South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP)

Action Plan Meeting
Apia, Samoa
7-8 June 2004

Synthesis Report of Issues for Development of Action Plan 2005-2009

Introduction

This synthesis from seven countries, two territories and one NGO highlights the issues raised during the review of the 2001-2004 SPREP Action Plan and the development of a new Action plan for the period 2005-2009.

In relation to the multiple choice questions (Questions 1-20)
Please see Annex I attached.

General Questions in relation to Part I

Q 21. Where was capacity strengthened and where do gaps remain?
The responses received all reported progress in building capacity. During the period of the Action Plan for example institutions such as Ministries, Departments, Offices were established to address environmental issues. Legislation was developed as well as strategies and plans in the different focus areas. There was also capacity training of officials and public awareness campaigns.

Numerous gaps were identified. For example:

- Technical capacity was required in county to develop national capacity on the range of environment and sustainable issues addressed under the Action Plan; Human Resource Development was needed and country attachments and youth volunteers had been helpful;
- Support was needed to implement the provisions of the various conventions;
- National Strategies and policies for resource management needed to be completed or further developed;
- There were gaps with the absence of baseline data and acquisition of such data to inform decision making was needed;
- Building public awareness was an ongoing process and more work needed to be done in this area;
- More resources needed to be allocated to building administrative, institutional and physical infrastructure;
- Keeping personnel and positions after the life of projects remained; staff movements in country;
- There was a need to ensure capacity was built across the region rather than focus on a number of Pacific Islands.

VF 6096

Q 22. Did the Action Plan assist with national efforts to integrate environmental considerations into national planning processes?

The Action Plan did assist according to some responses but not according to others. On one hand it was a useful planning document but underdeveloped planning processes and sectoral interests did not facilitate holistic and integrated approaches. While the Action Plan set out guidelines, actual implementation was lacking. There was a recommendation that integration would be better addressed by ensuring that national priorities and overall national capacity is reflected in the Action Plan. With the development of national sustainable strategies and a regional commitment to harmonized approaches, there may be value in exploring bilateral approaches with member countries. This may result in greater or lesser engagement by particular SPREP programmes in each PICT.

Q 23. How did the Secretariat Assist with the implementation of Action Plan priorities?

The responses indicated that the Secretariats assistance included in-country assistance, legislation drafting, development of strategies, plans and policies, country attachments, research, national workshops, materials, technical training, backstopping and advice, human resource development, assessments, support at international meetings, Pilot project development and implementation, website information, briefs and information and regional/sub-regional workshops.

From the responses received, some members were engaged in more activities than others and some noted a need for targeted assistance in certain areas such as legislative drafting.

Q 23 (b). Were the above mechanisms effective/appropriate?

Generally the mechanisms for assistance were appropriate but more assistance was required in country. This included assistance from programme officers as well as high level visits. There was a need for monitoring as well as continuity of assistance. There were also issues about not being in a position for assistance because of the political status of a SPREP member. There was also a comment that the Secretariat was good at producing paper without any tangible on the ground results balanced against the comment that SPREP was particularly effective in providing training and technical assistance and in acting as a regional coordination mechanism.

Q 24. Did you receive any assistance from other SPREP Members in areas related to the Action Plan?

SPREP members did assist each other over the life of the Action Plan but this was an areas where much more emphasis might be placed especially through the sharing of experiences and success stories.

Q 25. Other Comments

- The Action Plan should focus on the implementation of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation at the regional and national levels. The Action Plan is very useful to members because it is the basis for national environmental programmes to address global, regional and national issues. It is therefore important that the SPREP Secretariat facilitate a wide consultative and participation process for identifying all PIC issues, then develop strategies for them. The strategies need to be practical for all PICs. It is important to note that the PICs vary in the level of existing national capacities to implement new strategies. Therefore the levels of national capacity building should vary for PICs according to their respective existing capacity strengths. The Secretariat needs to increase its facilitation

process. In PICs the resources are insufficient. Assistance should be sought from the developed countries of the Pacific region like Australia and NZ. This is to ensure that the Action Plan id fully used by the PICs. The Action Plan is the basis for national environmental strategies. It is important that the Action Plan is applicable to all PICs.

- The plan more than adequately targeted the priority environmental challenges and issues of the region over the Plan period. Summary Items worth noting were: More resources should be provided to integrated coastal management and coral reef protection efforts; Overall, Guam has strengthened its relationship with SPREP over the plan period and solidified U.S. support for more involvement where appropriate. We are in the process of negotiating with U.S. agencies to fund a person to be located in SPREP to coordinate with U.S. flag territories to increase involvement. We note that the attachment should be for at least 2 years but 3 years is optimal. We believe SPREP staff have done excellent work on oil pollution, international waters and environmental education activities.

- There is a need for the action plan to be clear as to who, specifically is to implement the actions described. In particular, it is important to differentiate whether the actions are intended to be undertaken by the SPREP Secretariat and/or members of SPREP. Given the very different rules of a Secretariat and a national government/territory, there are likely to be two distinct sets of actions. This differentiation is not clear in the current Action Plan and accountability for achieving the outcomes of the Action Plan is therefore undermined.

