phase 2 started in April 2007, however that year was basically held under the auspices of the first phase. There has been a major downsizing in the employment of the project secretariat. Prof. Skelton stressed that ACEP is now considered to be a South African programme, funded by DST, who has put in the money. There is also a strong partnership with DEAT, through MCM, who have brought ships and technical expertise, representing a significant additional source of in-kind funding. When trying to understand the coelacanths and their environment, it was quickly realised that the issues were transboundary, and something of an LME approach was considered appropriate, which is why the programme has visited many of the countries represented here. The South African Government, through DST, have committed R25m over 5 years, considerable funding for an African country, and there is also the indirect contribution from MCM/DEAT. The split of the grant has already been decided, with a minor part for management at SAIAB, which is earmarked to employ a manager, coordinator and PA. A second is a commitment to support the platform, (*FRS Algoa*), R1.8m pa, allowing ship-based research to take place, and the remainder goes into an open call for research projects managed by the NRF. The call closed at the end of January, and selections will be made in March. ASCLME will be involved in project selection, and data from the Programme will be shared with ASCLME. Prof. Skelton stated that whilst the coordinator will come on board in February, and may be able to assist with cruise coordination in a limited capacity, they would have to limit this to working with just their immediate partner (the ASCLME project) and could not assume responsibility for coordinating all the various programme's cruises without additional discussions.

DLIST and the ASCLME Project

Dr. Francois Odendaal then gave a brief introduction to the NGO, International Knowledge Management (IKM), of which he is part. He stated that in his experience, projects are only successful when they are supported both at the grassroots level and at the policy level, rather than being only 'top down' or 'bottom up'. Therefore they have for some time focused on what could be best described as 'bottom up, top down' approaches with considerable success, the Distance Learning and Information Sharing Tool (DLIST) being one example. He recently visited Madagascar to assess conditions on the east coast. In the three national coastal and marine parks, established around 15 years ago by EcoAfrica, a company he works for. He found that the local people were respecting the parks, but that poverty was increasing whilst stocks were decreasing. The dream of ecotourism in Masoala has by and large failed the local people; much like in Unguja, Zanzibar, where he also works, hotels are not owned by locals, and there has been considerable cultural erosion.

IKM in conjunction with EcoAfrica has developed a tool-set called DLIST, consisting of two parts, the first being a distance learning course on coastal management, for which there is more demand than can be met. Whilst in Madagascar, he discussed a partnership

with Toamasina University, in addition to the State University of Zanzibar, about offering courses there. People from East Africa have attended the DLIST associated courses intended for the BCLME, so there is clearly demand for courses relevant to the ASCLME region. This system helps to strengthen community level actions and activities because even just one or two members with knowledge can stop bad development, strengthen the fight against corruption and so on, provided they know mechanisms like EIAs exist and what the role of communities in such processes ought to be, and how to use them. Distance learning leads to more empowered communities.

The second part, DLIST, is the information sharing component, which is done in various ways over the internet as well as by using other awareness and information sharing mechanisms. Sharing information with even the remotest communities should not be considered impractical; a plethora of avenues have been explored with success in using radio, which has worked very well in Namibia, where it will shortly be done in 4 or 5 languages. They are also looking at using WorldSpace satellite to distribute courses. In Angola, where there is very poor internet connectivity, video blogging is being investigated. He emphasised that DLIST is much more than a website, but represents a community of practice, a group of people who transcend horizontal and vertical boundaries; many of them hailing from local communities, other stakeholder groups and even Government. IKM is currently working on trying to get Ambodiletra School in Madagascar to have internet; this is likely to happen before many of the larger NGOs in the area have it, by using new technology. DLIST has often been only the minor funder in projects, with others joining in. The system seems to be growing and proliferating. He also noted that an environmental film festival was also very successful.

The system promises to deliver meaningful community engagement and discussion, involving not only the Project but also the policy level. This involvement means that one doesn't have to wait for the SAPs; similarly, at the end of the Project, the systems put in place will continue working through people's involvement and increased knowledge. He stressed that in some ways, the term "capacity" has often been misused and fractured this approach; in many ways, artisanal fishers have a lot of knowledge and capacity, just of a different nature to scientists. DLIST's RAP approach involves one DLIST member of staff working with a local team. Such involvement means that the information continues to flow both ways.

