



UNITED NATIONS
ENVIRONMENT
PROGRAMME



ECONOMIC & SOCIAL
COMMISSION FOR
ASIA AND THE PACIFIC



SOUTH
PACIFIC
COMMISSION



FORUM
SECRETARIAT

South Pacific Regional Environment Programme



REPORT OF THE
INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE
SPREP ACTION PLAN

Noumea, New Caledonia, 27 June - 1 July 1988

South Pacific Commission
Noumea, New Caledonia
August 1988
Reprinted June 1989

© Copyright South Pacific Commission, 1989
The South Pacific Commission authorises the reproduction
of this material, whole or in part, in any form, provided
appropriate acknowledgement is given.

Original text: English

South Pacific Commission Cataloguing-in-publication data

Intergovernmental Meeting on the SPREP Action Plan (1988 : Noumea)
Report of the intergovernmental meeting on
the SPREP action plan Noumea, New Caledonia,
27 June - 1 July 1988.

1. Conservation of natural resources - Oceania
2. Environmental protection - Oceania 3. SPREP

333.72
ISBN 982-203-035-5

AACR2

Prepared for publication at
South Pacific Commission Headquarters, Noumea, New Caledonia and
Reprinted by
Regal Press, Launceston, Australia

SPREP/Action Plan Meeting 2/Report

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE SPREP ACTION PLAN

(Noumea, New Caledonia, 27 June - 1 July 1988)

REPORT

SPREP Information Centre
Received

27 JAN. 1999

South Pacific Commission
Noumea, New Caledonia
August 1988
Reprinted June 1989

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE SPREP ACTION PLAN

(Noumea, New Caledonia, 27 June - 1 July 1988)

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Agenda Item 1 - Opening of Meeting	1
Agenda Item 2 - Election of Office Bearers	1
Agenda Item 3 - Adoption of the Agenda	2
Agenda Item 4 - Country Statements	2
Agenda Item 5 - Status of SPREP and Apia Conventions	10
Agenda Item 6 - Expanding the Role of SPREP as the Co-ordinating Unit for Environmental Activities in the South Pacific Region	11
Agenda Item 7 - Implementation of the 1987-88 Work Programme	12
Agenda Item 8 - Implementation of Projects under Sub-contracts by Members of the Association of South Pacific Environmental Institutions	14
Agenda Item 9 - Consideration of Project Proposals for the 1989-90 Work Programme	15
Agenda Item 10- Statements by Observers	19
Agenda Item 11- (a) Consideration of a Budget for SPREP for 1989-90 and (b) Adoption of the 1989-90 Work Programme	23
Agenda Item 12- Institutional and Financial Arrangements for SPREP	24
Agenda Item 13- Other Business	27
Agenda Item 14- Adoption of the Meeting Report	27
Agenda Item 15- Closing of the Meeting and Final Statements	27

	<u>Page</u>
ANNEX 1 - Agenda	29
ANNEX 2 - List of Participants	31
ANNEX 3 - Address by the Acting Secretary-General, South Pacific Commission	43
ANNEX 4 - Opening Statement of UNEP Representative	47
ANNEX 5 - Prioritisation of Projects by Country Representatives	51
ANNEX 6 - List of Working Papers	55
ANNEX 7 - 1989-90 SPREP Work Programme	57

Introduction

1. This Intergovernmental Meeting on the SPREP Action Plan held in Noumea, New Caledonia, 27 June - 1 July 1988, was the second such meeting convened in the interest of ensuring greater involvement by the Governments of the region in determining SPREP's Work Programme for the ensuing two-year period (1989-90). The first meeting, the Regional Conference for Consideration and Review of the SPREP Work Programme 1987-1988, was held in Noumea in September 1986 and was given financial assistance by the Government of New Zealand. This second meeting was financially assisted by the Government of Australia. Participation at this second meeting was broadened to include representation by additional organisations with potential to assist SPREP in the implementation of its Work Programme. The participants list appears as Annex 2.

Agenda Item 1 - Opening of Meeting.

2. The meeting was opened by the Acting Secretary-General of the South Pacific Commission who welcomed delegates to the second meeting of government representatives to consider and approve a Work Programme for SPREP. He referred to the need for people to work actively, collectively and co-operatively to conserve the environment for themselves, their neighbours and future generations. He alerted delegates to the important task before them in reviewing the 1987-88 Work Programme and approving activities for 1989-90.

3. He thanked the network of implementing institutions, collaborating regional and institutional organisations and SPREP's donor governments and the agencies whose assistance had enabled SPREP to undertake its 1987-88 Work Programme. He thanked the Government of Australia for its generous support in enabling this meeting to be convened.

4. He referred to difficulties experienced with the implementation of the Work Programme and in particular the uncertainty associated with the receipt of member country contributions which made forward planning difficult. He urged governments to make an early commitment of their voluntary annual contributions.

5. Referring to the forthcoming 1989-90 Work Programme he noted that it was most ambitious and contained over 120 project proposals. Implementation of these proposals would necessitate a three-fold increase in the SPREP budget which was unrealistic hence the need to reduce the programme and budget at this meeting. He hoped for a fruitful and successful meeting. A full version of this paper appears as Annex 3.

Agenda Item 2 - Election of Office Bearers.

6. The representative of the Cook Islands was appointed as Chairman of the meeting, with the representative of the Federated States of Micronesia as Vice-Chairman.

Agenda Item 3 - Adoption of the Agenda.

7. The agenda was adopted subject to the following alteration. Agenda Item 9, Expanding the Role of SPREP as the Co-ordinating Unit for Environmental Activities in the South Pacific Region, was placed after Agenda Item 5. The revised agenda is attached as Annex 1 and a list of Working Papers as Annex 6.

Agenda Item 4 - Country Statements

8. The representative from American Samoa referred to the establishment of the American Samoa Environmental Protection Agency in 1987 as a significant step towards developing a sound programme for the protection of American Samoa's natural resources and environment. With assistance from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the American Samoa EPA has initiated projects and regulations relating to oil spill management, ground and surface water contamination, pesticides, petroleum storage and public education.

9. He also referred to American Samoa's involvement with hazardous waste management which was subject to U.S. regulations developed by the US EPA. A study of hazardous waste in American Samoa indicated that waste oil disposal was more of a problem. A plan for waste management has been drawn up. He also indicated that American Samoa had thoroughly evaluated a hazardous waste disposal plant proposal which had subsequently been rejected. He warned delegates that other countries in the region may be approached with similar proposals and urged that any such proposal be carefully evaluated.

10. The representative of Australia stated that Australia regards the SPREP Convention as a significant international regime for the protection of the South Pacific environment and that Australia is moving towards ratification of the SPREP and Apia Conventions. Australia is part of the South Pacific Region and shares, and is working towards solutions to, problems of managing and protecting the environment and natural resources. These problems involve finding the appropriate balance between the rational use of resources and the need to protect the integrity and productivity of the environment for future generations. In Torres Strait, Australia is working with Papua New Guinea to establish mechanisms to protect the marine environment and in particular examining the impact of mining operations. Australia is also concerned about protection of key habitats such as sea-grass beds and has developed community-based management of dugongs.

11. He further stated that substantial resources are committed to managing and conserving the Great Barrier Reef Region; the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority being particularly keen to co-operate with other agencies in the Region in gathering information on the crown-of-thorns starfish for its research programme. Australia has developed environmental impact assessment procedures and is willing to share its experience with other countries and Australia shares common concerns relating to the implications of climate change. Australia has similar concerns with conservation of small island environments and endangered species, the involvement of traditional communities and the integration of traditional knowledge and practice in protected area management and in the conservation of migratory species. For example, the Australian National Parks and Wildlife Service could assist in a number of aspects of turtle conservation and management in the region.

12. The representative of the Cook Islands stated that since 1975, Conservation has been a section of the Department of Internal Affairs. Deepening concern about the effectiveness of a Government Department to protect the environment led, in mid-1987, to the establishment of an independent Conservation Service to implement the Conservation Act 1986-87. The new Conservation Act concerns every aspect of the environment from management plans to conserve any aspect of the environment to prevention of litter.

13. Since June 1987 the main thrust of the Service has been in the public education area. A litter education programme has been implemented with assistance from SPREP as has a coastal erosion education project. In the field of wildlife conservation work has been carried out under the Kakerori Recovery Programme and the northern island group conservation investigation continued. Finally he indicated that good progress was being made in the area of nature awareness with the development of natural history books, school field trips, radio programmes and wildlife readers.

14. The representatives of the Federated States of Micronesia stated that since the first SPREP Intergovernmental Meeting, the FSM had gained independence and had reorganised the executive branch of its government resulting in the authorities of the FSM Environmental Protection Board being transferred to the newly formed Department of Human Resources. Two of FSM's four states, namely YAP and KOSRAE have enacted environmental legislation to establish environmental regulatory agencies while the other two states are in the process of enacting similar legislation.

15. It was stated that, with the implementation of the Compact of Free Association between the FSM and the United States, funds are available for development of natural resources and economic activities, such as fish processing plants, tourism development, gold exploration, increased agricultural production and manufacturing industries. This has necessitated that the FSM Environmental Programme become actively involved in ensuring that these activities do not have negative environmental impacts.

16. FSM announced that its Congress ratified the SPREP Convention and Protocols in June 1988 and that this ratification would be formalised in August this year. Congress also authorised a US\$ 3 000 contribution for SPREP activities in 1989.

17. The representative of the Republic of Fiji stated that his government's policy and programmes are guided by five-year development plans, the most recent stating that the maintenance of Fiji's healthy environment through protection and conservation of its unique features, and the judicious utilisation of its resources form an integral part of development. An Environment Management Committee (EMC) was established in 1980 to co-ordinate and advise Government on important matters pertaining to environmental management. Through the National Trust for Fiji, the government has established a number of reserves, sanctuaries and undertaken restorations. A number of environmental problems continue to affect Fiji such as deforestation, mangrove destruction, soil erosion, and pollution of coast and rivers and development pressure.

18. The objectives for environmental management in Fiji are to protect and conserve unique features of Fiji's environment; ensure that environmental assessments are incorporated into programmes and projects; set up a machinery to initiate, integrate and implement environmental policies; and strengthen environmental education. It is planned to consolidate all environmental matters under the agency for better co-ordination, effective formulation and implementation of national environmental policies by the establishment of an Environment Management Unit within the Directorate of Town and Country Planning. Requirements for environmental impact assessment are proposed to ensure that development activities are in harmony with environmental policies.

19. The representative for France stated that the process for ratifying the 1986 SPREP Convention has been started. Due to various elections and the early dissolution of the National Assembly, however, it was not possible to complete this procedure during the last session of the previous parliament. It will be continued once the new institutions are functioning.

20. The Guam representative stated that the Government of Guam's commitment to the protection of the environment is embodied in the law creating the Guam Environmental Protection Agency in 1973, which states that a high quality environment be maintained at all times and that environmental degradation not be allowed. Guam EPA has evolved into a well respected regulatory institution with programmes for the control of water, air and toxic chemical pollution. The development of statutes and regulations has been established with very strict provisions and penalties.

21. Guam is undergoing a tremendous amount of development in support of an ever-growing tourism industry which has strained the government of Guam's ability to supply potable water, accommodate waste-water treatment and develop solid waste disposal systems. In addition, land clearing and habitat loss, dredging and reef damage/loss and soil erosion present potential problems with degradation of surface and marine waters of Guam. There is an extensive effort by Guam EPA to control development in the northern region of our island (a "sole source aquifer", which is entitled to a specialised review process). The Guam EPA representative concluded by stating they see a great need to establish a more refined planning and land use policy and the development of statute/regulations requiring Environmental Impact Reviews.

22. The representative of the Marshall Islands expressed the best wishes of his government and its Environmental Protection Authority Board of Directors who hoped for a successful meeting in reviewing the 1987-88 Work Programme and in determining activities to be undertaken by SPREP in 1989-90.

23. He outlined to the meeting activities being undertaken by the Marshall Islands' Environmental Protection Authority in building up their environmental management capabilities and in identifying funding sources with the aim of meeting the Republic of the Marshall Islands' obligations under Section VI of the Compact of Association with the United States. The Republic of the Marshall Islands looks forward to a continued good relationship with the United States Environmental Protection Agency and with the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP).