- The Action Plan appears to be quite broad in terms of its goals. While it is understood that building of capacity is essential to a country being able to address environmental issues in a long term, sustainable manner, it seems at times that there has been a lack of actual tangible, concrete results. Even on a very small scale, such tangible results would be very beneficial by allowing Palau to actually begin addressing its environmental problems, as well as showing the public and lawmakers that success is possible. It is understood that SPREP operates on a budget funded by donating organizations, and that because of this SPREP is somewhat constrained in the projects it undertakes on behalf of the SPREP member countries. However, it would seem that smaller scale programs that have the end result of equipment and trained personnel for these nations so that the environmental issues can be addressed on a daily basis would be more beneficial to the member countries than would the multitude of reports, publications and off-island conferences that seem to be the main focus of the current approach.

PART II – NEW ACTION PLAN (2005 – 2009)

1. Is the overall vision in the Action Plan 2001-2004 valid " People of the Pacific Islands better able to plan, protect, manage and use their environment for sustainable development"valid?

The vision as expressed in the SPREP Action Plan 2001-2004 remained reasonably to extremely valid.

2. The Action Plan goal for 2001-2004 was "To achieve the key results identified in the Action Plan and to ensure that the strategic issues identified are successfully identified." Members were asked to define a goal for the new Action Plan that captured the region and member countries' vision for the new Action Plan?

The goal in the Action Plan 2001-2004 was described as a 4 year goal, to achieve the key results (objectives and outcomes) identified in the Action Plan. This was viewed as unrealistic and not achievable as results from the questionnaire indicated. A member commented, "...the goal might refer to the memberships view of progressively meeting expectations over the longer term but modifying the [expected] outcomes. Conversely another member called for a redefinition of the goal to describe finite, measurable and achievable end goals. A member noted that the goal for the new Action Plan should be inked to the goal for the strategic Plan.

3. What are the most critical environmental and sustainable development issues SPREP members and its Secretariat need to address in the new Action Plan?

- The regions natural environment was still very vulnerable to catastrophic changes in climate change, ozone layer depletion, unsustainable use of natural resources and waste generation;
- The issue of climate change can only be addressed if bigger developing countries and developed countries control their emissions of GHGs. The new Action Plan needs to urge PICs to get these countries to control their emissions. Furthermore, realising from the past that this reduction process may take some time to undertake, the new Action Plan needs to identify initiatives for PICs to protect its coastlines and developments;
- Integrate the management of landscapes and sea-scapes;
- The new Action Plan needs to identify further extensive conservation strategies in all economic sectors. The three pillars of sustainable development need to be clearly defined and their inter-linkages established;
- The new Action Plan should focus equally on the importance of economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainable development. All national development plans should focus on interlinking economic, social and environmental matters. The importance of their co-existence must be stressed. One cannot exist alone to achieve sustainable development;
- The direct involvement of indigenous communities with all stakeholders in the management of natural resources must be promoted. More should be reflected by the Action Plan regarding the ownership of resources and the traditional customs associated with the use of resources;

- Waste Management/Pollution Prevention (solid and hazardous wastes); Nature Conservation (marine and terrestrial); Environmental Education (community-based); Sustainable Development (strategies to attract appropriate development);
- These are captured in the BPOA and SOE and Legal Reviews that need to be updated;
- Management and disposal of municipal and hazardous wastes. Prevention and mitigation of marine pollution. Non-centralized sewage disposal (on-site systems and community systems). Small-scale community based public water systems and water catchment safety;
- For a small country like Tokelau, we would maintain the issues in the current Action Plan with the following of our list of priorities. (1) Pollution Prevention, (2), Nature Conservation, (3), Climate Change (4), Economic Development;
- All environmental concerns are very important and need to be addressed as soon as possible. Therefore in this sense, it is highly important for SPREP to address all the key areas indicated in the previous Action Plan. E.g... marine and terrestrial biodiversity conservation, climate change variability, pollution prevention, economic development and building of capacity of member countries.

Clearly there are numerous critical environmental and sustainable issues that SPREP members face as illustrated in The Regional Synthesis for Sustainable Development (BPOA+10), as presented and supported by Ministers of the Pacific Region in the preparatory meeting for the ten year review of the Barbados Plan of Action held in the Bahamas in February 2004.

4. Please identify four broad objectives for the new Action Plan that would accommodate your issues in Question 3 above

Some responses identified the general areas that should be covered in a new Action Plan. The areas identified covered nature conservation, pollution prevention, climate change and economic development. Others responses provided specific objective proposals:

Under Pollution Prevention

- Present waste management options which are economically feasible, appropriate and sensitive to island ecosystems with the necessary technical assistance for effective development and implementation;
- To increase the capacity and capabilities of SPREP members to manage and respond to marine pollution, hazardous waste, solid wastes, sewerage and other land based sources of pollution and to meet the requirements of relevant international and regional legal instruments;
- To implement appropriate levels of capacity for minimising, managing and appropriately disposing of municipal and hazardous wastes through the raising of public awareness and the creation of the necessary legislative, administrative and physical infrastructures;
- To research, develop and make available to SPREP member countries alternative approaches to the production of decentralized potable water for public consumption that are appropriate to the unique characteristics and available resources of each member country;
- To research, develop and make available to developers alternative methods of on-site and community based wastewater disposal appropriate to the unique geological and topographic characteristics of each of the member countries;
- To implement appropriate levels of capacity for preventing and mitigating marine pollution.