The Sustainable Seas Trust and the ASCLME Project

Dr. Tony Ribbink then gave an extremely brief overview of the Sustainable Seas Trust (SST) in view of the time constraints of the meeting. [\[Annex 21\]](#) He stated that he had always been very excited about ASCLME and long-term sustainability. He noted that many people in the room had been in some way involved in the development of SST. The development of a functional SST has fallen somewhat behind schedule; he is now working on this full-time since his retirement from ACEP. He stated that he would send a document outlining the Trust in more detail as time was so short.

Next Steps

The PD then ran briefly through the next steps to be taken [[Annex 22](#)]. He emphasised that the next Steering Committee and Stakeholder meeting venue should, if possible, dovetail with the WIO-LaB SC meeting if that is feasible within the time-constraints of each Project. If SWIOFP is officially started by then it should also be involved and planning for Steering Committee meeting should also be consecutive with that Project wherever possible. Currently the next WIO-LaB meeting is planned for May. If this could be rolled over into June then it might be feasible to have a joint meeting although that is still quite early for ASCLME. The PD said he would stay in communications with WIO-LaB and SWIOFP over this and would keep the Steering Committee updated as he received further information.

He noted the core Steering Committee (countries and immediate partners in co-funding) has requested the opportunity to convene separately without the observers as a matter of discretion to allow them to discuss internal policy issues. This has been done during this meeting but it was felt that the arrangements were back to front and that in future meetings there should be a full session first followed by the smaller core group so that there is no need to repeat presentations and so that the second session can be of a short duration. This was generally agreed.

Closure of Workshop

The PD closed his presentation with a slide depicting children from the region as a reminder as to why this whole process was undertaken, stating that, in many ways, their future was now in the hand of these projects, and those at these meetings. He acknowledged gratefully having borrowed the slide from Dr. Ribbink.

The Chair stated that issues relating to the private sector had not been discussed in this meeting and that this should be a point for further discussion at the next meeting. He then asked the Resident Representative of the UNDP, representing the implementing agency and the SC member from South Africa, representing the host country, to close the meeting.

The RR made some closing comments on behalf of the GEF implementing agency, UNDP. He said the meeting was originally scheduled to be held in Mauritius but the timing and logistics proved very difficult as it clashed with the December holiday period, but thanked the host country, South Africa, for hosting it. He looked forward to hosting the next one in Mauritius. He thanked the Project Director, the participating countries, the other two Projects, stakeholders and other UN agencies for attending the meeting, and for their input. He stated that he felt the two days had gone well, and what was previously *terra incognita* was now more familiar. The objectives of the Project seem sound and well supported. Whilst not all the issues were solved, they were identified, and procedures to rectify them were proposed and accepted.

The SC member from South Africa, on behalf of the host country, said they were honoured to have held this meeting in South Africa, and thanked Rudy van der Elst for hosting the meetings at ORI at no charge to the Projects. He also congratulated David

Vousden on an excellent start, and stated that if there was any doubt about the suitability of his appointment these were now laid to rest. He noted that the PD's attention to detail was excellent, and many people had commented positively on his leadership so far. He went on to thank stakeholders for their valued contributions, and commented on the spirit of cooperation that was evident. He felt sure that if this level of commitment and collaboration continued, the Project should enjoy every success. He gave final thanks to everyone and hoped they would enjoy the closing function.

Finally, the Chair thanked delegates and the meeting was officially closed.

Annex I: Acronyms & Abbreviations

ACEP – African Coelacanth Ecosystem Programme
ASCLME – Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems Project
ASCLMEs – Agulhas and Somali Current Large Marine Ecosystems Programme
AMSEN – African Ministerial Conference on the Environment
BCLME – Benguela Current Large Marine Ecosystem
CCG – Cruise Coordination Group
CoP – Conference of Parties
DEAT – Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, South Africa
DLIST – Distance Learning and Information Sharing Tool
FARI – Forum for Academic and Research Institutions
GEF – Global Environment Facility
IKM – International Knowledge Management
IMS – Institute of Marine Sciences, Zanzibar
IW – International Waters
LME – Large Marine Ecosystem
MCM – Marine and Coastal Management, DEAT
MDG(s) – Millennium Development Goal(s)
MoU – Memorandum of Understanding
PAC – Programme Advisory Committee
PD – Project Director
P&G C – Policy and Governance Coordinator
PCC – Programme Coordination Committee
PCU – Project Coordination Unit
POP – Persistent Organic Pollutant(s)
PSC – Project Steering Committee
ReCoMaP – Regional Coastal Management Programme
SAIAB – South African Institute for Aquatic Biodiversity
SAP – Strategic Action Programme
SC – Steering Committee
SWIOFC – South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission
SWIOFP – South West Indian Ocean Fisheries Project
TDA – Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
ToR – Terms of Reference
UN – United Nations
UNDP – United Nations Development Programme
UNOPS – United Nations Office for Project Services
WIO-LaB – Western Indian Ocean Land-based Project