24. After welcoming old and new conference members to New Caledonia, the Territory's representative listed the principal environmental problems occurring in New Caledonia and noted that fairly comprehensive legislation had been enacted over the previous fifteen years with regard to conservation both on land (mines, forestry, flora and fauna, agricultural activities, physical planning, tourism and industrial areas) and of the marine environment (foreshore, lagoon, barrier reef and marine fauna). He stated that the presence of major research organisations such as ORSTOM, IFREMER, Cirad and the Institut Pasteur in New Caledonia had yielded a great deal of information about ecological and nature conservation issues, helping establish an extensive network of nature reserves and protected areas, covering both land and sea. Details of this policy could be found in the New Caledonia country paper presented at the 1985 Apia Conference and available from the South Pacific Commission.
25. New proposals for wildlife and nature reserves were also being prepared and would be ready for submission to the next Parks and Reserves Conference in 1989.
26. The representative of New Caledonia concluded by noting the importance his Territory attached to environmental matters, as witnessed by its attendance at the IUCN General Assembly held in Costa Rica in January 1988. He pointed out the mutual interest taken by the IUCN in the South Pacific by the appointment of the SPREP Co-ordinator, Mr. Reti, as Regional Councillor for Oceania to the IUCN.
27. The representative of New Zealand commented that the key environmental issue reported by New Zealand at the last Inter-governmental meeting of SPREP in 1986 was the reorganisation of public service environmental administration. He reported that new institutions had now been in place for one year and these include a Ministry for the Environment, Department of Conservation and a Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. In addition, the Ministry of Works and Development was disbanded on 31 March 1988, with several land use functions passing to other departments. A comprehensive review of the laws that govern New Zealand's natural and physical resources is now being undertaken. Under review are land use planning, water and soil, mining, clean air and noise control legislation, and environmental assessment procedures. The review of resource management laws is associated with a review of local government. The outcome of these reviews will have considerable impact on environmental considerations in New Zealand. Other major reviews of protected areas legislation, marine and coastal legislation, and historic places legislation are under way. These will consolidate and streamline environmental considerations in nature conservation and development. These reorganisations of environmental administration and the subsequent policy reviews have consolidated functions, but until the reviews are completed there are likely to be limited resources available to contribute to regional environmental matters.
28. He referred to the National Parks Centennial celebration year (1987-88) which had effectively concluded. Since SPREP last met two national parks have been gazetted in New Zealand, Wanganui River National Park and Paparoa National Park. New Zealand's national parks now cover over 9% of the total land area of the country. In 1987 the Department of Conservation ran an international training course centred at Turangi in the North Island. Twenty one people from 15 countries participated and the course was considered to be highly successful. New Zealand recognises the value to the South Pacific region of such training programmes and is hopeful that such courses will continue.

29. He informed the meeting that following a conference in March 1988 the Ministry for the Environment is co-ordinating New Zealand working groups on global warming and consequent climatic effects. The objective is the development of policy proposals by mid-1990. New Zealand also supports global and regional research into environmental impacts of nuclear war. A strategy for the control of pollution and the management of hazardous substances (including wastes and pesticides) is being developed for consideration by Government in 1989. New Zealand is also establishing principles concerning procedures for the importation of exotic biota and experimentation involving genetically modified organisms. In September 1987, New Zealand signed the Montreal protocol for the limitation of the consumption of chlorofluorocarbons and is currently working towards ratification. On 25 November 1986 New Zealand signed the Convention for the Protection of Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region and intends to ratify the convention as soon as constitutional procedures are completed. He concluded by saying New Zealand looked forward to continuing to apply its expertise in the South Pacific Region and to working alongside other countries in the implementation of the SPREP Action Plan.

30. The representative of Palau informed the meeting that the Republic of Palau is moving forward to strengthen its environmental protection programme. It is considered particularly important for Palau to strengthen its Programme at this time as, like the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands, Palau is moving into the status of Free Association with the United States. At present Palau receives full support from the U.S. EPA, however beginning with this next fiscal year, greater local contribution will be required. One significant development was a decision to place the Environmental Quality Protection Board directly under the Office of the President as a quasi-independent agency. This was done to improve the Board's stature and give it greater influence and contact with other departments and ministries.

31. The Board, like the U.S. EPA is primarily a regulatory and monitoring organisation. However, it recognises the importance of public education and awareness and has made this an important part of its programme. The areas it covers include water quality - both marine and drinking water, solid waste, wastewater treatment and disposal, and hazardous waste. Among the key issues of concern to Palau are solid waste management, water quality, and impact of earthmoving, particularly coastal dredging and fill activities, on its natural resources. To address the above, it is important that Palau improve its environmental impact assessment capabilities and its regulations and procedures for environmental assessment. The Board aims to ensure the continued economic development of Palau is undertaken in such a way as to ensure there are minimal deleterious impacts on the environment. There should be ensured a sustainable use of natural resources. The Board believes that Palau's natural resources are critical to the economic success of the country, as well as other aspects of overall health and well being of the people. Finally, the representative indicated that Palau looked forward to continued co-operation and interaction with SPREP, its member countries and other associated institutions.

32. The representative of the Solomon Islands stated that his country's aims and objectives included the rational and sustainable use of resources, protection of the environment and the conservation of nature and natural habitats, recognition of the role of traditional knowledge in national development and the promotion of international and regional co-operation in environmental protection. He mentioned that the most widespread current environmental concerns were deforestation through logging, mineral exploration and large scale agricultural projects, and town planning. Other problems include pressure on wildlife and pollution problems.

33. He informed the meeting of a number of constraints facing the Solomon Islands in dealing with these problems. These included limited knowledge of the natural environment, inadequate recognition of the importance of traditional knowledge, the need for improved public conservation awareness and the need for improved legislation, staff training and environmental planning. To overcome these the Solomon Islands will, among other things, be developing legislation and policy for environmental assessment, wildlife control, and will endeavour to formulate a National Conservation Strategy. Other activities will include training and involvement with regional and international conservation agencies.

34. The representative of Tokelau wished to thank and compliment the work of SPREP, in the past and at present. SPREP activities have been useful, particularly the Traditional Knowledge Fishing Project, the results of which have been used as resource materials in local school curriculum teaching programmes. Although environmental and conservation issues are traditionally managed, Tokelau is aware of the importance of adopting legislation to address those issues. In 1985 Tokelau embarked on its first Law Project assisted financially by UNDP and New Zealand. This Law Project will adopt legislation to address the areas of Environmental Protection and Conservation. Tokelau will continue its support to SPREP in the future.

35. The representative of Tonga referred to the development of SPREP over the twelve years of his association with the Programme and expressed his hope that the Work Programme for the next biennium would be successfully implemented. He commented that Tonga's environment programme was largely implemented by the Ministry of Lands, Survey and Natural Resources which was endeavouring to develop integrated environmental planning legislation. Other activities undertaken in Tonga included a weekly environmental radio programme and the annual environment awareness week which had just been completed. Projects started in 1982 to rejuvenate giant clams and black coral were producing encouraging results. Activities relating to staff training both at grassroots and progressing upwards to university degree level and in protected area management were being undertaken.

36. He also stated that Tonga had recently evaluated a hazardous waste incineration and electricity co-generation proposal by a USA company similar to that which had been proposed to American Samoa. This evaluation had been undertaken by the Government's Inter-departmental Environmental Committee which had been established with the assistance of ESCAP. As a result, the Committee had been able to successfully recommend to Cabinet that hazardous waste should not be introduced into the Kingdom of Tonga now or in the future. He suggested that in view of the frequency with which such proposals from outside were occurring now in the region, it would be appropriate for SPREP to urgently convene a workshop on the subject.

37. The U.S. representative noted the importance of a regional commitment to protection of the South Pacific environment through the SPREP Action Plan and his government's support for its implementation through the SPC and the UNEP Regional Seas Programme. He further noted that his country had actively participated in the negotiation of the SPREP Convention and protocols and had signed them in 1986 at the Conference adopting them.

38. The U.S. representative also indicated that in addition to the interest and commitment of the U.S. AID Mission in Suva, the U.S. Government as a whole was reviewing how it might become more active in the SPREP Work Programme, in particular those agencies with expertise in SPREP activities, such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Coast Guard.

39. In his country statement, he generally summarised U.S. legislation designed to protect air, water, soil and living resources, including stringent controls over the export of hazardous wastes, and emphasised the increasing awareness of the need to deal with environmental protection on a cross-media basis. The U.S. representative stressed the importance of addressing transboundary environmental problems in co-operation with others including on global issues of relevance to the region such as possible climate change and ozone layer protection. To this end he noted the 1987 Montreal Protocol on Substances which deplete the ozone layer and urged the South Pacific nations to join the Protocol as soon as possible. He further encouraged efforts by SPREP and the nations of the region to co-operate with competent international organisations with a view to promoting the environmental quality in the region.

40. The Vanuatu representative stated that his is a country in which the natural environment is in a relatively undisturbed condition. The vast majority of Ni-Vanuatu are dependent upon a healthy natural environment for their subsistence agriculture and hunting and gathering from forest, river and reef. The country's economy is heavily dependent upon agriculture, tourism, forestry and fishing. As population increases and development projects are implemented, Vanuatu's natural environment and its resources will come under increasing pressure.

41. Vanuatu established an Environment Unit in 1986 within the Ministry of Lands, Minerals and Fisheries. Major environmental programmes that have been undertaken or are planned include: surveys of the country's coral reefs, dugongs, crocodiles, freshwater resources; EIA procedures were introduced in 1987 for development projects that may adversely affect the natural environment; a review of Vanuatu's environmental legislation is scheduled for 1988 and Vanuatu is planning to develop a National Conservation Strategy that will provide a blue-print to enable the country's development programmes to proceed without excessive environmental damage. Training on coastal resource management, environmental impact assessment and village level environmental concerns have taken place or are planned. Vanuatu is planning to develop a protected areas system as a component of its overall management of the country's natural environment. With the implementation of these programmes, Vanuatu is confident that environmental considerations will be taken fully into account in its development programmes.

42. The representative of Western Samoa stated that over the past two years his country's environment and conservation programme emphasised the maintenance of existing and on-going environmental conservation projects, although some new projects were initiated with assistance from SPREP and the New Zealand Government. Among the activities undertaken in the area of environmental education were the annual Conservation Week and Arbor Day campaign, promotion of a national conservation symbol and development of an environmentally orientated science curriculum. In the fields of natural resource management and protected areas, emphasis has been given to reducing forest clearfelling for forest plantation development, watershed management activities and the development of a forest resources inventory. Budgetary constraints had impeded protected area management but a SPREP funded marine survey of the Aleipata Islands had been completed and would provide a basis for the establishment of a new marine protected area.

43. A SPREP funded consultant's investigation into the environmental impact of tourism had been completed and would be presented to the Government shortly. He also informed the meeting that Western Samoa had also been approached with a hazardous waste disposal proposal and had rejected this following an evaluation assisted by advice and information from SPREP, UNEP (through INFOTERRA) and the US EPA.

44. The representative of the South Pacific Bureau for Economic Co-operation (SPEC), on behalf of his Director, extended SPEC's best wishes and hopes for a successful meeting. He stated that SPEC continues to accord the protection of the environment and natural resources in the Pacific the highest of priorities. The Director of SPEC, as depository of the Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment of the South Pacific Region and the associated Protocols, welcomes the advice by countries that they are moving towards ratification or accession to the Convention. The early entry into force of the Convention is vital towards the completion of the constitutional aspects of the SPREP Action Plan. It will also facilitate the projected activities that the SPREP Secretariat has foreshadowed in one of its papers to be discussed at this meeting. He added that the Convention has been closed for signature since November 1987. Countries that have not signed the Convention may now accede to it.

45. He further stated that at the first meeting of this body in 1986 reference was made by the SPEC representative to two programmes within SPEC - the South Pacific Regional Tourism Development Programme and the Rural Energy Development Programme which have strong environmental components and implications. These programmes are on-going and will be reviewed in meetings under SPEC auspices later this year. He concluded by wishing the meeting every success in its proceedings and hoped that constructive decisions on the region's environment will be arrived at in line with the desires and interest of the peoples of the region. SPEC will continue to support the endeavours of the countries in the search for the preservation of the environmental heritage of the region.

46. The representative of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) briefly recalled his organisation's involvement in the development and implementation of SPREP since 1975, and reviewed the position of UNEP towards the future development of SPREP, as reflected in Annex 4.

47. The representative of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) stated that within the framework of its work programme, ESCAP has co-operated with SPREP since 1982. The ESCAP involvement with SPREP has ranged from organisation of workshops, training of radio broadcasters on environment, support for studies undertaken, organisation of expert group meetings in the South Pacific and supporting participation of South Pacific countries in workshops/seminars outside the South Pacific and participation of ESCAP in SPREP meetings. In addition, ESCAP provides, in co-operation with SPREP, direct support to the member countries of the South Pacific such as the development of an environmental management plan for Tonga. Besides, ESCAP also picks up projects from the work programme of SPREP for implementation. Two such projects implemented recently are (1) Review of Environmental Legislation of Tuvalu and (2) Training Course on Coastal Resource Management Planning held at Port Vila, Vanuatu.

48. The representative of ESCAP further stated that ESCAP would continue to provide assistance to South Pacific countries in providing regional dimension to SPREP training activities by supporting participation of outer island experts, follow-up on the recommendations of review of environmental legislation of Tuvalu, sub-regional training course on EIA methodology, follow-up activities on the findings and recommendations of the World Commission on Environment and Development, and activities related to promotion of environmental awareness within the budgetary constraint of ESCAP.

49. The meeting was also informed that ESCAP Commission during its 44th Session in Jakarta decided to hold a ministerial level conference on environment in 1990 and urged that the work programme of SPREP be directed to bring the environmental problems of the South Pacific in the forefront for discussion at the ministerial level meeting. The meeting was also made aware of the adoption of the resolution in the last Commission session of ESCAP urging its members and associate members to adopt long-term strategy of environmentally sound and sustainable development in Asia and the Pacific.

Agenda Item 5 - Status of SPREP and Apia Conventions.

50. The Secretariat outlined the background to the SPREP and Apia Conventions and reported on progress reached to date in bringing both Conventions into force. It was noted that since the Apia Convention was adopted in 1976 only three countries had signed and one acceded. Ratification by four countries is necessary to bring it into force. Similarly it was noted that thirteen countries had signed the SPREP Convention by March 1988 but only two, the Cook Islands and the Republic of the Marshall Islands had ratified. A further eight ratifications would be needed to bring the Convention into force.