Under Nature Conservation Objective

- Effective protection of the natural heritage of the Pacific Islands Region through the conservation and sustainable management of their natural resources and biodiversity.

Under Climate Change

- To improve the Pacific Islands understanding and strengthen the capacity to respond to climate change, climate variability and sea-level rise.

Environmental Education

- assist in providing environmental education resources at the community level and demonstrate application of conservation activities to ensure full appreciation and stakeholder buy-in.

Sustainable Development

- strengthen national capacity to manage environmental protection at the community level and to project national sustainable development strategies to potential investment groups;
- to strengthen regional and national capacity to integrate environmental research, information, planning and management with developmental processes in a manner which identifies opportunities as well as constraints.

5. From the environmental and sustainable development objectives and issues identified above, what actions should be taken to address them:

(a) by the countries and territories?

The responses included:

- Establishment of Departments of Environment; Establishment of Units on Climate Change, Waste Management, Nature Conservation and Environment Education Awareness;
- Establishment of networking systems between government and non government organizations for information sharing in economic, social and environmental issues;
- Enactment of Legislation on sustainable development and resource use; Policies to integrate economic, social and environment issues;
- countries and territories (C&T) should provide the context and forum for acceptance of program efforts as well as a demonstrated commitment to sustain implementation, oversight and monitoring;
- C&T must only take on programs or projects that can be sustained to completion. If C&T are not able to lay the groundwork then additional assistance (from the Secretariat or other partners) could be provided to enhance capacity;
- The National Development Strategies identify some but not all environmental concerns and these need to be elaborated and revised further every year in the Ministry Operational Plans (MOPs) for relevancy; Quantitative targets could be built in so that progress can be evaluated.
- There should be an ongoing drive to mainstream environment into national planning and finance;
- Attendance to all sub-regional and regional workshops as well as implementing national workshops and the actual implementation of programmes;
- Securing funding from national budget or other donors;

- Incorporating the identified issues in the Action Plan into their Action Strategies to ensure effective implementation; Strengthen the capacity between the line ministries, departments, NGOs etc... in the implementation stages;
- Broaden awareness capacity down to the civil society and strengthen legal framework and actions;
- Development of network of MPAs representing the whole range of habitats, ecosystem functions, ecological and biological processes within national jurisdiction;
- a) identifying critical ecosystems and species and then establishing legal, managerial and administrative regimes to protect them in the long-term. b) integrating environmental sustainability principles into all sectoral and land/sea use development and/or management plans.

(b) by the Secretariat?

- Review areas of concern to the countries and effectiveness of environmental management capacities of the countries;
- Review effectiveness of implementation strategies that would address climate change, pollution, nature degradation etc;
- Develop more effective environment awareness programmes;
- More effective training and workshops at local community levels;
- Develop more country focused environment management projects;
- Assessment of process of level of achievement of sustainable development;
- Act to (research) package and deliver program and projects according to the C&T implementation context and capabilities. The emphasis should be to identify and develop program/project packages or systems at various levels (national, local, and community) with the appropriate consideration for flexibility;
- Focus on coordinating implementation through others...as a strong lead facilitator;
- List of Technical Competency should be provided by the Secretariat to each country;
- SPREP Meeting agenda should address updates of national focal points;
- Resource Centers of environmental information established;
- Waste disposal (including electronic waste) needs to be addressed;
- Projects to remove waste off island needed useing links to POPs and Basel and Waigani;
- Second National Communications under UNFCCC needs to be supported;
- Review of environmental legislation needed;
- HRD support needed as staff turnover is high. VSA and AVI type assistance.
- Address issue of alien invasive species in ballast water;
- Assistance with publicationsSPREP to assist with SOE publication;
- Set up conservation areas to protect medicinal plants and public awareness to respect these areas;
- Assistance with a National Red List to identify endangered flora and fauna;
- Determine current and forecasted future needs for each Action Plan objective;
- Determine current state of regulatory and response capacity for each objective, determine and make known to SPREP country needs for each objective in order to match current and future needs to current and future capacity, work with SPREP to create an action plan for attaining each objective and work towards the action plan goals with technical and resource assistance from SPREP;

- Organising training workshops;
- secure funding from donors, (iii), assist member countries in actual implementation;
- Strengthening co-ordination and monitoring; effective implementation; effective management in general and securing of financing for identified issues;
- Visits to countries for proper monitoring;
- a) Develop and promote model legislative, managerial and administrative tools. b) develop and promote rapid ecological assessment techniques and tools c) provide capacity building and regional advocacy in (a) and (b), and assist PICs to promote national priorities and positions in international for a.

(c) by other stakeholders?