ASCLME STEERING COMMITTEE INVITEES - FIRST STEERCOM - DURBAN, 22-23 January 2008

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND PROGRAMME PARTNERS							
REPRESENTING	NAME	TITLE/POSITION	ORGANISATION	BASED	EMAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE/FAX	FULL ADDRESS
COMOROS	Mr. Farid Anasse	Chef de Departement	SIG Ministère chargé de l'Environnement	COMOROS	farid_anasse@yahoo.fr	Tel: +269 762428 Fax: +269 762428	Chef de Département SIG & Point Focal National de la Convention de Nairobi, BP 289 Moroni. Ministère chargé de la Pêche et de l'Environnement, Union des Comores
KENYA	Mr Harrison Ong'anda	Programme Coordinator	Kenya Marine and Fisheries Research Institute	KENYA	honganda@kmfri.co.ke	Tel: +254 41 47 51 57	Kenya Marine & Fisheries Research Institute, P.O. Box 81651 - 80100, Mombasa, Kenya
MADAGASCAR	Mrs Hajanirina Razafindrainibe	NRM Expert	SAGE	MADAGASCAR	Hajanirina.sage@blueline.mg	Tel: +261 320 78 22 21	Service d'Appui à la Gestion de l'Environnement (SAGE), Lot V1 21 D Bis, Villa RANOROSOA II, Ambatoroka, P.O. Box 6080, Antananarivo 101, MADAGASCAR
MAURITIUS	Mr Mitrasen Bhikajee	Director	MOI	MAURITIUS	bhikajee@moi.intnet.mu	Tel: +230 427 44 32/33	4th Floor, France Centre Building, Victoria Avenue, Quatre Bornes, Mauritius
MOZAMBIQUE	M. Policarpo Napica	National Director of Environment	MICOA	MOZAMBIQUE	p.napica@micoa.gov.mz	Tel: (+258 1) 466407 Fax: (+258 1) 465849	Sede do Ministério, Rua Kassuende, 167, Maputo, Mozambique. P.O.Box 2020 Policarpo Napica, National Directorate of Environmental Management, Av.Acordos de Lusaka 2115, Maputo-Mozambique, P.Box 2020
SEYCHELLES	Mr Ronny Renaud	Managing Directory	SCMRT-MPA	SEYCHELLES	r.renaud@scmrt-mpa.sc	Tel: +248 225114 Fax: +248 224388	Seychelles Centre for Marine Research & Technology – Marine Park Authority, P O Box 1240, Victoria, Mahe, Seychelles
SOUTH AFRICA	Mr. Johann Augustyn	Chief Director	MCM/DEAT	SOUTH AFRICA	augustyn@deat.gov.za	Tel : +27 21 402-3103 Fax : +27 21 425-6977	Marine and Coastal Management, Private Bag X2, Rogge Bay, 8012, South Africa
TANZANIA	Mr. Magnus Ngoile			TANZANIA	mngoile@simbanet.net	Tel +255 748 490049 Fax +255 22 2668611	National Environment Management Council P.O. Box 63154/63207 Dar es Salaam TANZANIA Dar es Salaam P.O. Box 63154/63207
SAIAB	Mr. Paul H Skelton	Director	SAIAB	SOUTH AFRICA	P.Skelton@ru.ac.za	Tel: +27 (046) 603 5816 Fax +27 (046) 622 2403	SAIAB, Private Bag 1015, Somerset Street, Grahamstown, 6140, South Africa
ACEP	Angus Paterson	Director	ACEP/SAEON	SOUTH AFRICA	angus@saeon.ac.za	Cell +27 83 275 4407	SAEON House, 18 Somerset Street, Private Bag 1015, Grahamstown, 6140, South Africa
NAIROBI CONVENTION	Mr Dixon Waruinge	Programme Officer	Representative of the NAIROBI CONVENTION UNEP	KENYA	dixon_waruinge@unep.org	Tel: +254 20 62 20 25	United Nations Environment Programme, Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI), Nairobi and Abidjan Conventions Secretariat, P.O Box 30552 - 00100, Nairobi, Kenya
UNDP LEAD CO	Mr. Claudio Caldarone	RR UNDP	UNDP LEAD CO	MAURITIUS	claudio.caldarone@undp.org	Tel: (230) 212 3726 / 7 Fax: (230) 208 4871	United Nations Development Programme, 6th Floor, Anglo Mauritius House, Intendance Street, Port Louis, Mauritius
UNDP LEAD CO	Ms. Elena Gari	Environment Programme Officer	UNDP LEAD CO	MAURITIUS	elena.gari@undp.org	Tel: (230) 212 3726 / 7 Fax: (230) 208 4871	United Nations Development Programme, 6th Floor, Anglo Mauritius House, Intendance Street, Port Louis, Mauritius
UNDP LEAD CO	Mr. Satyajeet Ramchurn	Environment Programme Officer	UNDP LEAD CO	MAURITIUS	satyajeet@hotmail.com		
UNOPS	Mr Mahir Aliyev	Portfolio Manager	UNOPS	DENMARK	mahira@unops.org	Tel: +41 22 917 85 57 Fax: +45 3546 7501 Tel: +45	United Nations Office for Project Services, Midtermolen 3, P.O. Box 2695, DK-2100 Copenhagen, Denmark
WIO-LaB	Mr Peter Scheren	Project Manager	UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB	KENYA	peter.scheren@unep.org	Tel: +254 62 12 70 / +254 62 32 03	Peter Scheren, Project Manager UNEP-GEF WIO-LaB Project, c/o UNEP, Block A, Rm. 130, P.O. Box 47074 Gigiri, Nairobi, Kenya
SWIOFP	Kaitira Katonda	Project Manager	SWIOFP	KENYA	kikatonda@yahoo.co.uk		
ASCLME PCU	Mr. David Vousden	Project Director	UNDP-GEF ASCLME	SOUTH AFRICA	david.vousden@undp.org	Cell: +27 (0)79 038 6802 Fax: +27 46 622 6621	ASCLME House, 18 Somerset Street, Private Bag 1015, Grahamstown, 6140, South Africa
ASCLME PCU	David Laroché	Project Preparation	UNDP-GEF ASCLME	USA	dal1727@myvermont.com	Tel: +1 802 370 9932	
UNDP	Akiko Yamamoto	Regional Portfolio Manager for International Waters, Eastern and Southern Africa	UNDP	SOUTH AFRICA	akiko.yamamoto@undp.org	Tel: +27 12 354 8125 Cell: +27 82 850 9824 Fax: +27 12 354 8111 Skype: akiko.yamamoto120	Regional Portfolio Manager for International Waters, Environment Finance Group, UNDP Eastern/Southern Africa, 351 Schoeman Street, PO Box 13196, The Tramshed, Pretoria, 0126, South Africa