51. In discussion of the Secretariat recommendations contained in the working paper to this agenda item (WP. 1) the representative of the United States said his country was reviewing the SPREP Convention with a view towards ratification. He suggested the focus of action in the near future should be on bringing the SPREP Convention into force, after which the first meeting of the Contracting Parties would make decisions on its implementation and could, if necessary, consider the issue of linking the two conventions. He also indicated the United States would be willing to consider the Apia Convention if there was strong regional interest in it.

52. The representative of Vanuatu indicated his country supported the status of the two Conventions in principle, however it would like to see the total prohibition of nuclear testing and dumping of nuclear waste within the SPREP Convention area. Vanuatu therefore reserved its position on the SPREP and Apia Conventions. Referring to the apparent difficulties some countries were having in coming to a decision on ratifying the SPREP Convention, the representative of Tonga suggested the Secretariat should visit the countries concerned and encourage them in this respect. He was of the view that there should be no further meetings until the Convention was in force.

53. Further discussion took place on the issue of linking the SPREP and Apia Conventions and whether this was an appropriate issue for discussion at the proposed joint meeting of Parties to both Conventions. It was generally agreed that this was a matter for the first meeting of the Parties to the SPREP Convention to consider. It was noted that a meeting would be called within one year of the Convention coming into force. The meeting approved the following recommendations from WP. 1:

- 26.1. That all eligible governments review their position with a view to ratifying or acceding to the Apia and SPREP Conventions.
- 26.2. That SPREP should seek financial assistance to fund a legal expert to provide advice and assistance to member governments, as necessary, on measures being taken, or to be taken, to ratify and/or accede to the Apia and SPREP Conventions.

Agenda Item 6 - Expanding the Role of SPREP as the Co-ordinating Unit for Environmental Activities in the South Pacific Region

54. The SPREP Co-ordinator introduced this item by briefly reviewing the Working Paper for this agenda item (WP. 7). He stated that over the past 5 years the Secretariat has maintained its "common touch" with the needs of SPREP member governments, who are increasingly turning to SPREP for advice and assistance on environmental matters. In response to this, the Secretariat sees the need to expand SPREP activities in the areas outlined in the working paper. This would also serve to reduce or avoid duplication of effort by developing the expanded role of SPREP in conjunction with regional and international organisations which are interested in collaborating in environmental management in the Pacific. He stressed that the expanded role would be funded primarily by extra-budgetary sources.

55. The representative of Tonga queried whether this expansion was based on the results of a study or on the experience of the SPREP Secretariat in assisting SPREP member countries. The Secretariat responded that the proposal to expand the role and activities of SPREP was a result of the latter, adding that SPREP was channelling the interests and support capabilities of outside organisations into priority programme areas to be administered by the Secretariat in response to member country needs.

56. The representative of New Zealand supported the recommendations of the working paper, which were seen as a consolidation of SPREP's role in responding to important areas of environmental concern in the Pacific. The Fiji representative also added support, noting that Fiji interests and needs, particularly in the area of National Conservation Strategy development, would be addressed by the activities proposed.

57. The representative of Tonga asked for clarification of UNEP's earlier statement in regard to its support for the SPREP Secretariat in implementing the Action Plan. The representative of UNEP responded by saying that UNEP will be withdrawing from the SPREP Co-ordinating Group to allow governments to exercise their role in guiding SPREP. He reiterated that UNEP would continue to work with SPREP in joint project areas that are compatible with UNEP's global programme.

58. The representative of the United States noted the Secretariat's role in carrying out the expanded programme as envisaged in the working paper. However, he questioned the relationship of the expanded role to the existing 1987-88 Work Programme and the proposed 1989-90 Work Programme. In addition he queried whether the programme would assist in developing in-country environmental assessment capabilities or the capabilities of the Secretariat and whether there were means to ensure SPREP's role other than adding new posts.

59. The SPREP Co-ordinator responded by saying the proposals include a strong training component in order to help develop in-country capabilities. He added that the expanded programmes would cover many of the projects proposed by SPREP for inclusion in its Work Programme and that the expanded activities would make use of expertise from within the region as much as possible and only require core funding for administrative costs. He noted that new posts would not necessarily be based at SPC in Noumea.

60. The meeting approved the following recommendation to:

- (i) approve the plans for the expansion of the activities of the Secretariat as proposed; and,
- (ii) endorse the efforts of the Secretariat in seeking adequate financial support from extra-budgetary sources for the establishment and operation of the posts as proposed.

Agenda Item 7 - Implementation of the 1987-88 Work Programme

61. The Secretariat introduced its working paper which reviewed projects undertaken in the 1987-88 Work Programme. It was pointed out that the number of projects had increased from 74 submitted at the First Intergovernmental Meeting of the SPREP Work Programme in 1986 to 116 projects in 1988. Of these 116 projects, 65% were either completed or underway, with this percentage expected to increase to 88% by the end of 1988.

62. The provision of funds and in-kind support from a number of sources namely governments, institutions, regional and international bodies had enabled the implementation of the 1987-88 Work Programme. The Secretariat particularly referred to the considerable support given by UNEP, by the SPC, by extra-budgetary contributions from the governments of Australia and New Zealand, together with support from IUCN, IMO and USAID. The Secretariat believed that considerable progress had been made in implementing a large and comprehensive programme.

63. The representative of Tonga sought the retention of the Giant Clam Replanting Project (NR16) which he noted was designated by the Secretariat for deletion from the 1989-90 Work Programme. The Secretariat indicated that the suggested deletion or retention of the project was subject to the agreement of the representative of Tonga and to the provision of full project details at the meeting.

64. The representative of Australia referred to the difficulty experienced by delegates in assessing such a large number of projects and suggested that for future meetings it might be beneficial to instead present working papers on each of the project categories. This suggestion was supported by the representative of Western Samoa and welcomed by the Secretariat as useful in ensuring reporting in more manageable proportions.

65. The representative of Tonga sought clarification from the Secretariat on the past expenditure of the UNEP contribution to the programme since 1983 and questioned from where funds would be forthcoming should UNEP support be withdrawn from the Programme. The representative of UNEP stated that his organisation would not be withdrawing from SPREP but would withdraw from the Co-ordinating Group and offered to provide a written statement clarifying his organisation's position. (See Annex 4). In answer to a further query from the representative of Tonga, he replied that where appropriate, UNEP funds could be channelled directly to countries.

66. In response to a query by the representative of ESCAP relating to his organisation's 1986 and 1987 contributions to the Programme, the Secretariat indicated that in order to incorporate estimated in-kind contributions such figures would need to be provided to the Secretariat prior to report preparation. The representative of New Zealand referred the meeting to paragraph 18 of the Secretariat's working paper (WP. 2) which he suggested fully acknowledged the importance of in-kind contributions to the continued implementation of the Work Programme.

67. The meeting endorsed the Secretariat's Review of the 1987-88 Work Programme and expressed its appreciation to contributing organisations and countries that had made the implementation of the Work Programme possible.

Agenda Item 8 - Implementation of Projects under Sub-contracts by Members of the Association of South Pacific Environmental Institutions

68. The Chairman of ASPEI introduced the report of the Association to the meeting and informed delegates that over the past five years the Research and Training Institutions and other organisations within the region had undertaken, within the constraints of time and funds, the implementation of aspects of the SPREP Work Programme. He commented that the Institutions and Organisations of the region represented a significant pool of scientific and technical expertise which is available to assist SPREP in implementing the SPREP Work Programme. A number of significant reports and publications are now available, resulting from previous contributions to the research and monitoring and environmental education training and information activities undertaken under the SPREP Work Programme. Through the Institutional training programmes, the Institutions have contributed significantly to the pool of trained national and regional personnel having the skills necessary to manage the environment of the region.

69. He noted that the involvement of the Institutions in the implementation of the SPREP Work Programme began with the First Consultative Meeting of Research and Training Institutions held at SPC headquarters in 1983. This meeting recommended the implementation of a series of regional reviews concerning the state of knowledge with respect to various areas of environmental concern. A number of these reviews had been published, including; water quality; pesticides; resource data handling; oceanography. A second Consultative Meeting was held in 1984 and a third in 1986. In the light of the results of these early reviews and the implementation of activities between 1984 and June 1986, the Third Consultative Meeting recommended to the First Intergovernmental Meeting the adoption of the 1987-1988 work programme.

70. The ASPEI Chairman commented that the report on Institutional involvement in the Work Programme demonstrated that the Institutions and Organisations of the region represent significant pools of expertise which can be mobilised for managing our shared environment. It also demonstrated the Institutional commitment to achieving the primary objectives of the SPREP Action Plan. He added that over the last three to five years, individuals and institutions involved in SPREP activities have come to recognise the need for a more coherent and co-operative approach to tackling the management of the environment of the region. With such a need in mind, the Institutional representatives decided at the 1986 Consultative Meeting to form a Professional Association, the Association of South Pacific Environmental Institutions (ASPEI), as a forum to facilitate information transfer and co-ordinate institutional activities within the approved work programme. ASPEI is now recognised as a scientific advisory body by UNEP. In closing, the ASPEI Chairman emphasised that the Institutions and ASPEI stand ready to assist in implementing the aims and objectives of the SPREP Action Plan and await with interest the decisions of this Meeting concerning the potential role the ASPEI members can play in the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme.

71. In response to questions from the meeting the ASPEI Chairman clarified aspects of his report and confirmed that UNEP had in the past been the main source of funds for their activities. The representative of Western Samoa noted that many of the institutions' projects were located in the host countries of the main institutions and sought, and received assurance that efforts were made to expand the projects beyond these countries.

Agenda Item 9 - Consideration of Project Proposals for the 1989-90 Work Programme

72. The Secretariat introduced the Working Paper on this item noting that there were some 140 project proposals to be considered. Of these a number still required further information and representatives were urged to provide this during the course of the meeting. It was noted that the cost of the projects was much greater than anticipated income necessitating prioritisation for funding. It was emphasised that implementation of this extensive work programme would require the assistance of member governments, institutions and a wide range of other interested organisations.

73. The Chairman of the Fourth Consultative Meeting was called upon to present that meeting's report. He indicated that although the meeting had no formal brief, it had grappled with the task of evaluating the projects and where possible integrating them into wider regional projects, particularly in relation to the two principle areas of UNEP's global programme; (i) Climatic Change and Sea Level Rise and (ii) Marine Pollution Monitoring. Attempts were also made to identify budget savings throughout the proposed Work Programme.

74. Referring to the extensive nature of the proposed Work Programme the representatives of Fiji, Solomon Islands, Cook Islands and Western Samoa expressed optimism that the programme could be largely implemented but they understood that this would not be possible for all their submitted projects. They stated it was understood that submission of a large number of projects by a country served to indicate that country's priorities for environmental action. A list of projects prioritised by the countries themselves appears as Annex 5.

75. The Intergovernmental Meeting then decided to receive reports from the Working Groups of the Fourth Consultative Meeting.

76. The report of the Working Group on Monitoring, Research and Control of Pollution in Coastal and Open Ocean Waters of the SPREP Convention Area (SPREP/POL) proposed that a number of related projects could be integrated into a single regional project which would meet the UNEP criteria for support for marine pollution monitoring activities. An amended list of problems of particular importance to countries in the region, prepared by the ASPEI Working Group for a regional review for GESAMP's global review of the health of the ocean was noted by the meeting.

77. It was proposed that the Scientific Co-ordination of the project be assigned to Professor John Morrison of the University of the South Pacific while the meeting noted that the issue of which organisation would undertake the Technical Co-ordination was unresolved. It was explained that Scientific Co-ordination relates to integration of the individual institution activities including standardisation of methodologies across projects and the organisation of inter-laboratory calibration exercises, provision of overall guidance to the training component, evaluation of the data produced and presentation of major reports to regional and international meetings.

78. In discussion of this issue the representative of the Cook Islands expressed concern over the possible loss by SPREP of the Technical Co-ordination function. The representatives of France, Western Samoa, New Caledonia, the Marshall Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Fiji all supported retention of the Technical Co-ordination function within the SPREP Secretariat. The Secretariat explained that it believed there was value in a number of projects being scientifically co-ordinated outside the Secretariat if this would lead to improved efficiency. However, it considered that SPREP should retain the Technical Co-ordination function. In summary the Chairman noted that the majority of countries preferred that the Technical Co-ordination remain with SPREP.

79. The report of the Working Group on Protected Area Management, Species Conservation, Historic Site Protection and Exotic Organisms was introduced. Reference was made to the high degree of biological diversity in the region and very high levels of species endemism which contributed towards the high numbers of endangered species of flora and fauna in the region. It was the view of this group that the specific species conservation projects and projects relating to the establishment and management of protected areas were all of high regional priority. It was also noted that the potential for disruption of the often fragile ecological and environmental systems of islands through the introduction of exotic organisms was high.

80. The group reviewed the 23 projects under its consideration with a view to improving their efficiency, outputs and scientific content. The projects were mostly country specific and independent so there were few opportunities for grouping them into wider regional projects. It was noted that the projects involving baseline surveys would eventually contribute to a regional data base on biological diversity. Another exception was projects relating to the management of marine turtles and as the Consultative Meeting had prepared a recommendation for the meeting's consideration calling for the development of a regional marine turtle management and conservation programme and to be co-ordinated with the UNEP East Asian Seas Region.