- NGOs to integrate into government policy-development systems;
- resource owners to be part of resource use and allocation decision making systems;
- industrial and commercial sectors to be represented into national environment committees;
- NGOs, resource owners and private sectors to develop awareness of their capacities in sustainable development;
- community and national level stakeholders must act to initiate change and then ensure that opportunities are seized for maximum benefit. There should be no "hand-outs" so to speak, instead there should be partnerships based on action, implementation and practice. SPREP should encourage national governments to engage stakeholders and partners to achieve implementation, whenever possible;
- Assist with networking and in partnerships where they are allocated certain responsibilities in an overall project/programme;
- Donor funding;
- Assist member countries in determining current and future needs and capacities, action plans for attaining objectives. Determine common threads and seek out funding that can be applied to the exercise of implementing capacities, through the creation of appropriate legislative, regulatory, administrative and physical infrastructures;

6. (a) What should be the main areas of focus and programmes in the new Action Plan?

The responses suggested that all the current programmes were relevant. A member indicated Action Plans needed to be developed tailored to the needs of each country.

Another response indicated that the focus should be on local communities. Their participation in policy/decision making processes, capacity building of resource owners, resource management and more extensive environmental awareness at local community levels and promotion of the sustainable development concept. EIA mechanisms were also noted as well as sustainable livelihoods including ecologically sound approaches to conservation.

(b) If changes were to be made to current areas of focus and programmes, what specific changes would you make?

Retaining the current programme areas with a focus on local communities was suggested. A member suggested refocusing Climate Change & Variability to emphasise two areas, mainly climate variability forecasting and information exchange from global and regional centers to national governments and practical hazard mitigation and response measures to improve survivability, adaptation, response, etc.

A suggestion was made to better describe and manage (prioritize, develop, execute, evaluate and report) expected outcomes by limiting the total number of outcomes under any one KRA area to 10 items. Redundancies and overlap in outcomes were noted. There was also a call for more emphasis on environmental education as a broad programme area with the results of the organization's work must be broadcast widely. More mileage from was needed and this required enhancing the transferability of technology, management approaches, experiences, data, etc. The power of information exchange/accessibility should not be underestimated. There were technology limitations at the national and local levels but SPREP could become a leader in innovating education and information exchange.

Capacity building at the national level was important as well as public awareness

7. What implementation strategies will be important for the new Action Plan?

Responses included:

- implementation of projects with the local communities, especially the resource owners as the success of most natural resource conservation management systems normally depended on the attitudes of these communities. The strategies needed to have incentives benefiting the target communities. The implementation stages of such programmes needed to be facilitated by the Secretariat through donors as in most cases under the current programmes, the countries and communities did not have the technical and financial resources to complete the implementation processes;
- The existing strategies were adequate for the next Plan. However, in the move from project implementation to coordination and advisory roles the Secretariat should not move away from maintaining a strong interest in facilitating projects especially in the area of coordinating and sponsoring demonstration projects, pilot studies, research, and similar efforts;
- SPREP work needed to link into National Development Strategies and Ministry Operational Plans. SPREP officers could be used to address different environmental issues during the same visit;
- Tailoring of overall program and approach to each country's needs. Initial determination of country objectives through assessment prior to commencement of implementation. Identification of relevant agencies and entities in each country by the focal points. Commitment on the part of the relevant agencies and entities, in writing, to supply the necessary resources to achieve the stated goals. Milestone markers for each period (6 months, year etc.) that can be used to track progress. Allocation of resources by SPREP should be based on each country reaching the appropriate milestone marker;
- All the implementation strategies in the Action Plan 2001-2004 were relevant. The role of Secretariat and partnership with other organizations should be strengthened so that regardless of political ties and relationships of member countries with

cosmopolitan countries, their full SPREP membership status did not exclude that member from participating in SPREP activities regardless of the funding source;

- Set targets by which to measure implementation consistent with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation (JPOI), designed in a manner to assist other reporting requirements;
- Ensure the sustainable development priorities of the Pacific region are fully acknowledged and integrated in the BPOA+10 outcomes;
- Secure and strengthen political support from the international community for programmes and initiatives that are essential to sustainable development of this region's people, their environment and natural resources;
- Work to ensure that BPOA+10 engages a broad range of donors to support the sustainable development of SIDS;
- Promote new and existing partnerships beneficial to sustainable development of the region;
- Enhance the efficiency of use of existing resources and secure and mobilise resources to build capacity for sustainable development;
- it will be important for implementation strategies to differentiate between those actions to be undertaken by the SPREP Secretariat and those to be undertaken by SPREP members. Also how the national priorities and overall national capacity is reflected in the implementation strategies. It would be useful to have the implementation of the Action Plan linked to National Sustainable Development Strategies and, if necessary, this may result in some parts of the Action Plan not being implemented in every PICT.