OBSERVERS AND PRESENTERS							
REPRESENTING	NAME	TITLE/POSITION	ORGANISATION	BASED	EMAIL	TELEPHONE/FAX	FULL ADDRESS
O.R.I	Rudi van der Elst		Ocean. Res. Inst. Durban	SOUTH AFRICA	rudv@ori.org.za	Tel: 031-3288222 Fax: 031-3288188	P.O. Box 10712, Marine Parade, 4056, South Africa
NOAA ReCoMaP	Mr. Bradford Brown Mr. James Anderson	NOAA LME Program Contractor Fisheries Specialist	NOAA RECOMAP Project	USA Mauritius	JabariBrad@aol.com james.anderson@coi-ioc.org	Phone: (230) 427 2583 Fax: (230) 427 2808	ReCoMaP 112, Farquhar Avenue Quatre Bornes Mauritius
SUST. SEAS TRUST	Tony Ribbink	Director	SST	SOUTH AFRICA	a.ribbink@ru.ac.za	Cell: +27 83 640 1588 Tel: +27 46 603 8045	Warden Flat, Jameson House, Private Bag 1031, Grahamstown, 6140
ASCLME PCU	Johann Lutjeharms	Professor of Oceanography UCT	University of Cape Town	PCU SOUTH AFRICA	jre@mweb.co.za		
ASCLME PCU	James Stapley	IT and Comms Consultant	ASCLME	PCU SOUTH AFRICA	james@jamesstanley.com	Cell: +27 82 531 4099 Fax: +27 82 879 5006	ASCLME House, 18 Somerset Street, Private Bag 1015, Grahamstown, 6140, South Africa
ASCLME PCU	Lucy Scott	Information Specialist	ASCLME	PCU SOUTH AFRICA	L.scott@ru.ac.za	Cell: +27 46 622 6621	ASCLME House, 18 Somerset Street, Private Bag 1015, Grahamstown, 6140, South Africa
ASCLME PCU	Claire Attwood	Media Outreach Consultant		SOUTH AFRICA	cattwood@mweb.co.za	Cell: +27 83 290 7996	
DLIST/EcoAfrica	Mr. Francois Odendaal	Director	EcoAfrica	SOUTH AFRICA	francois@ecofafrica.co.za	Tel: +27 21 448 3778 Fax: +27 21 447 2614	3 Bishop road, Observatory, 7925, South Africa
DLIST/EcoAfrica	Rean van der Merwe	Director	EcoAfrica	SOUTH AFRICA	rean@ecofafrica.co.za	Tel: +27 21 448 3778 Fax: +27 21 447 2614	3 Bishop road, Observatory, 7925, South Africa
MCM-DEAT	Ashley Naidoo	Director, Research Support, MCM-DEAT	MCM-DEAT	SOUTH AFRICA	anaidoo@deat.gov.za	Tel : +27 21 402-3569 Fax : +27 21 402-3639	Marine and Coastal Management, Private Bag X2, Rogge Bay, 8012, South Africa
IRD	Jean-Francois Ternon	Scientist	IRD	France/Reunion	jean-francois.ternon@ird.fr		
CSIR	Neville Swejld			SOUTH AFRICA	nswejld@csir.co.za	Tel: +27(021)8882555 Fax: +27(021)8882648 Cell: +27(082)9689660	RGL Coastal Processes Natural Resources & the Environment Council for Scientific & Industrial Research Stellenbosch, South Africa
Rhodes University/EFA	Warwick Sauer	Professor of Ichthyology and Fisheries Science	Rhodes University/EnviroFish Africa	SOUTH AFRICA	w.sauer@ru.ac.za	Cell: +27 82 774 1337 Fax: +27 46 622 4827	DIFS, PO Box 94, Grahamstown, 6140, South Africa