81. Following discussion and general support, the meeting endorsed the recommendation "that a project for the co-ordination and integration of regional marine turtle management initiatives be developed which will focus on the promotion of field conservation activities, the development of supporting legislation and public education programmes and the development of regional arrangements for marine turtle management." Further, the meeting requested the representative of UNEP, which is the Secretariat of the Action Plan for the Protection and the Development of the East Asian Seas Region, to bring the problem of marine turtle management to the attention of the forthcoming Intergovernmental Meeting convened under that Action Plan with a view to seeking inter-regional co-operation between SPREP and the East Asian Seas Region on the subject.

82. The Working Group on Inland Water Quality, Pesticides and Pollution Control reported on its technical evaluation of projects under this subject area. These projects were concerned with assessment of hazards due to wastes originating from agriculture, forestry, industry, domestic and mining sources. Projects in this category aimed at reducing deleterious impacts on inland waterways, estuaries, lagoons and the terrestrial environment.

83. The Working Group had concluded that there was a degree of overlap of projects in this category particularly due to the difficulty of clearly delineating coastal from inland waters. Some projects were of a technical nature, others more policy-oriented with ramifications involving introduction of new legislation. Some projects were local and specific to a particular country's needs while others were of a regional nature. However, one feature common to all projects in this group, was the absence of an identified funding source.

84. Projects were prioritised purely on a technical basis, priority two applying to those which required extra detail before adequate evaluation could be undertaken. The Working Group fully appreciated that prioritisation was a matter for the decision of government representatives.

85. In relation to Project WQ 9, Assessment and Monitoring of Drinking Water, the representative of Vanuatu requested that the original proposal as submitted by his government which had requested equipment only, be reinstated in place of the revised version involving a larger WHO input.

86. In response to questions from delegates relating to the basis on which the Secretariat determined project implementation, the Secretariat stated that where a number of countries requested a similar project, these were undertaken on a regional or sub-regional basis of cost-effectiveness, following considerable consultation. It was further stated that projects recommended by the Secretariat for non-incorporation in the 1989-90 Work Programme could be re-submitted by government representatives so long as adequate details were provided at this meeting.

87. The representative of American Samoa noted that 90% of his government's proposals had been suggested for funding from other sources. He requested the Secretariat to consider partial funding of some of these projects where fuller funding was not available.

88. The representative of the United States noted that several references had been made in the working papers of the meeting to the involvement of U.S. Federal agencies with respect to proposed projects. He indicated that Federal agencies would continue to work to see how Federal programmes could be made relevant to such projects including those on groundwater protection and on pesticides training. He further noted previous U.S. agency involvement in SPREP, and that he would bring to the attention of such agencies other projects of potential interest.

89. The report of the Working Group on Natural Resource Management and Environmental Planning and Administration was presented. This Group had separated the projects under consideration into three main sections: National Conservation Strategies, Coastal Zone Management and Traditional Resource Knowledge. The Group strongly supported the development of the SPREP/IUCN regional umbrella project for National Conservation Strategies and the efforts to seek extra-budgetary funding for that Programme. Similarly it gave priority to the traditional resource knowledge grouping and urged that an overview regional programme be developed in this area. In this regard it was noted that a regional seminar on "The Science of Pacific Peoples" would be held at USP in 1990 and would address this topic. The nature of projects on coastal resource management clearly reflected the regional and national importance of this topic.

90. The Working Group on Environmental Education, Training and Information reported that the large number of projects under this category reflected increased awareness by governments, institutions and non-government organisations of the need for expansion of environmental education, information and training activities. The group considered that most of the projects were of high priority; those given a low priority were assigned that rating only because they were possible candidates for funding from other sources. The 52 projects represented a balanced spread between regional, sub-regional and in-country projects together with a broad geographical scope.

91. The group suggested that the Secretariat seek additional information relating to Workplan/Methodology of some training activities, namely (i) WT 21 Sand Mining and Dredging (ii) WT 22 Prevention of Stream Siltation, and (iii) WT 11 Transportation, Handling and Storage of Hazardous Materials. Without this information, it was suggested, there would be difficulty in ensuring these activities had an emphasis on environmentally safe practices. The importance of the EIA Training Workshop WT 1 was stressed but efforts should be made to ensure that such training was tailored to specific country needs and backed up by appropriate legislation.

92. During the course of the meeting, several delegates had expressed concern over the threatened importation to the region of hazardous waste for disposal. Several countries had been approached by the proponents of this project but each had successfully managed to forestall this activity.

93. The meeting called upon the representative of the Pacific Basin Consortium on Hazardous Waste to produce a document outlining appropriate immediate action to alert other governments of this threat. The Secretariat was asked to provide recommendations for the convening of a regional workshop on Hazardous Waste Disposal.

94. The meeting supported the recommendation from the Fourth Consultative Meeting that small amounts of seed money be made available through NGO's supported by SPREP namely, the South Pacific Action Committee on Human Ecology and the Environment (SPACHEE) and the Melanesian Environment Foundation to support other non-government organisations involved in environment-related activities.

95. The report of the working group on Impacts of Climate Change and Sea Level Rise on Pacific Island States of the SPREP Region was introduced. This project had been developed in response to the general consensus in the scientific community that changes will occur in climate and sea levels over the next century which could have profound impact on the island countries of the South Pacific. Other indirect impacts could also occur such as significant changes in weather patterns leading to disruption of agriculture and other sectors. These impacts will be of a different nature than those experienced by larger countries and warranted examination in the South Pacific context. These recommendations were submitted for the meeting's endorsement.

96. The representative of Tonga referred to the workshop on the effect of climate change on sea level undertaken by the CCOP/SOPAC in LAE, Papua New Guinea, 1987 and its member countries and urged that there be collaboration on these projects. In reply to queries from the representatives of Fiji and the Cook Islands, it was clarified that the working group report did not refer to projects on the proposed SPREP Work Programme. Rather, it referred to a draft proposal developed at the Consultative Meeting in response to UNEP's stated interest in providing collaborative support in this area to member countries of the region.

97. The representative of the Cook Islands sought clarification on whether country funds would be required to support this project and it was indicated that funding would be from extra-budgetary sources. Further discussion on the implications of the project for the SPREP budget and work programme ensued. It was clarified that the work done by the SPREP task team on climate change to date which had been fully funded by UNEP, related to the first phase of the project for which a preliminary draft report had now been completed. The proposal before the meeting related to the subsequent phases of the overall project.

98. The meeting endorsed the recommendation of the Consultative Meeting that the study on the potential impact of the expected climate changes, initiated by UNEP for the SPREP region as part of its global programme in that field, be completed by ASPEI. The meeting also accepted the suggestion made by the representative of UNEP that a workshop, jointly sponsored and organised by UNEP, ASPEI and Secretariat of SPREP, be convened for representatives of governments participating in SPREP and of relevant member institutions of ASPEI to consider the study and to agree on follow-up steps to be taken, including on their costs. These may include baseline studies for determining the long-term trends and effects of climate changes on ecological and socio-economic systems and assistance to governments in identification of response options and in the implementation of suitable options. The representative of UNEP confirmed that the completion of the study and the costs of the workshop will be borne by the Environment Fund of UNEP as UNEP's contribution to SPREP. He has also indicated that UNEP would be ready to consider supporting financially the follow-up activities expected to be recommended by the workshop, provided that the costs are shared between SPREP and UNEP and that the cash contributions through UNEP will not exceed 80 per cent of the total cash requirements of the recommended follow-up activities. The meeting agreed to support such course of action as well as the proposal of the Chairman of the Co-ordinating Group to empower that Group to decide about the SPREP funds which could be used to support the recommendations of the workshop. The representative of the U.S. brought to the meeting's attention that a WMO/UNEP Intergovernment Panel on climate change will be convened later this year and the representative of UNEP confirmed that the preparation of impact studies, such as the one for the South Pacific are closely co-ordinated with the preparations for the Panel.

Agenda Item 10 - Statements by Observers

99. The representative of the Committee for Co-ordination of Joint Prospecting for Mineral Resources in South Pacific Offshore Areas CCOP/SOPAC stated that CCOP/SOPAC has co-operated with SPREP on project work since 1982. At present seven of the CCOP/SOPAC programme projects have environmental components, they are:

- | | | |
|----|---|----------------|
| 1. | Central Lagoon Study in Tongatapu | In progress |
| 2. | Ocean Discharge in Western Samoa | Begins 1988 |
| 3. | Lagoon Study and Ocean Discharge, Vanuatu | In progress |
| 4. | Mining Waste, Solomon Islands | Planning |
| 5. | Location of Recreational Facility, Kiribati | Completed 1988 |
| 6. | Dredging in Tuvalu | Planning |
| 7. | Dredging in Rarotonga, First Stage | Completed |

100. Areas of co-operation also include participation in Training Workshops, and educational activities. It is recommended that SPREP attend the 17th annual CCOP/SOPAC session to be held in Fiji in October of this year to review project programmes and plan future co-operation for 1989.

101. The representative from Ecology Division of the New Zealand Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, outlined the activities of his organisation. He noted that the DSIR had 23 divisions that cover a wide range of scientific disciplines (e.g. Botany Division, Entomology Division, Soil Bureau, Geological Survey and Division of Marine and Freshwater Science). Scientists from the Water and Soil Research Section of Ministry of Works and Development have recently joined DSIR.

102. DSIR has had a long history of scientific research in the South Pacific. Ecology Division, in particular, has done studies in the region since the 1950's. Two scientists appointed recently have had experience in South Pacific ecology and so work in the region is likely to increase. Ecology Division is involved in two current SPREP studies (PA 7 - Cagou in New Caledonia and PA 12 - Kakerori on Rarotonga, Cook Islands).

103. Ecology Division has a policy of undertaking joint-venture research whereby if a project has direct scientific benefits, the costs of salaries are shared in a variable ratio between Ecology Division and the joint-venture partner with the level depending on the scientific relevance of the work. Travel and local costs are normally met by the partner or an outside agency and staff from the partner are given training in ecological techniques wherever possible.

104. He then outlined a package of conferences and events (The World of Birds) to be held in New Zealand in November/December 1990. This package includes the 20th International Ornithological Congress, the 20th Conference of the International Council for Bird Preservation and the 1st Pacific Nature Film Festival. These events should be of considerable interest to scientists and wildlife managers within the region because several workshops and symposia will be devoted to matters of particular concern in the South Pacific region.

105. The representative of Greenpeace thanked the Chairman for the opportunity to address the meeting. She explained that Greenpeace, as an international non-governmental organisation with an agenda comprised of peace and environmental issues, represents nearly two million members world-wide including three-quarters of a million members in the United States and over 30 000 supporters in the Pacific region. Greenpeace was founded in 1970 and currently has offices in nineteen countries, and supports a base camp in Antarctica. Greenpeace is funded by contributions from the general public, usually in the form of small donations, fundraising initiatives and merchandise sales. No government or corporation can influence positions on particular issues through the use of economic pressure.

106. The Greenpeace representative encouraged the participants to consider the following proposals which it will be advocating during the meeting and at other fora in the future.

- (1) the designation of coral atolls as Specially Protected Areas, inherently part of the marine environment, to be protected from hazardous activities;
- (2) the accession to the London Dumping Convention (LDC) by more Pacific states and active support for global bans on radioactive waste dumping and incineration at sea;
- (3) restricting pesticide use in the Pacific.

She emphasised that Greenpeace would continue to oppose existing and expanded nuclearisation of the Pacific; the export of products that are banned, severely restricted or unregistered in their country of origin to the Pacific; the transference of hazardous technologies to the Pacific; the shipment of waste through the Pacific and the hazards associated with such shipment; and the disposal of hazardous materials on coral atolls. Finally, she indicated that Greenpeace looked forward to working with SPREP now and in the future to ensure that the Pacific remains a beautiful, unique and fragile ecosystem protected from human destruction.

107. The representative of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) made a short presentation on his agency's role and possible interest in the SPREP programme. Canada's official development assistance of over Canadian \$2 billion per year is divided among many countries, including those of the Commonwealth, la Francophonie, as well as the Americas and the Pacific Rim.

108. In the case of the South Pacific, the Minister of State for External Affairs has announced a Canadian \$10 million 5-year programme, for ocean development. The implementing agency for this programme will be ICOD with CIDA providing the funds and general direction as to the scope and nature of the programme. While final approval had not yet been obtained for programme details, it was anticipated that from 4 to 6 activity areas would be commenced, of which one possible item would be support to SPREP. CIDA's observer status at this meeting was therefore an excellent opportunity to learn of the priorities of the region in environmental matters.

109. The CIDA representative noted that the CIDA programme was intended to focus on institution-building and be developmental in nature with emphasis on regional activities likely to be favoured. Mention was also made of the priority attached by CIDA to environment as part of the recently issued ODA Charter as well as the policy thrusts identified in the CIDA publication "Environment and Development".

110. Although it is premature to consider individual proposals at this time, he advised attendees of his willingness to discuss, at this meeting, CIDA's approval to environmental issues and the possible modalities for implementation of the proposed programme. Canada's official representatives in the Region however, were the High Commissioners in Canberra and Wellington with matters of programme funding being the responsibility of CIDA bilateral branches, in this case Asia Regional.