8. In what practical ways can SPREP members assist each other implement the Action Plan?

Responses included:

- Each country to review its implementation success stories and otherwise, identify successful initiatives, constraints in its implementation strategies; All countries to share their successful initiatives and constraints;
- All countries to develop staff attachment programmes with their environmental agencies;
- All countries to jointly demonstrate to SPREP their constraints;
- Bigger member countries to assist smaller developing countries;
- Countries to learn from the mistakes of other countries;
- Form sub-regional associations on an initiative basis where collective efforts at national government levels produce synergistic benefits to all. Examples of this type of work are cooperation to enhance business opportunities for sub-regional recycling, marine monitoring, environmental emergency response, etc;
- Share information, experience, technical expertise on successful projects like the Fukuoka Method. Atoll members have similar concerns and forum addressing this needs to be strengthened. Developed SPREP members should look at ways of assisting with Secretariat facilitating;
- The one size fits all approach to programmes does not often accord with the unique charactersics of countries and territories. Therefore it is imperative that projects are designed to be flexible enough to tailor to the specific needs of the member;
- By disseminating and discussing current and needs for these objectives in order to broaden the knowledge base of each country. If a currently implemented approach in

one country is determined to be appropriate for another country, country-to-country assistance should be made available. Sharing of technical resources, particularly with regard to personnel, between countries;

- Attachment and study tours;
- sharing of experiences and human resources;
- country dialogues and agreement to consider national priorities and authorities to implement any external activity;
- A multi-stakeholder partnership approach is essential to achieving sustainable development in SIDS, which is reflected in the Pacific Type II initiatives launched at the WSSD, national partnerships and SID to SIDS partnerships;
- The National focal point system has not always been the most successful method of strengthening the Secretariat's linkages with members. SPREP's constituency is primarily the Environment Agencies or Foreign Affairs. Technical focal points in addition to the standard focal points would greatly facilitate the implementation of projects (PACPOL), (national waste operations).

9. **To what extent should the Secretariat assist Pacific island countries and territories with the various regional, global conventions and processes(e.g. CSD,WSSD etc...)?**

Responses included:

- PICs do not have the full capacity to meet their commitments to the conventions and all need technical and financial assistance. This also includes human resource development. Many years have now gone by when PICs have signed the conventions. It would be cost effective for the Secretariat to assess the levels of assistance needed for each PIC. It should then provide the appropriate level and type of needed assistance;
- Where possible, the use of SPREP as a regional mechanism should reduce individual country reporting requirements. SPREP should coordinate country and regional positions at international gatherings and promote the unique qualities of the Pacific so as to ensure these are reflected in the work-programmes, administration and management of conventions and processes;
- Facilitate sub-regional associations. The Secretariat does a good job of representing the region globally and should continue along the existing work plan. Continue to quickly provide information on global and regional environmental conventions and treaties to all members;
- SPREP needs to be at the forefront of issues to provide assistance to countries at international meetings. A brief is expected. Facilitation of meeting of PICs. Drawing in technical and legal expertise to discuss issues and implications and consistency with earlier PIC statements. Also advice and assistance with interventions. We are fortunate that SPREP does this and this should continue. Kiribati is also on the CBD Bureau, Samoa on the Biosafety MOP, Tuvalu on the UNFCCC Bureau-all need support of Pacific concerns;
- By identifying conventions and processes that may offer benefits to SPREP member countries. By breaking down the requirements and benefits of said instruments, summarizing them, determining interlinkages in terms of both requirements and benefits (and conflicts if they exist), and making this available in a simple format. By querying SPREP member countries as to whether SPREP should pursue new instruments and in what manner, and by carrying out the will of the member countries with regard to these instruments.

10. (a) Can you suggest mechanisms and processes to strengthen and improve collaboration between SPREP and other regional organizations?

- The attendance of SPREP at CROP meetings should be encouraged and vice versa. The areas of responsibilities of SPREP and other regional organizations should be differentiated, defined with no overlapping areas. This would allow each organization to be responsible for particular components of programme areas, hence, allow the organizations to work together. The organization should be seen necessarily to work together in order that all areas of concern are addressed;
- Continue collaboration with other CROP members in PIROF ISA and other appropriate activities, keeping SPREP members informed of SPREP involvement in CROP activities. Monitor and participate in the U.S. All Islands Coral Reef Initiative and U.S. All Islands Coastal Management regional meetings and U.S. Pacific Islands Environmental Conference;
- Be more coordinated. Don't argue over who gets the cake. Focus on country interests first;
- Assess the commonalities and differences between SPREP and other regional organizations in terms of goals, members and resources. Determine where and how association and collaboration with other regional organizations can benefit SPREP member countries. Pursue collaboration with those regional organizations whose goals and methods are synchronized with SPREP;
- Annual meeting for all regional organizations, (ii), set out clear mandate for each regional organization and to follow, (iii), for countries programme, respective countries should lead and make decision taking into consideration each organizations mandate and funding;
- Just strengthen the CROP terms of reference. A united Pacific countries Action Plan is essential. Although organizations have their own strategies, there seems to be overlapping roles mostly on environmental issues. If SPREP is to deal with environmental issues, why not SPREP deal with the issues. A need to sort this out between CROP is vital.

(b) Can you suggest mechanisms and processes to strengthen and improve collaboration between SPREP and non-government organisations?