FIRST STEERING COMMITTEE AND INCEPTION MEETING
DURBAN - SOUTH AFRICA

22ND-23RD JANUARY 2008

Hosted by the Oceanographic Research Institute supported by the UNDP Country Office Mauritius

AGENDA FOR ASCLME FIRST STEERING COMMITTEE

Durban, South Africa. 22nd January 2008

START – 0830 (Hotel pick-up 0800)

1. Opening Welcome and Remarks
Claudio Caldarone – Resident Representative for the UNDP Lead Country Office – Mauritius.
Representative of RSA
UNDP GEF - Akiko Yamamoto
2. Election of Chair and Adoption of Agenda
3. Summary of Implementation Progress. [David Vousden - Project Director](#)
4. Review of Revised Outputs, Activities and Deliverables. [David Vousden - Project Director](#)
5. Review of Budget and Approval of Work Programme. [David Vousden - Project Director](#)
6. Presentation on Governance and Policy Needs for the ASCLME Project/Programme. [Magnus Ngoile - Governance and Policy Needs Review Consultant](#)
7. Administration and Management Procedures (including Steering Committee procedures). [Presented by David Laroche - Project Development Consultant](#)
To Include:
 - Management structure and strategy for the Project
 - Research Cruise Coordination and Selection Process

- Procedures for Steering Committee oversight of the Project
- Coordination at the Programme level (ASCLME, SWIOFP and WIO-LaB)
- Sovereign Rights of Countries over Data Collection within Territorial Waters and EEZ (Including review of wording for an appropriate MoU)

8. Review of Agenda for tomorrow's Inception Workshop. [Chair](#)

9. Any Other Business

10. Closing Remarks

[Claudio Calderone – Resident Representative for the UNDP Lead Country Office – Mauritius.](#)

Steering Committee Dinner to be held at the 'Cargo Hold' restaurant at 7.30 pm (Bus to pick up from hotel at 7.00 pm)

N.B. Refreshment and lunch breaks will be proposed by/to the Chair and agreed by the meeting as appropriate to the timing of discussions but approximately at the times listed below. Lunch and Dinner will be provided by the Project

MORNING BREAK (10.30)

LUNCH BREAK (12.30- 1.30)

