



Report for the
BIOPAMA PACIFIC REGIONAL INCEPTION WORKSHOP

Apia, Samoa

11TH to 15TH June 2018



www.biopama.org

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS | 1 |
| 1. WORKSHOP OVERVIEW | 3 |
| 2. OFFICIAL OPENING | 4 |
| 3. SETTING THE SCENE | 5 |
| 3.1 INTRODUCTION TO THE BIODIVERSITY AND PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME 2017 – 2023 | 5 |
| 3.1.1 <i>An overview of what BIOPAMA is and isn't</i> | 6 |
| 3.2 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES, PROGRAMME OUTLINE AND EXPECTATIONS | 6 |
| 3.3 PROTECTED AREAS IN THE PACIFIC | 6 |
| 3.4 A CONVERSATION WITH THE BIOPAMA REGIONAL IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS | 7 |
| 3.5 PANEL DISCUSSION – PROTECTED AREA TYPES, CIRCUMSTANCES AND NEEDS IN THE PACIFIC | 9 |
| 3.6 INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT INITIATIVES FOR PROTECTED AREAS | 14 |
| 3.6.1 <i>Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)</i> | 14 |
| 3.6.2 <i>IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas WCPA</i> | 14 |
| 3.6.3 <i>United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre UNEP WCMC</i> | 15 |
| 4. NEEDS, PRIORITIES AND ASPIRATIONS FOR ENHANCING PROTECTED AREA GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT . | 16 |
| 5. PACIFIC ISLANDS PROTECTED AREA PORTAL PIPAP | 18 |
| 5.1 PIPAP OVERVIEW | 18 |
| 5.1.1 <i>Inform Project</i> | 18 |
| 5.1.2 <i>Practical review and input on PIPAP</i> | 19 |
| 6. INFORMATION SYSTEMS FOR PROTECTED AREAS | 21 |
| 6.1 OVERVIEW BY EC-JRC | 21 |
| 6.2 HOW CAN INFORMATION LEAD TO BETTER CONSERVATION OUTCOMES? | 22 |
| 6.3 SYSTEMATIC CONSERVATION PLANNING | 23 |
| 6.4 PRACTICAL REVIEW AND INPUT ON THE WORLD DATABASE ON PROTECTED AREAS WDPA | 24 |
| 7. PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS AND GOVERNANCE TOOLS | 25 |
| 7.1 OVERVIEW | 25 |
| 7.2 PRACTICAL SESSION ON MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS | 27 |
| 8. BIOPAMA ACTION COMPONENT | 28 |
| 8.1 ACTION COMPONENT OVERVIEW | 28 |
| 8.2 REVIEW AND INPUT ON THE ACTION COMPONENT | 28 |
| 8.2.1 <i>Process issues</i> | 28 |
| 8.2.2 <i>Eligibility issues</i> | 29 |
| 8.2.3 <i>Potential activities</i> | 30 |
| 9. WORKSHOP SUMMATION | 35 |
| ANNEX A: COUNTRY CASE STUDIES | 37 |
| 1. LARGE MARINE PROTECTED AREAS – THE COOK ISLANDS’ EXPERIENCE WITH MARAE MOANA | 37 |
| 2. PALAU’S PROTECTED AREA NETWORK PAN | 38 |
| 3. THE SAMOAN EXPERIENCE WITH PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT | 40 |
| 4. EXPERIENCES WITH MANAGING PROTECTED AREAS IN THE SOLOMON ISLANDS | 42 |
| 5. PROTECTED AREAS MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCES IN KIRIBATI | 44 |
| 6. PROTECTED AREAS MANAGEMENT IN THE TORRECELLI RANGES OF PAPUA NEW GUINEA | 46 |
| ANNEX B. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS | 48 |
| ANNEX C. WORKSHOP PROGRAMME (CONCISE VERSION) | 53 |

List of acronyms and abbreviations

| | |
|----------|---|
| AC | Action Component |
| ACP | African, Caribbean and Pacific |
| BIOPAMA | Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management |
| BIORAP | Rapid biodiversity assessment |
| BINGO | Big international non-government organisation |
| CBD | Convention on Biological Diversity |
| CBO | Community Based Organisation |
| CEESP | (IUCN) Commission on Environment, Economic and Social Policy |
| CI | Conservation International |
| CITES | Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora |
| CMS | Contact Management System |
| COP | (CBD) Conference of the Parties |
| DG DEVCO | Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development |
| DOPA | Digital Observatory for Protected Areas |
| EbA | Ecosystem-based Adaptation |
| EC | European Commission |
| EDF | European Development Fund |
| EEZ | Exclusive Economic Zone |
| EU | European Union |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organisation |
| FELA | Fiji Environmental Law Association |
| FR | Forest Reserve |
| GCF | Global Climate Fund |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Product |
| GD-PAME | Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GEF-SGP | Global Environment Facility – Small Grants Program |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| GPAP | Global Protected Area Programme |
| GPS | Global Positioning System |
| IBA | Important Bird Area |
| ICCA | Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas |
| IMET | Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool |
| IP | Intellectual Property |
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| IUCN | International Union for Conservation of Nature |
| JRC | Joint Research Centre |
| KBA | Key Biodiversity Area |
| LMMA | Locally Managed Marine Area |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MACBIO | Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Management in Pacific Island Countries |
| MEA | Multilateral Environment Agreement |
| MECDM | Ministry of Climate Change, Environment and Disaster Management |