- NGOs should be part of the implementation programmes of PICs. NGOs should be part of consultation processes that assess or identify issues. The NGOs can be involved in regional programmes through the governments. The NGOs can be a source of technical expertise and funds for regional programmes. The NGOs of the Pacific region should be given priority to be involved in regional programmes and assessment of capabilities of NGOs need to be carried out to identify NGOs to be involved. There should be a register for NGOs through which existing and new NGOs would be listed with their respective expertise areas relating to the protection and conservation of the South Pacific region. The register should also include NGOs of other regions that could be utilized where local NGOs do not have the capabilities;
- The WSSD Type II initiatives and processes may assist in encouraging collaboration between SPREP and NGOs. For conservation focused

- The term environment has a much wider meaning than those elements comprising the biophysical environment. Environmental also includes the social and economic aspects of development as well as the biophysical features of the environment;
- Ensure the new Action Plan includes those items that the Action Plan shall include as set out in the Agreement Establishing SPREP.

Some Preliminary Findings

The Nine responses received, indicated the following:

1. National capacity to manage the environment and promote sustainable development during the life of the Action Plan had been strengthened for some members but there were many gaps that needed to be addressed.
2. There was a trend towards integrating environment into national development plans. However there was still a long way to go.
3. Environment covers a wide area and there was a need to focus on the specific areas that SPREP (members and Secretariat will focus on during the life of the Action Plan).
4. Clearly there should be a focus on manageable outcomes and mechanisms to gauge progress made.
5. The vision contained in the Action Plan 2001-2004 remains valid.
6. The goal in the Action Plan 2001-2004 was not achieved within 4 years based on the responses to the expected outcome areas.
7. The Action Plan 2001-2004 adequately targeted the priority environmental challenges and issues of the region over the plan period.
8. The relevance of the program areas identified under the Action Plan 2001-2004 continues.
9. Given that different capacities and needs of SPREP members, the new Action Plan should be broad enough for its members but specific enough to identify particular needs.
10. There was a lot of expertise in the region that could be shared among members and there was a need to develop partnerships among members taking into account their different capacity.
11. There was a need to engage territories and the SPREP members in the northern Pacific a lot more in programmes.

Addendum

Secretariat's Perspective

The Secretariat was also asked to give its assessment of the 2001 – 2004 Action Plan.

The Secretariat as a whole saw ownership of the last Action Plan was shared between the Secretariat and members and that it guided the Secretariat's work in developing annual work programmes and plans. There was however disconnection between the day to day work of the Secretariat and the Action Plan. It was recommended that fuller engagement and ownership for both the Secretariat and members could be promoted through ongoing review and monitoring of country demands and programme responses. The Secretariat saw that the ability for reflection and reporting – both by members and the Secretariat as being limited or irregular in the last Acton Plan. It was suggested that monitoring could be helped through developing regional and national State of the Environment reporting systems that would enable measurement of progress during the life of the Action Plan. The strong need for monitoring and review throughout the Action Plan cycle could be assisted and facilitated by making and understanding links between the Action Plan, Annual Work Programme and Budget, Programmatic Strategy with key environmental and sustainable development indicators coming out of reports to the WSSD, BPOA+10 etc...

In terms of diverse regional needs the Secretariat saw flexibility and tailoring service delivery to country needs and capacity as being issues to consider into the new Action Plan. There have been ongoing efforts in the last plan to increase dialogue and communication with members to ensure that programmes and projects are designed for their unique situations but often this has been circumvented by the needs of international donors and stakeholders. The Secretariat believes that a bottom up approach is crucial and that activities undertaken should where possible be nationally focused and driven.

Suggestions for strengthening linkages with members include:

- SOE reporting/country profiles to enable ongoing evaluation of member needs and enabling environment circumstances.
- Developing technical and advisory focal points as well as operational focal points for the Secretariat.
- Developing a SPREP website, email, email discussion groups and newsletters.
- Nationally focused workshops and training events
- Longer term in country contact.
- Better linkages to NGOs.
- Reporting on Action Plan progress at the SPREP meeting.
- Community based support.

In commenting on the future Action Plan, the Secretariat suggested inclusion of the cross-sectoral theme matters that were outlined in the programme strategy. It was also seen that members had to be involved in the development of the Aciton Plan and in determining the means of delivery and that the onus of use and implementation should be shared between the Secretariat and its member countries.

agencies, the Pacific Islands Rountable for Nature Conservation can also be used as a mechanism to bring SPREP and NGOs together;

- In certain cases countries and territories have very few non-government organizations with particular interest in the environment. SPREP could be a catalyst for assisting organizations develop an environmental agenda and programme or assist in developing environmental organizations from the ground up. NGO's are an important component of environmental advocacy and there are probably too few such organizations in our hemisphere and in Guam particularly;
- Direct networking relationships with NGOs to secure assistance for countries;
- Non-governmental organizations of each member country should be encouraged to go through national focal point of contact. Maybe NGOs should be allowed to copy correspondence that requires the Secretariat's assistance to SPREP, but the decision will be of the individual nationals.

12. Do you have any other comments/views on the future direction, strategic issues and programme priorities for the new Action Plan?