AFTERNOON BREAK (3.30)



FIRST STEERING COMMITTEE AND INCEPTION MEETING
DURBAN - SOUTH AFRICA

22ND-23RD JANUARY 2008

Hosted by the Oceanographic Research Institute supported by the UNDP Country Office Mauritius

AGENDA FOR ASCLME INCEPTION WORKSHOP

Durban, South Africa. 23rd January 2008

START – 0830 (Hotel pick-up 0800)

Opening of Meeting - Welcome and Procedure

1. Welcome Address from **Claudio Caldarone – Resident Representative for the UNDP Lead Country Office – Mauritius.**
2. Host Comments from **Representative of RSA**
3. Agency Comments and Purpose of Inception Workshop from UNDP GEF - **Akiko Yamamoto**
4. Election of Chairperson and Adoption of Agenda for Inception Workshop
Facilitated by David Vousden – Project Director

Update and Status of ASCLME Project

Project Director to present a revision of project Outputs and Activities, an update on where the project currently stands on implementation, and a reminder of what is needed to deliver the TDAs and SAPs. This will help to guide the following session on Priority Areas

5. Summary and Update of the ASCLME Programme and Project. **David Vousden - Project Director**
6. Presentation on Governance and Policy Needs for the ASCLME Project/Programme. **Magnus Ngoile - Governance and Policy Needs Review Consultant**

7. Update on Implementation Progress during Inception Phase (October - December 2007). [David Vousden - Project Director](#)
8. Review of TDA and SAP Delivery Requirements for the ASCLME Project/Programme. [David Laroche – GEF Project Development Consultant](#)

Stakeholder Review and Guidance on Priority Areas for the TDA/SAP Process

The meeting will briefly review what the original Project Document had identified as priorities. The floor will then be opened for guidance and recommendation from the countries to update these priorities and to advise the Project Coordination Unit on the most current national and regional needs and existing initiatives. The LME priorities are broken down into the following areas:

9. Offshore Data Capture for the LMEs – Priority areas within the two LMEs requiring further knowledge on biological, chemical and physical parameters using an ecosystem monitoring approach. [Introduced by Prof. Johann Lutjeharms](#)
10. Priorities for Data Capture within the LME Coastal Zones. [Dr. Rudy van der Elst](#)
11. Priorities for Social and Economics Assessments that are required to support TDA and advise the SAP process. [Introduced by Prof. Warwick Sauer](#)
12. Expected Inputs from ASCLME Programme Sister Projects to the TDA/SAP process. [David Vousden - Project Director](#)
13. Identification of Gaps in Programme relating to the TDA (e.g. Marine pollution, invasive species. Socioeconomics relating to commercial fisheries, etc). [David Laroche – GEF Project Development Consultant](#)

Project Staff to highlight important specific requirements to achieve the end objectives and deliverables

14. Mechanisms for National and Regional Coordination for Data Capture and Management. [Lucy Scott – Inception Phase Data Consultant to ASCLME](#)
15. Presentation of the Communications and Stakeholder Outreach Plan. [Claire Attwood- Outreach Consultant to ASCLME](#)
16. Partnership, Coordination and Stakeholder Participation requirements for the TDA and SAP development process. [Introduced by David Vousden - Project Director, with inputs from ACEP, SST and EcoAfrica](#)

Wrap-up and Closure of Meeting

17. Any Further Comments from the Floor on TDA and SAP Process and Project Arrangements. [Facilitated by Chair](#)

18. Next Steps. [Project Director to Summarise](#)

19. Closing Remarks [from UNDP](#)

20. Closing Remarks [from Host Country](#)

[Inception Workshop Dinner at Havana Grill 1930 hours](#)

N.B. Refreshment and lunch breaks will be proposed by/to the Chair and agreed by the meeting as appropriate to the timing of discussions but approximately as follows:

Morning Break:	1030 pm
Lunch:	1230-1.30 pm
Afternoon Break:	3.30 pm

ASCLME PROJECT - OUTPUT DELIVERY WORKPLAN

OUTPUT DELIVERABLES	2008											
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
OUTPUT 2.1: LME based indicators linked to national and regional M&E mechanisms are developed and captured within institutional work												
A. LME Indicator Specialist recruited and contracted						X						
B. ToRs for development of M&E Programmes and Indicators at national and regional level						X						
C. Report from national Workshops including information cited above												
D. Report from Regional Workshop with requirements for LME Monitoring												
E. Nationally Adopted Work Programmes and Annual Reports												
OUTPUT 2.2: A region wide socio-economic valuation of near-shore marine goods and services is undertaken to gain greater understanding of the social and economic importance of these areas												
A. ToR developed for Socio-economic Survey sub-contract		X	X									
B. Sub-contractors identified				X	X							
C. Adopted Study Plan for Socio-Economic Survey					X	X						
D. Final Report of Survey												
E. Policy Level Briefing Document focusing on both National And Regional advantages of the LME approach as defined through the Socio-Economic Evaluation Survey												
F. Distribution list and follow-up strategy for assessing effectiveness of Briefing Document												
OUTPUT 2.3: National and regional data handling, storage and synthesis focal centres are established												
A. Formal list of National Data Management Focal Institutes	X	X	X									
B. Report from the Regional Workshop on Data Management			X	X	X							
C. Report from National Workshops on Data Management and Handling						X	X	X				
D. Formally adopted Regional and National Data Management Plans including work programmes and budgets for capacity building							X	X	X	X		
E. National Data Management Centres and Regional Data Management Node Annual Reports to ASCLME Programme												
OUTPUT 2.4: Use of GIS and predictive models expanded to increase systems knowledge												
A. Identification of Programme level Work-Group and planning/convening of workshop		X	X									
B. Report from Programme level Working Group on GIS and Remote Sensing data handling and management needs, along with a work programme and budget that also addresses training and capacity building at the national and regional level.								X	X	X		
C. Reports from training workshops												
D. Annual GIS/RS data management reports											X	X

ASCLME PROJECT - OUTPUT DELIVERY WORKPLAN

OUTPUT DELIVERABLES	YEAR 1			YEAR 2			YEAR 3			YEAR 4			YEAR 5			
	S-N	D-F	M-M	J-A	S-N	D-F	M-M	J-A	S-N	D-F	M-M	J-A	S-N	D-F	M-M	J-A
OUTPUT 1.1: Review existing data in region pertinent to ASCLME TDA and SAP development (including the collection, repatriation, synthesis and storage of country and regional data, and the repatriation of extra-regional data and information)																
A. Information and Capacity Building Specialist identified and contracted	x	x														
B. Formally-adopted D&I Working Group Report			x													
C. Agreed priorities for data collection and 'gap-filling'			x													
D. Work programme and Budget for data collection and 'gap-filling'			x													
OUTPUT 1.2.A: Identify and prioritize ecosystem assessment and ecosystemic process information gaps in key oceanographic areas of the ASCLMEs along with work-plans, cruise schedules, budgets and responsibilities																
A. ROE Identified and contracted		x														
B. Revised and adopted list of Priorities for ASCLME Ecosystem Monitoring and Mapping		x														
C. Project Cruise Plan and Schedule including training exercises both onshore and offshore (with timetable and budget). This Cruise Plan to be closely coordinated with SWIOFP and ACEP, as well as WIO-Lab where appropriate.			x													
D. List of expected products from each cruise as an Annex to the Cruise Plan and Schedule			x													
OUTPUT 1.2.B: Key knowledge gaps in near-shore (artisanal/subsistence) fisheries updated, nursery areas and other rich biological habitat mapped or otherwise identified using existing information																
A. ToRs developed, sub-contractors identified and sub-contracts signed		x	x													
B. Peer-reviewed Report on nearshore fisheries, and critical habitats				x	x	x	x									
C. Recommendations for priority studies and data collection								x	x							
D. Recommendations for management of critical areas (e.g. management zoning MPAs and replenishment areas)								x	x	x						
OUTPUT 1.2.C: Management and Policy gaps/needs identified as part of root cause requirements for TDAs development (national and regional)																
A. Create ToR and contract short-term regional governance/policy expert		x														
B. Develop a Project Workplan for Governance and Policy Coordination		x														
C. Contract long-term Governance and Policy Specialist		x														
D. Report on governance and policy issues and shortfalls within region relating to LME management (to include in the TDA)								x	x							
E. Recommendations for immediate and longer term solutions and improvements (to guide the SAP)											x	x				
OUTPUT 1.3: Active offshore and coastal oceanographic data collection to fill gaps in ecosystem assessment and status as necessary for development of TDAs and SAPs																
A. Identify cruise coordination mechanism for ASCLME Project		x	x													
B. Identify and contract person responsible for cruise coordination		x														
C. Cruise coordination agreement (including details of equipment requirements and sources as well as formal agreement on ownership/sharing of data)			x													
D. Sub-Contract with FAO for 2008		x	x													
E. Sub-contract with FAO for remainder of project					x				x				x			
F. MoU/Agreement between ASCLME and ACEP on use and deployment of SA research vessels		x	x													
G. Coordinated Cruise Logistics Plan and Work-programme for each year of project		x			x				x				x			
H. Individual Cruise Reports based on adopted reporting protocol				x				x				x			x	
I. Distribution list for cruise reports		x	x													
OUTPUT 1.4: Baseline information obtained on persistent organic pollutants (POPs) within the LMEs through use of key indicator species																
A. Identify and recruit POPs Expert		x														
B. Workplan, budget and timeline			x													
C. Final report on POPs and associated indicator species for use in TDA and SAP													x			
OUTPUT 2.1: LME based indicators linked to national and regional M&E mechanisms are developed and captured within institutional work programmes and budgets																
A. LME Indicator Specialist recruited and contracted				x												
B. ToRs for development of M&E Programmes and Indicators at national and regional level				x												
C. Report from national Workshops including information cited above								x								
D. Report from Regional Workshop with requirements for LME Monitoring										x						
E. Nationally Adopted Work Programmes and Annual Reports													x			
OUTPUT 2.2: A region wide socio-economic valuation of near-shore marine goods and services is undertaken to gain greater understanding of the social and economic importance of these areas																
A. ToR developed for sub-contract		x														
B. Sub-contractors identified		x	x													
C. Adopted Study Plan for Socio-Economic Survey			x													
D. Final Report of Survey										x						
E. Policy Level Briefing Document focusing on both National And Regional advantages of the LME approach as defined through the Socio-Economic Evaluation Survey											x					
F. Distribution list and Follow-up strategy for assessing effectiveness of Briefing Document											x	x				
OUTPUT 2.3: National and regional data handling, storage and synthesis focal centres are established																
A. Formal list of National Data Management Focal Institutes		x														
B. Report from the Regional Workshop on Data Management			x													
C. Report from National Workshops on Data Management and Handling				x												
D. Formally adopted Regional and National Data Management Plans including work programmes and budgets for capacity building				x												
E. National Data Management Centres and Regional Data Management Node Annual Reports to ASCLME Programme					x				x				x			x