111. The representative of the World Bank welcomed the opportunity to attend the SPREP Intergovernmental Meeting and to represent a new Bank interest in environmental issues and concerns in the South Pacific region. He noted that, so far, there had been no direct Bank involvement in the region's environmental action programme, although the environmental implications of a number of development projects had been carefully considered in lending for Bank member countries including Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Western Samoa.

112. With the establishment of a central Environment Department (with a director who had close earlier associations with SPREP) and environmental units in all four Regional Offices, the Bank's capacity for environmental work had clearly increased. A number of in-depth country studies had been initiated. The Bank was the executing agency for a UNDP Asia region environmental programme. In the Pacific, the aim was to pay more specific attention to environmental issues in Bank economic and sector studies which were being developed in co-operation with the Australian International Development Assistance Bureau and would be financed primarily from the AIDAB South Pacific Facility. In designing its study programme, the Bank would co-operate with SPREP to ensure that its work complemented and did not duplicate other environmental initiatives and utilised relevant Bank expertise to strengthen the programme for the region as a whole.

113. The representative of the World Young Women's Christian Association, (YWCA) Energy and Environment Desk stated that her organisation's earlier work in the region was largely focussed on appropriate technology co-operation with the Community Education Training Centre (CETC) and USP/Rural Development Institute (RDI) on development of the smokeless stove designs, ferro-cement tanks, latrines, and so on. Foundation membership of Nuclear Free Pacific, and regional environment groups led to strong environment statements emanating from regional women's meetings.

114. World YWCA recognised the strong connection between energy development and environment stress and the escalating requests from member YWCAs and other international women's organisations for servicing of programmes and projects in this field by the setting up of the Energy and Environment Desk. A newsletter is produced twice a year and an environment watch "spies" (Y'S EYES) network is attempting to implement a watching role for individuals and groups in the protection of the environment at the local level. Workshops at regional and national level are held around the world to develop technology skills among rural field workers, and training for the staff of YWCAs and other women's groups in advocacy, lobbying, and so on, in defence of the environment.

115. The Environment Liaison Centre International in Nairobi, Kenya, is a consortium of NGOs set up after the 1981 UN Environment Conference. The membership is by organisation (not individual) so the World YWCA Energy and Environment Desk acts as the representative of the South Pacific on ELCI and attends annual Board meetings. ELCI has a number of project areas of interest including small project funding, and any issues which ELCI might usefully consider should be directed to World YWCA, Energy and Environment, Nadi, Fiji.

116. A telexed message from the International Council for Bird Preservation (ICBP) was read to the meeting. ICBP expressed regret that it was unable to be represented and indicated its full support for the aims and activities of SPREP and its desire to collaborate and co-operate with SPREP in the future. It was noted that ICBP's major involvement in the Pacific was the publication, in co-operation with SPREP, of a report in 1986 on bird conservation in the Pacific Islands. This provided a review of available knowledge on bird conservation in the region and identified priorities for action. A number of these recommendations are now being followed up by a variety of agencies in collaboration with SPREP. One of the main roles of ICBP is to identify conservation priorities for birds on a global scale, and to provide scientific advice on the development and management of projects based on its experience of bird conservation worldwide.

117. ICBP's activities relating to the Pacific in the future will involve: (a) Island database profiles, with particular emphasis on threatened and endemic birds, to be compiled in August/September for New Caledonia and the Solomon Islands to complement the Kagu project (one of the high priorities for ICBP because of the level of bird endemism and the number of threatened species); (b) participation in the Kagu project through the provision of support for fundraising initiatives and advice on technical aspects; (c) continuation of provision of data to other SPREP-associated activities, e.g. UNEP Directory of Islands, USAID/TNC project to evaluate biological diversity in the South Pacific; (d) the ICBP World Conference in New Zealand in 1990 which will include a symposium on the Conservation of South-West Pacific birds. It is anticipated that the World Conference will provide a focus for the development of further projects in the Pacific, based on the highest identified priorities, in collaboration with SPREP in the 1990's.

118. The Vice-Chairman for the Research and Monitoring Network (RMN) of ASPEI outlined ASPEI's role as a scientific and technical advisory body to SPREP. He noted that ASPEI would be available to assist the governments of the region in scientific matters. Furthermore he noted that ASPEI will organise on behalf of UNEP, the inter-regional symposium at the 6th Inter-Congress of the Pacific Science Association's meetings at Vina del Mar, Chile, in 1989. ASPEI is presently the scientific advisory body for this region to UNEP and through its Chairman, presented a preliminary report on climate change and sea level rise in this region, to the Consultative Meeting. ASPEI is also editing for UNEP a scientific monograph on the Pacific written by Russian scientists.

Agenda Item 11 - (a) Consideration of a Budget for SPREP for 1989-90 and
(b) Adoption of the 1989-90 Work Programme

119. The Secretariat working paper (WP. 5) was introduced as an indicative statement of the budgetary implications associated with adoption of the SPREP Work Programme for the 1989-90 Biennium. The Secretariat referred to the difficulties of planning and implementing the work programme within the existing uncertain financial situation under which SPREP operated. It was pointed out that as member country contributions are made on a voluntary basis, it is not possible to determine in advance the total amount of contributions. Other financial resources at the Secretariat's disposal were extra-budgetary funds, the level of which was largely dependent on efforts by the Secretariat. Although 1987 had seen a marked increase in extra-budgetary assistance, the number of projects had also grown to the extent that the financial requirement to implement these proposals greatly exceeded the expected financial input.

120. The Secretariat presented a more manageable budget for the 1989-90 Work Programme with an adjusted list of projects based on the assumptions (i) that proposals which did not include budget figures were not considered a high priority by the submitting country/institution; (ii) that SPREP could only make a partial contribution to some projects which were priced outside its reach; (iii) that for joint projects, largely dependent on funding by international organisations, only the SPREP financial contribution was included; and (iv) Secretariat proposals for major extra-budgetary funded meetings and training courses be excluded from the budget statement.

121. Several delegates congratulated the Secretariat on its attempts to present a clearer picture and on its efforts to produce a more manageable budget. Delegates agreed that they would assist this cost-cutting exercise by prioritising their submitted projects. (These prioritisations appear as Annex 5).

122. In response to a query from the representative of the United States, the Secretariat stated that those projects with regional implications were given some sort of priority and although some countries might disagree with this approach, it was important to attempt to distribute benefits as widely as possible.

123. Following a question from the representative of Tonga regarding an apparent non-reconciliation between revenue and expenditure for 1987, the Secretariat clarified that the document gave this impression because it showed income for 1987-88 while expenditure was only included for 1987. A balance for income and expenditure would occur later in the year when 1988 expenditures were recorded. The Guam representative pointed to Appendix III WP. 5 and the apparent non-reconciliation of this balance sheet. The Secretariat acknowledged the comment.

124. The meeting approved the 1989-90 Work Programme as outlined in WP. 4 and its 5 addendums and endorsed the indicative budget in Appendix II of the Secretariat's Working Paper 5, noting the action undertaken by the Secretariat to develop a budget consistent with the resources at its disposal. A list of projects under the 1989-90 Work Programme appears as Annex 7.

Agenda Item 12 - Institutional and Financial Arrangements for SPREP

125. The Secretariat introduced a Working Paper on this subject and referred to the background to the proposal to establish an Environmental Trust Fund for SPREP. The rationale behind the concept was to provide an effective basis for firm, assessed contributions to SPREP and a predictable budget. The Secretariat emphasised that there must be a change to the funding basis of the programme if there is to be effective budgeting and planning. The Secretariat was therefore requesting that consideration be given to the recommendations for endorsement of the concept of a Trust Fund and that the concept be put to a joint Meeting of the Parties to the Apia and SPREP Conventions for consideration.

126. The representative of CIDA sought clarification on the role of potential donors in relation to the Trust Fund. The Secretariat confirmed there were several alternatives for the operation of the fund but it was envisaged that donor agencies could fund projects outside the Trust Fund arrangement which was primarily to provide for the core costs of the Secretariat. However the option would be open for donor agencies to contribute to the Trust Fund if they wished.

127. It was noted that the 1986 Intergovernmental Meeting had already endorsed the "establishment" of the Trust Fund. The Secretariat indicated that although the matter had been discussed by the 1986 South Pacific Conference no decision had been taken. However, with the subsequent signing of the SPREP Convention the Parties to that Convention will need to look at the issue of a firm assessed basis for funding SPREP and it was considered the Intergovernmental Meeting should reopen the matter.

128. The representative of New Zealand expressed the view that the real problem was in ensuring the regularity of funding for the programme and suggested that the establishment of a Trust Fund would not in itself guarantee that this would occur. The representatives of Australia and Guam agreed that the issue was one of securing a commitment from governments to regular payment of contributions to the Programme and suggested that rather than a "Trust Fund" the meeting should be considering a "dedicated account" for these contributions.

129. Discussion took place on the current formula for fixing the level of voluntary contributions and several participants indicated they had no mandate to review funding levels or mechanisms. However the meeting generally agreed that all countries should be urged to at least maintain contributions at current levels and should actively pursue the provision of budgetary funds so their contributions can be paid in a timely fashion.

130. The representative of UNEP then explained how the concept of Trust Funds worked in other Regional Seas Programmes and he emphasised that his organisation's experience in the other regions showed that this provided financial stability and a sound basis for planning.

131. The meeting generally supported the idea that some form of "dedicated account" should be set up to provide funds from which the Secretariat's core costs and other approved project costs could be met. Discussion ensued on how such an account would be managed. It was considered logical that the SPC would be the management agency and SPC financial rules would apply as is currently the case with SPREP funds. However, the meeting distinguished between the day to day operation of the account and its budgetary control. It was considered the latter should be exercised by the governments. This led to a discussion on the future role of the Co-ordinating Group which would presently exercise such control and other possible mechanisms.

132. A recommendation from the Fourteenth Co-ordinating Group meeting relating to a possible restructuring of the Co-ordinating Group, together with the announcement by the UNEP representative to this Intergovernmental Meeting of his organisation's withdrawal from the SPREP Co-ordinating Group, led to a discussion of the future role for the SPREP Co-ordinating Group including its possible replacement by a steering group comprised of governments and administrations.

133. The representatives of Guam and Western Samoa put forward separate proposals for the composition of a possible Steering Committee. Both proposals envisaged a group of representatives of governments and administrations assuming the role of the co-ordinating group. The representative of Guam suggested 5-6 members, chosen in an alphabetical fashion from the member countries. The representative of Western Samoa suggested a 6 member steering group comprising the SPREP Co-ordinator, the next Intergovernmental meeting chairman, a representative from each of Polynesia, Melanesia, Micronesia and other countries. Guam supported Western Samoa's model and suggested a modification which would see representatives from the following groups; Polynesia, Melanesia, Micronesia, USA/UK/France, NZ/Australia and the chairman to the next Intergovernmental Meeting. Official observers would be SPC, SPEC, UNEP, ESCAP and ASPEI. The SPREP Secretariat would be the secretariat to such a steering committee. In the discussion which followed, the meeting agreed that there should be continuity within the membership of such a committee and that consideration should be given to ensuring balanced representation amongst the member countries linked to their geographical distribution.

134. The representatives of France and Tonga expressed reservation about any change to the existing co-ordinating mechanism for SPREP.

135. Extensive discussion took place on the historical background of the Co-ordinating Group role and whether or not SPREP was an independent entity or an SPC programme. The representative of Western Samoa stated that his country regarded SPREP not as an independent programme but as a programme of the SPC. During the ensuing discussion the representative of UNEP requested that the meeting clarify whether SPREP is still considered as a jointly sponsored programme of SPC, SPEC, ESCAP and UNEP or agrees with SPC to treat SPREP as an SPC programme only. Some representatives, namely Fiji, Tonga, Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands stated that they did not have a mandate to discuss the matter at this Intergovernmental meeting. The meeting agreed that further consideration of these matters would not be fruitful at this time but that they should be pursued at the next South Pacific Conference. Rather it was considered more beneficial for the meeting to return to discussion of the important matters relating to financial arrangements for SPREP as had been earlier suggested by the representative of France.

136. The representative of Australia considered it was also important to look beyond traditional sources of funding and suggested the development of broad programmes with regional objectives would assist in this direction. In this regard he informed the meeting of the views of Australia towards any future increase in assistance to SPREP noting that Australia would need to obtain evidence from the countries themselves of the commitment they have to SPREP and the relevance of SPREP's work to their socio-economic development.

137. Further discussion on the funding issue followed and the meeting resolved that delegates and the Secretariat should pursue the aim of having each country commit themselves to making a firm contribution at a particular time to SPREP. It was noted that differences in budget cycles would need to be taken into consideration.

138. Following discussion of the earlier suggestion of the representative of Australia regarding the regional significance of projects, the meeting adopted the following recommendation:

"The meeting recognises the potential benefits of grouping related projects into programmes of regional significance and recommends the Secretariat continue and expand these efforts, while also seeking to support national projects with regional implications and other important national projects as set out in country priority listings".