- Ensure regional GIS compatibility for environmental data (e.g., the EMAP system used in U.S. entities could be extended to others using U.S assistance);
- Getting expertise based in SPREP through use of staff supported by the U.S. (such as the current turtle worker from WPRFMC),
- Sharing of information on environmental economic values among members and coordination of this as well as generation of new information on this by SPREP;
- Strengthen SPREP resources in marine natural resources and coral reef work. Consider application in Pacific Islands of successful environmental programs in SE Asia and in Caribbean and Indian Ocean Islands, perhaps bringing in experts from there;
- Develop ways to better tap Guam and Hawaii experts to help other islands e.g., through the Pacific Islands Program of the East West Center or other US backed programs;
- There is a need to further develop country profiles. The GEF National Self Assessment Project offers an opportunity to do this;
- There needs to be a clear link between the various planning processes undertaken by SPREP, and in particular between the Action Plan and the Strategic Plan. If these two plans are developed according to different processes, what mechanisms exist to bring them together and ensuring complementarity?
- The 3 'pillars' of sustainable development should be reflected in the new Action Plan. The link between the Action Plan as a Pacific environmental agenda, and the broader Pacific Sustainable development agenda also needs to be explicit;
- There is a need to differentiate between these actions specific to the SPREP Secretariat and those specific to SPREP members (especially in the implementation strategies);
- It would be useful for the action plan to better reflect the priorities and capacity of individual members as expressed in their National Sustainable Development Strategies, and to be more strategic in engaging bilaterally around nationally owned and driven plans. (part of the overall harmonization agenda);
- be flexible to change. i.e do not be locked into a plan because it is there. Plans must be rolling depending on best options that come up at the relevant time;

ANNEX I

SYNTHESIS DOCUMENTS

PART 1: REVIEW OF 2001-2004 ACTION PLAN

1. In general, how beneficial was the Action Plan to your country/territory ?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Australia	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Fiji	☐ Extremely beneficial	■ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
France	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Guam	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Kiribati	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	■ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Marshall Islands	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Nauru	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
New Zealand	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Niue	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
N Marianas	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Palau	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	■ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
PNG	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Samoa	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Tokelau	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	■ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Tonga	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely beneficial	■ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
USA	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
Wallis and Futuna	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely beneficial	☐ Very beneficial	■ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial
PNG	☐ Extremely beneficial	■ Very beneficial	☐ Fairly beneficial	☐ Not beneficial

2. How reflective was the Action Plan of your current national priorities?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Australia	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Fiji	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	■ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
France	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Guam	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Kiribati	☐ Extremely Reflective	■ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Marshall Islands	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Nauru	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
New Zealand	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Niue	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
N Marianas	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Palau	☐ Extremely Reflective	■ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
PNG	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Samoa	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Tokelau	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	■ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Tonga	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely Reflective	■ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
USA	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely Reflective	☐ Very Reflective	■ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective
PNG	☐ Extremely Reflective	■ Very Reflective	☐ Fairly Reflective	☐ Not Reflective

3. How well did the Action Plan allow for coordination of national environmental activities?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Australia	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well

Fiji	☐ Extremely well	■ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
France	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Guam	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Kiribati	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Marshall Islands	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Nauru	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
New Zealand	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Niue	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
N Marianas	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Palau	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
PNG	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Samoa	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Tokelau	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Tonga	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Tuvalu	■ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
USA	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely well	■ Reasonably Well	☐ Fairly well	☐ Not well
PNG	☐ Extremely well	☐ Reasonably Well	■ Fairly well	☐ Not well

4. How well did the Action Plan take into consideration your countries/territories special circumstances?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Australia	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Fiji	☐ Extremely well	■ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
France	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Guam	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Kiribati	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well

Nauru	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
New Zealand	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Niue	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
N Marianas	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Palau	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
PNG	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Samoa	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Tokelau	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Tonga	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely well	■ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
USA	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very beneficial	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
PNG	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very beneficial	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well

5. How successful was the Action Plan in assisting with programmes on atmospheric, terrestrial freshwater and marine ecosystems?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Australia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fiji	☐ Extremely successful	■ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
France	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Guam	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Kiribati	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Nauru	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Zealand	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Niue	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
N Marianas	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

Palau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tokelau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tonga	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely successful	■ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
USA	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

6. How successful was the Action Plan in assisting with programmes on prevention and management of pollution?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Australia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fiji	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
France	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Guam	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Kiribati	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Nauru	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Zealand	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Niue	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
N Marianas	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Palau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tokelau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

Tonga	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
USA	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

7. How successful was the Action Plan in assisting with programmes on strengthening national and regional capacities ?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Australia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fiji	☐ Extremely successful	■ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
France	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Guam	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Kiribati	☐ Extremely successful	■ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Nauru	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Zealand	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Niue	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
N Marianas	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Palau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tokelau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tonga	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
USA	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

8. How successful was the Action Plan in assisting with programmes on training, educational and public awareness activities ?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Australia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fiji	☐ Extremely successful	■ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
France	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Guam	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Kiribati	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Nauru	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Zealand	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Niue	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
N Marianas	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Palau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tokelau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	■ Not successful
Tonga	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely successful	■ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
USA	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely successful	■ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