OVERVIEW OF WORK PROGRAMME AND BUDGET

ASCLME WORKPLAN FOR 2008

2008 OUTCOME SPREADSHEETS

THE AGULHAS AND SOMALI CURRENT LARGE MARINE ECOSYSTEMS PROJECT

EXPENDITURE DESCRIPTION	US\$	%GE
National Training Exercises and Data Coordination Workshops (including Capture of Best Lessons and Practices in LME Management)	\$2,610,000	21.4
Contracts for Local Experts/Specialists	\$2,586,900	21.2
Data Collection and management for TDA/SAP and long-term sustainable monitoring programmes	\$2,422,150	19.9
Regional Admin, Management and Support Costs	\$2,277,000	18.7
Implementing and Executing Costs (UN Agency)	\$903,700	7.4
Equipment and Support to Countries	\$675,000	5.5
Travel and Support Costs for SteerCom and Technical/Scientific Management Coordination Meetings	\$607,500	5.0
Contracts for International Experts/Specialists	\$117,750	1.0
Project Total	\$12,200,000	100.0

ASCLME BUDGET 2007- 2008

ASCLME PROJECT EXPENDITURE TO END 2007

	Cost (US\$)
Physical Purchases: Office Equipment, furniture, etc	\$41,847
Services: Telephone, electricity, municipal costs, insurance	\$1,027
Travel and Accommodation: Flights, accommodation, DSA for all staff and consultants	\$31,350
Contracts: Staff salaries and benefits; consultancy contracts	\$141,900
TOTAL	\$216,125

ASCLME BUDGET ESTIMATES 2008

ASCLME PROJECT ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE - 2008

	Cost (US\$)
Physical Purchases: Office Equipment, Scientific Equipment, furniture, etc	\$400,000
Services: Telephone, electricity, municipal costs, insurance, vehicles, etc	\$40,000
Travel and Accommodation: Flights, accommodation, DSA for all staff and consultants	\$750,000
Contracts: Staff salaries and benefits; consultancy contracts, research contracts	\$975,000
Administrative Overheads (8%):	\$173,200
TOTAL	\$2,338,200