Agenda Item 13 - Other Business

139. The representatives of Fiji and Guam suggested the Secretariat could provide countries with guidance on regional priorities and projects likely to attract extra-budgetary assistance when requesting proposals. It was also suggested that a standard format be used for the reviews undertaken by the Consultative Meeting. The Secretariat indicated that a project proposal format had been devised for this meeting and that all projects were considered by the Secretariat to be of equal interest. Further it was expected that countries would use the Action Plan as a guide to relevance of projects.

140. The representative of the Cook Islands urged that future Consultative Meetings be held at least three months prior to the Intergovernmental Meeting and that the project reviews be circulated to the Governments in adequate time for their consideration.

141. The representative of Tonga offered to host the proposed Hazardous Waste Workshop outlined in WP. 4/Ad. 4, subject to formal approval of his government and that the Workshop be held within six months.

Agenda Item 14 - Adoption of the Meeting Report

142. The Meeting adopted the report.

Agenda Item 15 - Closing of the Meeting and Final Statements

143. In his closing statement the representative of SPEC congratulated the Chairman for his handling of the meeting and expressed his thanks to the Secretariat and the SPC for their work and for hosting the meeting. He also expressed his thanks to the delegates and the other members of the Co-ordinating Group for their active participation.

144. The representative of ESCAP also expressed his thanks to the Secretariat and all others associated with the meeting and to the participants at the Fourth Consultative Meeting, for their evaluation of the Work Programme proposals and the guideline this had provided to the Intergovernmental Meeting. He stated that as always, ESCAP had been pleased to participate and would continue to actively work with SPREP and its member countries in the region on environmental management issues.

145. Recalling his organisation's association with, and support to SPREP in the last 13 years, as a jointly sponsored programme of SPC, SPEC, ESCAP and UNEP, implemented through the Secretariat of SPREP on behalf and under control of the Governments from the South Pacific region, the representative of UNEP reiterated that his organisation's general support to SPREP was and remains to be contingent on maintenance of such arrangement. UNEP regrets that this meeting declined to reconfirm the joint co-sponsorship of SPREP by its original four sponsors and accepted to treat SPREP as a programme of SPC only. Under such conditions UNEP will be unable to continue considering and supporting SPREP as part of UNEP's Regional Seas Programme. However, UNEP would be ready to consider supporting directly, or through the Secretariat of SPREP, on a project funding basis, activities falling within UNEP's global mandate, programme and priorities, and subject to appropriate institutional and cost-sharing arrangements with organisations and institutions with which such projects would be jointly implemented. In the light of this development and taking into account that regrettably the Coordinating Group did not manage to meet since September 1987, UNEP's announced intention to withdraw from the Group and suggestion that it be replaced by a body composed of government representatives, seems a logical and necessary step leading to direct control of SPREP by those for whose benefit SPREP was established.

146. The representative of the South Pacific Commission congratulated the chairman and delegates on their achievements of the past week which would provide valuable guidance to the Secretariat over the ensuing two years. He thanked the delegates, the Secretariat and the staff of the SPC for their efforts which had made the meeting a success.

147. The Chairman expressed his thanks to the SPREP Secretariat for the organisation and smooth running of the meeting, to the SPC for the provision of the venue and support staff, to the translators and interpreters who made it possible to hold the meeting in two languages and to the SPC Social Club for its assistance with the social events.

ANNEX 1

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE SPREP ACTION PLAN

(Noumea, New Caledonia, 27 June - 1 July 1988)

A G E N D A

1. Opening of Meeting
2. Election of Office Bearers
3. Adoption of the Agenda
4. Country Statements
5. Status of the SPREP and the Apia Conventions
6. Expanding the Role of SPREP as the Co-ordinating Unit for Environmental Activities in the South Pacific Region
7. Implementation of the 1987-88 Work Programme
8. Implementation of Projects under sub-contracts by Members of the Association of South Pacific Environmental Institutions.
9. Consideration of Project Proposals for the 1989-90 Work Programme
10. Statements by Observers
11. (a) Consideration of a Budget for SPREP for 1989-90
(b) Adoption of the 1989-90 Work Programme
12. Institutional and Financial Arrangements for SPREP
13. Other Business
14. Adoption of the Meeting Report
15. Closing of the Meeting and Final Statements

ANNEX 2

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE SPREP ACTION PLAN 1989-90
(Noumea , New Caledonia , 27 June - 1 July 1988)**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

GOVERNMENTS

American Samoa

Mr Pati Fai'ai
Executive Director of Environmental
Protection Agency
Office of the Governor
PAGO PAGO
American Samoa 96799

Telephone : (684) 633-2304
Telex : GOVERNOR 501 SB

Mr Togipa Tausaga
Environmental Protection Agency
Office of the Governor
PAGO PAGO
American Samoa 96799

Telephone : (684) 633-2304
Telex : GOVERNOR 501 SB

Australia

Mr Allan Haines
Director
Marine Protection Section
Department of Arts, Sport,
the Environment, Tourism
and Territories (DASETT)
G.P.O. Box 787
CANBERRA ACT 2601
Australia

Telephone : (062) 467207
Fax : (062) 475615

Cook Islands

Mr Gerald McCormack
Director of Conservation Services
Ministry of Internal Affairs
and Conservation
P.O. Box 98
RAROTONGA
Cook Islands

Telex : SECFA 62056 RG

**Federated States of
Micronesia**

Dr Eliuel K. Pretrick
Secretary
Department of Human Resources
P.O. Box 490
KOLONIA
Pohnpei
Eastern Caroline Islands 96941
Federated States of Micronesia

Telephone : 320-2619
Telex : 764-6807 FSM GOV

Ms Donna Scheuring
Acting FSM Environmental
Health Co-ordinator
Environmental Health/Laboratory
Division of Health Services
Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 312
KOLONIA
Pohnpei
Eastern Caroline Islands 96941
Federated States of Micronesia

Telephone : (691) 619/643
Cable : FSM GOVT

Fiji

Mr B. Nair
Acting Director
Town and Country Planning
P.O. Box 2350
SUYA
Fiji

Telephone : 211 796
Telex : FOSEC 2167 FJ

France

Mr Claude Maynot
Second délégué français
à la Commission du Pacifique Sud
B.P. 420
NOUMEA
New Caledonia

Telephone : (687) 26.16.03
(687) 26.22.72
Telex : (706) 3095 NM

Guam

Mr Charles Crisostomo
Administrator
Guam Environmental Protection Agency
(GEPA)
P.O. Box 2999
AGANA
Guam 96910

Telephone : (671) 646 7579
(671) 646 8863/65
Cable : GEPA Guam
Fax : (671) 646 9402

Marshall Islands

Mr Robert Kelen
General Manager
Environmental Protection Agency
P.O. Box 1322
MAJURO
Marshall Islands 96960

Telephone : 3295

New Caledonia

Mr Jacques Kusser
Secrétaire du Comité pour la
protection de l'environnement
B.P. 4201
NOUMEA
New Caledonia

Telephone : (687) 27.26.74

New Zealand

Mr John Gilbert
Deputy Secretary for the Environment
Ministry for the Environment
P.O. Box 10362
WELLINGTON
New Zealand

Telephone : (04) 734.090
Fax : (04) 710.195

Mr Rob Ogilvie
Investigating Officer
(International Liaison)
Ministry for the Environment
P.O. Box 10362
WELLINGTON
New Zealand

Telephone : (04) 734.090
Fax : (04) 710.195

New Zealand (cont'd)

Dr Alan Edmonds
Deputy Director General
Advocacy and Science
Department of Conservation
P.O. Box 10-420
WELLINGTON
New Zealand

Telephone : (04) 710.726
Fax : (04) 733.656

Dr Wren Green
Assistant Director (External Relations)
Department of Conservation
P.O. Box 10-420
WELLINGTON
New Zealand

Telephone : (04) 710.726
Fax : (04) 733.656

Dr James Kember
New Zealand Consul-General
New Zealand Consulate-General
B.P. 2219
NOUMEA
New Caledonia

Telephone : (687) 27.25.43
Telex : 3036 NM KERERU

Palau

Mr Tokiwo Sumang
Ministry of Social Services
P.O. 100
KOROR
Republic of Palau 96940

Telephone : 1639
Telex : 8901
Fax : 7725

Ms Nancy S. Convard
General Manager
Environmental Quality Protection Board
(EQPB)
P.O. Box 100
KOROR
Republic of Palau 96940

Telephone : 1639
Telex : 8901
Fax : 7725

Solomon Islands

Mr Henry Isa
Principal Conservation Officer
Ministry of Lands, Energy and
Natural Resources
P.O. Box G24
HONIARA
Solomon Islands

Telephone : 23696
Telex : PRIMUS 66311 HQ

Tokelau

Mr Foua Toloa
Director of Agriculture and Fisheries
Office of Tokelau Affairs
P.O. Box 865
APIA
Western Samoa

Telex : TAWA 222 SX

Tonga

Mr Sione Tongilava
Secretary for Lands, Surveys and
Natural Resources
Ministry of Lands, Surveys and
Natural Resources
P.O. Box 5
NUKU'ALOFA
Tonga

Telephone : 23-210
Telex : 66269 PRIMO TS

United States of America

Mr Scott Hajost
Deputy Associate Administrator for
International Activities
Environmental Protection Agency
A-106 - Room W811
401 M Street, S.W.
WASHINGTON, DC. 20460
United States of America

Telephone : (202) 382-4870
Telex : 892 758 EPA WSH
Fax : (202) 382-7883
(202) 382-7884
(202) 382-7886

Mr Nicholas MacNeil
Office of Environmental Protection -
Room 4325
Department of State
WASHINGTON, DC. 20520
United States of America

Telephone : (202) 647-9266
Fax : (202) 647-5947

Vanuatu

Mr Jack Reuben
Second Secretary
Ministry of Lands, Minerals
and Fisheries
P.O. Box 151
PORT VILA
Vanuatu

Mr Paul Sami
Desk Officer
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
and Judicial Services
P.O. Box 124
PORT VILA
Vanuatu

Western Samoa

Mr Samuelu Sesega
SPREP Focal Point
Forestry Division
Department of Agriculture, Forests
and Fisheries
P.O. Box 206
APIA
Western Samoa

Telephone : 22561
Telex : 233 TREASURY SX
Fax : 2123

Mr Everett Bishop
Peace Corps Volunteer/National
Parks Officer
APIA
Western Samoa

Telephone : 21054

INSTITUTIONS

**Laboratoire d'étude et de
surveillance de
l'environnement (LESE)**

Mr Jean-Louis De Nardi
Engineer, Deputy Head of Laboratoire
d'étude et de surveillance de
l'environnement (LESE)
B.P. 519
PAPEETE
French Polynesia

Telephone : 43.02.31
Telex : 269 COSFAPOL/IPSN/EP/LESE
Fax : (689) 43.02.31

University of Guam (UOG)

Dr Harley I. Manner
College of Arts and Sciences
UOG Station
University of Guam (UOG)
MANGILAO
Guam 96923

Telephone : (671) 734-2921
Telex : 721 6275
Fax : (671) 734-3118

**University of Papua
New Guinea (UPNG)**

Dr John Pernetta
Chairman ASPEI
Biology Department
University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG)
Box 320
UNIVERSITY P.O.
Papua New Guinea

Telephone : 245210
Telex : NE 22366
Fax : 245187

Dr David Mowbray
Biology Department
University of Papua New Guinea (UPNG)
Box 320
UNIVERSITY P.O.
Papua New Guinea

Telephone : 245659 (W)
256280 (H)
Telex : NE 22366
Fax : 245187

**University of the South
Pacific (USP)**

Professor John Morrison
Head
School of Pure and Applied Science
University of the South Pacific (USP)
P.O. Box 1168
SUYA
Fiji

Telephone : 313-900
Telex : FJ 2276
Fax : (679) 300373

ORGANISATIONS

**Canadian International
Development Agency (CIDA)** Mr Phil Paradine
Canadian International Development
Agency (CIDA)
Place du Centre
200 Promenade du Portage
Hull
QUEBEC
Canada K1A 0G4

**Committee for Co-
ordination of Joint
Prospecting for Mineral
Resources in South Pacific
Offshore Areas
(CCOP/SOPAC)** Dr Ralf Carter
Committee for Co-ordination of Joint
Prospecting for Mineral Resources
in South Pacific Offshore Areas
(CCOP/SOPAC)
c/- Mineral Resources Department
Private Mail Bag
SUVA
Fiji

Telephone : 381139, 381377
Telex : 2330 SOPACPRO FJ
Cable : SOPACPRO SUVA
Fax : 384810

East-West Center Mr Richard Carpenter
Research Associate
Environmental and Policy Institute
East-West Center
HONOLULU
Hawaii 96848
United States of America

Telephone : (808) 944-7269
Telex : 989171 EWCUD
Fax : (808) 944 7970

**Ecology Division
Department of Scientific and
Industrial Research (DSIR),
New Zealand** Dr Hugh Robertson
Ecology Division
Department of Scientific
and Industrial Research (DSIR)
Private Bag
LOWER HUTT
New Zealand

Telephone : (04) 694 859
Fax : (04) 663 683

**Greenpeace
New Zealand Incorporated**

Mr Roger Wilson
Greenpeace International
25-26 High St
LEWES
East Sussex BN7 2LU
United Kingdom

Telephone : (0273) 478 787
Telex : 878 182 GPINT G
Fax : (0273) 471 631

Mr Peter Whitehouse
Greenpeace
New Zealand Incorporated
Private Bag
Wellesley St
AUCKLAND
New Zealand