9. How successful was the Action Plan in assisting in promoting integrated legal, planning and management mechanisms?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Australia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fiji	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
France	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Guam	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Kiribati	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Nauru	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
New Zealand	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Niue	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
N Marianas	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Palau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Samoa	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tokelau	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	■ Not successful
Tonga	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
USA	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	☐ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful
PNG	☐ Extremely successful	☐ Very successful	■ Fairly successful	☐ Not successful

10. How useful were the implementation strategies in the Action Plan to your implementation of the Action Plan?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Australia	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful

Fiji	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	■ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
France	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Guam	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Kiribati	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	■ Not useful
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Nauru	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
New Zealand	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Niue	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
N Marianas	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Palau	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	■ Not useful
PNG	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Samoa	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Tokelau	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	■ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Tonga	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely useful	■ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
USA	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely useful	■ Very useful	☐ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful
PNG	☐ Extremely useful	☐ Very useful	■ Fairly useful	☐ Not useful

11. How effective was the Secretariat in delivering regional programmes and services?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Australia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fiji	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
France	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Guam	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Kiribati	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

Marshall Is	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Nauru	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Zealand	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Niue	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
N Marianas	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Palau	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
PNG	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Samoa	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tokelau	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tonga	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
USA	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
PNG	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

12. How effective was the Secretariat in strengthening linkages among the Secretariat and member countries/territories?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Australia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fiji	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
France	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Guam	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Kiribati	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Nauru	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Zealand	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Niue	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

N Marianas	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Palau	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	■ Not effective
PNG	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Samoa	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tokelau	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tonga	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
USA	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
PNG	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

13. **How effective have monitoring mechanisms been at the national levels in the implementation of the Action Plan?**

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Australia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fiji	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
France	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Guam	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Kiribati	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	■ Not effective
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Nauru	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Zealand	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Niue	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
N Marianas	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Palau	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	■ Not effective
PNG	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Samoa	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

Tokelau	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tonga	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
USA	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
PNG	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

14. How effective have monitoring mechanisms been at the regional levels in the implementation of the Action Plan?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Australia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fiji	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
France	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Guam	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Kiribati	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Nauru	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Zealand	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Niue	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
N Marianas	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Palau	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
PNG	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Samoa	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tokelau	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tonga	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
USA	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
PNG	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective

15. How satisfied are you with the feedback and response you have received from the SPREP Secretariat?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Australia	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Fiji	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	■ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
France	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Guam	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Kiribati	☐ Extremely satisfied	■ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Nauru	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
New Zealand	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Niue	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
N Marianas	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Palau	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
PNG	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Samoa	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Tokelau	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	■ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Tonga	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Tuvalu	■ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
USA	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely satisfied	☐ Very satisfied	■ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied
PNG	☐ Extremely satisfied	■ Very satisfied	☐ Fairly satisfied	☐ Not satisfied

16. To what extent is SPREP, its role and programmes known in your government, country/territory

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Australia	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Fiji	☐ Extremely widely known	■ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
France	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Guam	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Kiribati	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Marshall Islands	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Nauru	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
New Zealand	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Niue	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
N Marianas	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Palau	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	■ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
PNG	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Samoa	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Tokelau	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	■ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Tonga	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	■ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
USA	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	■ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
PNG	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	■ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known

17. To what extent is SPREP, its role and programmes known in NGOs, the local communities and the private sector?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Australia	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Fiji	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	■ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known

Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
France	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Guam	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Kiribati	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	■ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Marshall Islands	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Nauru	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
New Zealand	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Niue	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
N Marianas	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Palau	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
PNG	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Samoa	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Tokelau	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	■ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Tonga	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	■ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
USA	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	☐ Not widely known

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	■ Not widely known
PNG	☐ Extremely widely known	☐ Very widely known	☐ Fairly widely known	■ Not widely known

18. To what degree has your country/ territory met its responsibilities for the management and implementation of country programmes/activities under the Action Plan?
RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely welll	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Australia	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Fiji	☐ Extremely well	■ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
France	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Guam	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Kiribati	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well

Marshall Is	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Nauru	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
New Zealand	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Niue	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
N Marianas	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Palau	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
PNG	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Samoa	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Sol Islands	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Tokelau	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	■ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Tonga	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Tuvalu	☐ Extremely well	■ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
USA	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Vanuatu	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well
Wallis Futuna	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very Well	☐ Fairly Well	☐ Not Well

NON GOVERNMENT ORGANISATION SUBMISSIONS

WWF (SPP)	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very well	■ Fairly well	☐ Not well
PNG	☐ Extremely well	☐ Very well	☐ Fairly well	■ Not well

19. How effective has the current national focal point system been?

RESPONSES

Am.Samoa	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Australia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Cook Islands	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fiji	☐ Extremely effective	■ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Fr Polynesia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
France	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Guam	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Kiribati	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	■ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Marshall Is	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Nauru	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Caledonia	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
New Zealand	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective
Niue	☐ Extremely effective	☐ Very effective	☐ Fairly effective	☐ Not effective