Ms Sebia Hawkins
Pacific Co-ordinator (USA)
Greenpeace
1436 U Street, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20009
New Zealand

Telephone : (202) 462 1177
Telex : 89-2359
Fax : (202) 462.4509

**Ocean Resources
Management Programme,
(ORMP)
University of the South
(USP)**

Dr Kilifoti Eteuati
Director
Ocean Resources Management
Programme (ORMP)
University of the South Pacific (USP)
P.O. Box 1168
SUVA
Fiji

Telephone : 313-900. Ext. 289/258/297
Telex : FJ 2276
Fax : (679) 300373

World Bank

Mr Graeme Thompson
Senior Economist
World Bank Indonesia Pacific
Department
1818 H Street, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20433
United States of America

Telephone : (202) 477-4729

World YWCA

Ms Ruth E. Lechte
World YWCA
Energy and Environment
Box 623
NADI
Fiji

Telephone : 73787 (W & H)

SPREP CO-ORDINATING GROUP

**Economic and Social
Commission for Asia and
the Pacific (ESCAP)**

Dr R. Karim
Environment Management Expert
Environmental Co-ordinating Unit (ECU)
Office of the Executive Secretary
Economic and Social Commission
for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)
The United Nations Building
Rajadamnern Ave.
BANGKOK 10200
Thailand

Telephone : 282-9161-200. Ext. 1691
Telex : 82392 ESCAP TH
82315 ESCAP TH

**South Pacific Bureau for
Economic Co-operation
(SPEC)**

Mr Leo Keke
Legal and Political Officer
South Pacific Bureau for
Economic Co-operation (SPEC)
P.O. Box 856
SUYA
Fiji

Telephone : 312600
Telex : 2229 SPECSUYA

**United Nations Environment
Programme (UNEP)**

Dr Stjepan Keckes
Director
Oceans and Coastal Areas Programme
Activity Centre (OCA/PAC)
United Nations Environment
Programme (UNEP)
P.O. Box 30552
NAIROBI
Kenya

Telephone : 33.39.30
Telex : 22068 UNEP KE
Fax : (2542) 520 711

South Pacific Commission

Mr Jon Jonassen
Acting Secretary-General

Mme Hélène Courte
Deputy Director of Programmes

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (SPREP)

South Pacific Commission
P.O. Box D5
NOUMEA CEDEX
New Caledonia

Mr Iosefatu Reti
Co-ordinator

Ms Neva Wendt
Environmental Education Officer

Mr Paul Holthus
Project Officer (Scientist)

Mr Peter Thomas
Protected Areas Management Officer

Mrs Judith Déméné
Secretary (SPREP)

Miss Marie-Thérèse Bui
Project Assistant (SPREP)

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION SECRETARIAT

South Pacific Commission
P.O. Box D5
NOUMEA CEDEX
New Caledonia

Mr Michel Mertens
Manager, Interpretation/
Translation Section

Mr Edward Marie-Magdeleine
Interpreter

Ms Dominique Toulet
Interpreter

Mr Roy Benyon
Interpreter

Mr Patrick Cowan
Translator

Mr Didier Holtzwarth
Translator

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION SECRETARIAT (cont'd)

Mrs Marina Laplagne
Translator

Miss Kathy Levanque
Secretary to the Conference

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

Telephone: (687) 26.20.00
Fax: (687) 26.38.18
Telex: 3139 NM SOPACOM

ANNEX 3

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE SPREP ACTION PLAN

(Noumea, New Caledonia, 27 June - 1 July 1988)

**ADDRESS BY THE ACTING SECRETARY-GENERAL,
SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION**

Distinguished Delegates,
Ladies and Gentlemen.

It gives me great pleasure on behalf of the South Pacific Commission and the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme in particular, to extend to you all a very warm and cordial welcome to the South Pacific Commission headquarters on the occasion of this second meeting on the SPREP Action Plan.

As some of you will recall, the first meeting of government representatives to consider and approve a work programme for SPREP was held here in September 1986. This was in fact, the first time the governments and administrations in the region were directly involved in directing the activities of SPREP since 1982. Your meeting this week is the second in a series of conferences to be held every two years to adopt the work programmes of SPREP and I hope therefore that the Conference will prove to be a profitable and rewarding experience for each and everyone of you. I have no doubt it will benefit the countries you represent and the South Pacific region as a whole. I believe an outstanding need in our region today is for people who care; for people who are prepared to work actively, collectively and co-operatively to conserve the environment for themselves, their neighbours and those who will come after them. If we accept this, then I am sure this Conference will be an outstanding success, because basically that is what it is all about.

The Secretariat has put a lot of planning and forethought into this Conference, and this is essential if it is to be successful. Planning implies action and actions should result in achievement; which in turn implies success. But success never comes from good planning alone if we then sit back and just wait for things to happen.

As you would see from the meeting agenda before you, you have an important task to accomplish over the next few days. That task, of course, is to review the activities of SPREP over the past two years and more importantly, to adopt a Work Programme for the Secretariat for 1989 and 1990.

From the Secretariat's viewpoint, satisfactory progress has been achieved with the implementation of the 1987-88 Work Programme, and I wish to take this opportunity, therefore, to thank the network of implementing institutions, collaborating regional and international organisations and our donor governments and agencies, whose contributions, in one form or another, made it possible for the Secretariat to organise and administer the implementation of the 1987-88 Work Programme.

In your review of the 1987-88 Work Programme, you will note that about 65 per cent of the projects listed under the Work Programme have either been completed or are under implementation and that by the end of 1988. This number will increase to about 88 per cent. Noting that there were some 116 projects in the Work Programme, these achievements are indeed significant and commendable.

I hasten to add, however, that it was not at all smooth sailing all the way for the Secretariat during the implementation of the Work Programme. There were several obstacles, but perhaps the most frustrating of which was the fact that the financial inputs to the Programme from member governments were not placed at the Secretariat's disposal in a timely manner. Hence, forward planning was most difficult and in many cases projects were implemented if and when funds became available.

I mentioned earlier the importance of your task this week to consider, and adopt a Work Programme for SPREP for the next biennium, i.e. 1989 and 1990. It is important because your decision will guide and decide the direction for SPREP during the two years ahead. Before you is a document (WP. 4) containing over 120 project proposals for your consideration and if approved, implementation under the 1989-90 Work Programme of SPREP. I must caution that if all these proposals were to be funded and implemented under the Work Programme, then there must be at least a three-fold increase in the financial inputs to SPREP during the 1989-90 period. I am sure you will agree with me that this would be an impossible undertaking both for your governments and the Secretariat, hence, it will be desirable for you to agree on a mechanism whereby the budget could be reduced.

Whilst the Secretariat has treated all proposals with equal interest, I would suggest that some form of project prioritisation would have to be exercised in order to reduce the 1989-90 budget to a manageable level consistent with the resources normally available to the Secretariat to implement its Work Programmes. I should welcome your co-operation in such an exercise.

Distinguished delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen, the 1989-90 Work Programme being proposed for SPREP is indeed an ambitious one, and the Secretariat's ability to implement it will only go as far as the resources to be placed at our disposal by your governments and collaborating institutions and international organisations would allow. It is to this effect that I urge our member governments through your meeting this week to consider making an early commitment of their contributions to SPREP to enable the Secretariat to organise the implementation of the Work Programme in a timely and effective manner. I strongly believe that the regional co-operation demonstrated through SPREP has brought the environmental concerns of each country in our region to the forefront and it is now time for us to take action to address these problems. As the Duke of Edinburgh said in Strasbourg in 1970; "It is totally useless for a lot of well-meaning people to wring their hands in conference and to point out the dangers of pollution or destruction of the countryside. If no-one is willing or capable of taking any action, all the impassioned speeches will be so much effluent under the bridge unless they are followed by drastic political action".

The very purpose of your Conference this week is to decide and agree on actions to be taken through the Work Programme of SPREP to address environmental problems of our region and I wish you success in your deliberations.

In closing, I would again like to express my sincere appreciation to all those who have in one way or another assisted in the implementation of the 1987-88 Work Programme of SPREP. I look forward to your active participation and co-operation in the implementation of the 1989-90 Work Programme.

Ladies and Gentlemen, this meeting would not have been possible without the generous financial support of the Government of Australia. On your behalf, I wish to convey to the Government and people of Australia through their representative at this meeting, our thanks and gratitude for their contribution which enabled the Secretariat to convene this important conference.

Without further ado, it is now my pleasure to declare the Meeting open.

ANNEX 4

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE SPREP ACTION PLAN

(Noumea, 27 June - 1 July 1988)

OPENING STATEMENT OF UNEP REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me start by conveying to you the greetings of Dr. Mostafa Tolba, UNEP's Executive Director and my organisation's best wishes for the success of this meeting.

UNEP has been associated with the development of SPREP from the very first days in 1975, and has considered it in the past 13 years as the South Pacific component of our own Regional Seas Programme, which today covers 10 regions and involves more than 120 states. UNEP was an active partner of your Governments and of the other organisations sponsoring SPREP in all events leading to the adoption of the SPREP Action Plan in Rarotonga in 1982, and to its subsequent implementation. The legal framework of the action plan, the SPREP Convention, was developed on UNEP's initiative, based on our global strategy for, and experience with, the Regional Seas Programme. Considerable financial support was provided by UNEP to projects carried out in the framework of SPREP and to support the Secretariat of SPREP and its activities. Since the Rarotonga conference this support amounted to about 1.8 million US\$, practically all of it channelled through the Secretariat of SPREP.

We believe that, when reviewing the past, you can look back with satisfaction to the long string of achievements since 1975. In spite of many difficulties encountered during these 13 years, we in UNEP consider SPREP as an example of our successful involvement in a region generally and unjustifiably neglected by the UN system. However, we feel that there is no time for complacency and your meeting will be faced with a number of important issues which would have to be resolved in the interest of SPREP's future development.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to summarise UNEP's position towards these issues, which can be broadly categorised as related to SPREP's work programme and to the institutional and financial arrangements supporting that programme.

A large number of projects and activities were carried out in the framework of SPREP. Most of them have been completed, quite successfully, and your meeting is invited to evaluate them. Your meeting is also invited to examine the proposals for future activities and to decide about priorities according to which they should be implemented. In our view the numerous proposals in front of you need to be tied up in several coherent, mutually reinforcing packages, in order to achieve their maximal contribution to the protection of the South Pacific environment. The meeting of research and training institutions, convened here during the last week, examined the proposals for future activities and formulated concrete recommendations for your consideration. I would like to recommend you to examine carefully the results of the last week's meeting because they could assist you considerably in deciding about the future workplan of SPREP.

The slow process of ratifications and accessions to the SPREP and Apia conventions is of grave concern to UNEP. From our experience in other regions an early entry into force of these conventions is seen by us as very critical, as it is expected to lay the ground for the establishment of stable and viable institutional and financial arrangements supporting SPREP.

For the time being a Co-ordinating Group, composed of representatives of SPC, SPEC, ESCAP and UNEP, is expected to guide the SPREP Secretariat in between your intergovernmental meetings. In our view the time has come to change this arrangement and to consider replacement of the Co-ordinating Group by another body, composed of government representatives elected by the intergovernmental meeting. In order to facilitate such a decision, UNEP would like to announce its withdrawal from membership in the Co-ordinating Group.

A non-governmental professional organisation, the Association of South Pacific Environmental Institutions (ASPEI), has emerged recently in your region and is playing an increasingly visible and important role in various SPREP activities. The Association has a consultative and advisory status with UNEP and enjoys our support. The Association's membership includes a wide variety of research and training institutions from your region and UNEP would like to recommend that you take full advantage of the contributions SPREP may receive from this Association.

The financial situation of SPREP is another subject of concern to UNEP. The establishment of a special fund, Trust Fund or other, supporting SPREP activities is seen by UNEP as the best approach which may provide a long-term solution to the financial problems of SPREP. Therefore, UNEP would like to urge you to consider carefully the proposal on that subject prepared by the Secretariat for this meeting.

As indicated to you during previous meetings, UNEP is not a funding agency. UNEP supported and is ready to continue supporting SPREP financially only as part of its own Regional Seas Programme. In the long run it is perhaps a healthy development that the secretariat of SPREP does not see it that way. However, under such conditions UNEP will have serious difficulties to continue providing general support to SPREP and will have to restrict its support to selected projects and activities which are directly related to the priority areas of UNEP's global ocean programme.

Two priority areas are of particular interest to UNEP:

- (a) monitoring, research and control of pollution in coastal and open waters of the Pacific, with emphasis on environmentally sound waste and coastal zone management;
- (b) research on impact of expected climate changes, identification of response options and assistance to governments in their implementation of suitable options.

Regardless of the modalities of UNEP's future formal relation with SPREP and its Secretariat, UNEP is ready to co-operate on these two issues, directly or through the Secretariat of SPREP, with all governments as well as with the research and training institutions of your region.

ANNEX 5

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE SPREP ACTION PLAN

(Noumea , New Caledonia , 27 June - 1 July 1988)

PRIORITISATION OF PROJECTS BY COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES

FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA

1. WT21 Training Course: Sand Mining and Coral Dredging Site Selection
2. PA23 Turtle Conservation
3. EP7 National and State Coastal Management Plans
4. PA24 Turtle Hatchery, Yap Outer Islands
5. NR14 Environmental Impacts of Destructive Fishing in Truk
6. WM14 Training in Environmental Management of Fish Processing Plants
7. WM13 Port Oil Spill Response Plan
8. WT22 Workshop on Prevention of Stream Siltation
9. WQ10 Survey of Mercury Levels in Fish and Water
10. NR31 Traditional Resource Management and Yam Conservation in Pohnpei
11. CM14 Zooplankton and Larval Fish

COOK ISLANDS

1. EE41 Pacific Wildlife Readers
2. PA12 Status and Conservation of Kakerori (Rarotonga Flycatcher)
3. EE35 Litter Consciousness Campaign
4. PA26 Cook Islands National Parks
5. EE42 Nature Programme Series
6. EP9 Northern Cook Islands Archipelagic Conservation Strategy
7. EE36 Coastal Zone Illustrative Advertisements
8. NR9 Pukapuka Traditional Resource Management Knowledge
9. EE37 Environmental Interpretation/Media

MARSHALL ISLANDS

The following are the listing of our project priority for biennium 1989-90 Work Programme. Please note that related projects are consolidated to save cost if they can be done at the same time, especially Priority 1 group:

- A. Priority 1.
 - NR28 Guidelines for Harvesting Renewable Coastal Resources
 - PA15 Survey of Potential Protected Areas
 - PA16 Inventory of Endangered Species
 - EP8 Coastal Management Plans Majuro and Kwajalein
 - EP17 Legislation for National Parks and Reserves
- B. Priority 2.
 - WM12 Pesticide Monitoring
 - WM17 Assessment of Alternative Solid Waste Disposal Methods
- C. Priority 3.
 - WQ8 Water Quality Monitoring

FIJI

1. **EP1** National Conservation Strategy
2. **EP10** Coastal Management Planning SW Viti Levu
3. **WM6** Oil Pollution Survey, Vuda Point
4. **PA9** Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings
5. **EE10** Upgrading Mobile Education Unit
6. **PA8** Management Planning Garrick Memorial National Park
7. **EE21** Support to Fiji Nature Club

WESTERN SAMOA

1. **NR15** Terrestrial Ecosystem Mapping
2. **EP4** National Environmental Strategy Development
3. **EP21** Afulilo Environmental Assessment
4. **EE26** Audio-visuals - Plants and Animals of Samoa
5. **EE27** Education Material - Parks and Reserves
6. **EE9** National Environmental Symbol Promotion

AMERICAN SAMOA

Priority 1. combine the two following projects:

WM15 Alternatives for Bulky Waste Disposal for American Samoa

WM16 Waste Oil Disposal in American Samoa

Priority 2. **WT23** Pesticide Management Training in American Samoa

Priority 3. **WQ12** Slow Sand Filter Demonstration for American Samoa

Priority 4. **WT24** Ground Water Training for American Samoa

Priority 5. **E18** Development of Environmental Health Information System for American Samoa

ANNEX 6

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE SPREP ACTION PLAN

(Noumea, New Caledonia, 27 June - 1 July 1988)

LIST OF WORKING PAPERS

- WP. 1 Status of the Apia and SPREP Conventions
- WP. 2 Implementation of the 1987-88 Work Programme: A Review
- WP. 3 Institutional Involvement in the Implementation of the SPREP Action Plan 1983-1987
- WP. 4 Project Proposals for Consideration under the 1989-90 SPREP Work Programme
 - WP. 4 Add. 1
 - WP. 4 Add. 2
 - WP. 4 Add. 3
 - WP. 4 Add. 4
 - WP. 4 Add. 5
- WP. 5 Consideration and Adoption of a Work Programme and Budget for SPREP for the 1989-90 Biennium
- WP. 6 Institutional and Financial Arrangements for SPREP
- WP. 7 Expanding the Role of SPREP
- WP. 8 Scientific Comments/Evaluation of Project Proposals in Add. 3-5 of Working Paper No. 4

ANNEX 7

SOUTH PACIFIC REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETING ON THE SPREP ACTION PLAN

(Noumea, New Caledonia, 27 June - 1 July 1988)

1989-90 SPREP WORK PROGRAMME

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Area</u>
NR 3	Pacific Resource and Environmental Data System	REG
NR 9	Pukapuka Traditional Resource Management Knowledge	CKIS
NR 12	Feral Cat Eradication	KB
NR 13	Baseline Studies of Nearshore areas	PAL
NR 14	Environmental Impacts of Destructive Fishing in Truk	FSM
NR 15	Terrestrial Ecosystem Mapping	W.SAM.
NR 17	Survey of Dugong Status	SOL
NR 19	Traditional Porpoise Harvest	SOL
NR 21	Traditional Resource Knowledge	TOK
NR 23	Introduced Species Handbook	REG
NR 26	Traditional Environmental Knowledge	SOL
NR 27	Study of Mangrove Fish Communities in S. W. Lagoons	N.CAL.
NR 28	Guidelines for Harvesting Renewable Coastal Resources	MAR
NR 29	Environmental Management of Forestry	PNG
NR 30	Survey of Exotic Weed Problems in Micronesia	SUBREG
NR 31	Traditional Resource Management and Yam Cultivation in Pohnpei	FSM

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Area</u>
PA 7	Study and Protection of Cagou	N.CAL.
PA 8	Management Planning Garrick Memorial National Park	FJ
PA 9	Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings	FJ
PA 13	Potential Protected Area Sites	VAN
PA 12	Status and Conservation of Kakerori (Rarotonga Flycatcher)	CKIS
PA 14	Protected Area on Customary Lands	SOL
PA 15	Survey of Potential Protected Areas	MAR
PA 16	Inventory of Endangered Species	MAR
PA 17	Survey of Wildlife Status	SOL
PA 18	Assessment of Estuarine Crocodiles	VAN
PA 19	Survey of Mt. Silisili National Park	W.SAM.
PA 20	Survey of Lake Lanotoo National Park	W.SAM.
PA 21	Lake Lanotoo Development Scheme	W.SAM.
PA 22	Reconstruction of Vailima Botanical Garden	W.SAM.
PA 23	Turtle Conservation	FSM
PA 24	Turtle Hatchery, Yap Outer Islands	FSM
PA 25	Integrated Development Plan, Waikatakata Catchment	FJ
PA 26	Cook Islands National Parks	CKIS
CM 2	Oceanography	REG
CM 8	Effects of Hydroclimatic Variations on Planktonic Life in West Pacific	REG
CM 9	Sedimentology in New Caledonian Lagoons	N.CAL.
CM 10	Variability of Salinity and Temperature in SW Pacific Waters	SUBREG
CM 11	Current Circulation Model	N.CAL.
CM 12	Lagoon Environment Monitoring System	SOL
CM 13	Reef Reserve Effects on Fish and Invertebrate Populations	SOL
CM 14	Zooplankton and Larval Fish Survey Kolonia	FSM
CM 15	Monitoring of Mangrove Crab Populations Pohnpei	FSM
CM 16	Biological Assessment of Patches and Inner Reefs	FSM
CM 17	Rehabilitation of Reef-dredged Sites	FP
CM 18	Trapping of Nutrients in Mangrove Swamps: Differences Among High Islands and Atolls	REG
WQ 6	Monitoring Coastal Water of French Polynesia	FP
WQ 7	Pacific Lagoonal Study	SUBREG
WQ 8	Water Quality Monitoring	MAR
WQ 9	Assessment and Monitoring of Drinking Water	VAN
WQ 10	Survey of Mercury Levels in Fish and Water	FSM
WQ 11	River Input into Pacific Waters	SUBREG
WQ 12	Slow Sand Filter Demonstration Project	ASAM
WQ 13	Monitoring Lagoon Water Quality Pohnpei	FSM
WQ 14	Training in Water Quality Monitoring	FSM
WQ 15	Monitoring of Coastal Water Quality and Training in Water Quality Assessment	PAL

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Area</u>
WM 1	Bio-indicator use to Monitor Coastal Contamination	REG
WM 2	Occupational and Environmental Hazards of Pesticide Use	REG
WM 4	Heavy Metal and Organochlorine Monitoring in PNG Coastal Waters	PNG
WM 5	Monitoring PNG Rivers for Heavy Metals from Mining	PNG
WM 10	Radioactivity on Guam	GUM
WM 11	Pesticides in the South Pacific	REG
WM 12	Pesticide Monitoring	MAR
WM 13	Port Oil Spill Response Plan	FSM
WM 14	Training in Environmental Management of Fish Processing and Cannery Plants	FSM
WM 15	Alternative for Bulky Waste Disposal	A.SAM.
WM 16	Waste Oil Disposal	A.SAM.
WM 17	Assessment of Alternative Solid Waste Disposal Methods	MAR
WM 18	Environmental Impact of Solid Waste and Land Fill	PAL
WM 19	Pacific Regional Workshop on the Management, International Transfer and Disposal of Hazardous Wastes	REG
EE 1	UPNG Environmental Science Programme, Fieldwork	PNG
EE 5	Undergraduate Agroforestry Research and Training	SUBREG
EE 9	National Environmental Symbol Promotion	W.SAM.
EE 10	Upgrading Mobile Education Unit	FJ
EE 11	Environmental Education Case Studies	REG
EE 14	P.L.E.S.	REG
EE 17	Support to S.P.A.C.H.E.E.	SUBREG
EE 18	Environmental Education Kits	REG
EE 19	Video-Environmental Issues in the South Pacific	REG
EE 20	Fieldwork - Environmentally Focussed Courses in Geography at USP	SUBREG
EE 21	Support to Fiji Nature Club	FJ
EE 22	Public Education Material - Solid Waste Management and Sanitation	PAL
EE 23	Environmental Seminars/Education Week Series	REG
EE 24	Curriculum Development Support	REG
EE 25	Water Quality Education Campaign	WF
EE 26	Audio-visuals - Plants and Animals of Samoa	W.SAM.
EE 27	Education Material - Parks and Reserves	W.SAM.
EE 28	Field trips for Micronesian Teachers and Students Studying Environmental Science	SUBREG
EE 29	Training Micronesian Teachers to use their Environment with Conservation Values	SUBREG
EE 30	Conservation Posters in Vernacular Language of Micronesia	SUBREG
EE 31	Fieldwork - Environmental Science	SUBREG
EE 32	Radio Programming for Conservation Education	SUBREG
EE 33	Marine Conservation Education in Micronesia	SUBREG
EE 34	Environmental Science Workshop	SUBREG
EE 35	Litter Consciousness Campaign	CKIS
EE 36	Coastal Zone Illustrative Advertisements	CKIS
EE 37	Environmental Interpretation/Media	CKIS
EE 38	South Pacific Journal of Natural Science	REG
EE 39	Environmental Education Kit on Coastal Zone Protection	REG
EE 40	Public Education on Rubbish Disposal	FJ
EE 41	Pacific Wildlife Readers	SUBREG
EE 42	Nature Programme Series	CKIS

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Area</u>
EI 1	Environmental Newsletter	REG
EI 2	Environmental Bibliographies	REG
EI 3	Coral Reef Newsletter	REG
EI 4	Audio-visual Material Production	REG
EI 7	Vanuatu Environmental Bibliography	VAN
EI 8	Environmental Health Information System	A.SAM.
EI 9	Medicinal Plants Publication	REG
EP 1	National Conservation Strategy	FJ
EP 4	National Environmental Strategy Development	W.SAM.
EP 6	National Conservation Strategy Publication	SOL
EP 7	National and State Coastal Management Plans	FSM
EP 8	Coastal Management Plans Majuro and Kwajalein	MAR
EP 9	Northern Cook Islands Archipelagic Conservation Strategy	CKIS
EP 10	Coastal Management Planning SW Viti Levu	FJ
EP 14	Vanuatu Environmental Staff Secondment to SPREP	VAN
EP 15	SPREP/IUCN NCS Programme	REG
EP 16	Environment Assessment of Mineral Development	SOL
EP 17	Legislation for National Parks and Reserves	MAR
EP 18	Environment Protection Strategy	TUV
EP 19	Conservation Strategy for New Ireland	PNG
EP 20	Feasibility Study of Declaring PNG Territorial Waters a Nuclear Free Zone	PNG
EP 21	Afulilo Environmental Assessment	W.SAM.
WT 1	Environment Impact Assessment, Training Course	REG
WT 3	Coastal Resource Management and Protected Area Training Course	REG
WT 11	Regional Workshop on Transport. Handling and Storage of Hazardous Materials	REG
WT 12	Protected Area Scholarships	REG
WT 16	Environmental Media Workshop	REG
WT 17	Environmental Education Workshop	VAN
WT 18	Post-graduate Training in Environmental Science	REG
WT 19	Joint Meeting of the Parties to the Apia and SPREP Conventions	REG
WT 20	Vanuatu EIA Training Course	VAN
WT 21	Training Course: Sand Mining and Coral Dredging Site Selection	FSM
WT 22	Workshop on Prevention of Stream Siltation	FSM
WT 23	Pesticide Management Training	A.SAM.
WT 24	Groundwater Training	A.SAM.
WT 25	Fourth South Pacific Nature Conservation and Protected Areas Conference	REG
WT 26	Solomon Islands Training in Environmental Planning	SOL
WT 27	Solomon Islands EIA Training Course	SOL