| | |
|-----------|---|
| METT | Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool |
| MIMRA | Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority |
| MNRE | Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Samoa) |
| MPA | Marine Protected Area |
| NBSAP | National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan |
| NGO | Non-governmental organisation |
| NR | Nature Reserve |
| OECM | Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures |
| ORO | Oceania Regional Office |
| PA | Protected Area |
| PAC | Protected Areas Committee (Fiji) |
| PAGE | Protected Area Governance and Equity |
| PAME | Protected Area Management Effectiveness |
| PAN | Protected Areas Network |
| PIC | Pacific Island Country |
| PIPA | Phoenix Islands Protected Area |
| PIPAP | Pacific Islands Protected Area Portal |
| PIRT | Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation |
| PNG | Papua New Guinea |
| PoWPA | Programme of Work on Protected Areas |
| RAPPAM | Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management |
| RIS | Reference Information System |
| RMI | Republic of the Marshall Islands |
| RO | Regional Observatory |
| SDG | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SoPA | State of Protected Areas |
| SPREP | Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme |
| TCA | Tenkile Conservation Alliance |
| TLTB | ŪTaukei Land Trust Board |
| TNC | The Nature Conservancy |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| UNEP-WCMC | United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre |
| UN-DOALOS | United Nations Division for Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea |
| UNTL | Universidade Nacional Timor Lorosa'e |
| USP | University of the South Pacific |
| WCPA | World Commission on Protected Areas |
| WCS | Wildlife Conservation Society |
| WDPA | World Database on Protected Areas |
| WWF | World Wildlife Fund |

1. Workshop overview

To formally launch the second phase of the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) programme, a regional inception workshop for the Pacific was held at the Tanoa Tusitala Hotel, Apia, Samoa from 11th to 15th June 2018.

The aim of the inception workshop was to ensure that all 15 countries in the Pacific ACP Group of States were engaged for the second phase of BIOPAMA. The working title of the workshop was '*Regional Workshop on Improving Information and Capacity for More Effective Protected Area Management and Governance in the Pacific*'. The invited participants primarily centred on people who are directly involved in work relating to marine, coastal and terrestrial (including inland waters) protected areas including: national government staff, NGO project officers; staff from national, regional and international agencies and institutions, and; resource persons with special technical skills and experience. The ACP Secretariat was represented by Mr Edmund Jackson. The full list of workshop participants can be found in Annex B.

The main objectives of the regional inception workshop:

- Provide information about the second phase of the Biodiversity and Protected Area Management Programme BIOPAMA - its objectives, benefits to countries, expected results and main activities and involvement by countries and organisations.
- Engage with stakeholders and partners about priority needs and opportunities for improving data gathering, assessment of data and information and capacity development for decision making and effective management and governance of protected areas.
- Demonstrations of the: Pacific Islands Protected Area Portal (PIPAP) managed by SPREP in collaboration with the European Commission – Joint Research Centre EC-JRC with its links to the BIOPAMA Reference Information System (RIS), developed by EC-JRC to cover all countries of the ACP; UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, and; other relevant web-based information tools for protected area planning and management.
- Provide general information about the BIOPAMA Action Component and identify national and local priorities that could guide decisions for investments through grant making (managed by IUCN).
- Obtain stakeholder views about issues that could be addressed through the BIOPAMA workplan.
- Facilitate a sharing forum for a wide cross section of protected area practitioners to contribute their experiences and ideas.

The inception workshop consisted of a series of technical and information presentations interspersed by panel discussions, participatory group work discussions and an informative field trip to local protected areas under different management and governance regimes. The agenda is included as Annex C of this report. The main points from presentations and discussions are summarized in this report.

The full content of all workshop presentations, related resources and links and 'workshop-in-action' photographs are available at: <https://biopama.org/node/254>

The responsibilities for planning, coordinating, facilitating and financing the workshop were shared equitably by IUCN ORO and SPREP with additional support provided by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment in the workshop hosting country Samoa, the EC-JRC and the UNEP-WCMC. The inputs obtained through the regional workshop for the Pacific will guide a detailed work plan for the implementation of BIOPAMA in the Pacific ACP region.

The BIOPAMA programme is an initiative of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States financed by the European Union's 11th European Development Fund (EDF), jointly implemented by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission (JRC). In the Pacific region, BIOPAMA is implemented by IUCN's Oceania Regional Office (IUCN ORO) in partnership with the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP). IUCN is grateful to our donor for supporting the funding of this regional inception workshop.

2. Official opening

A blessing for the success of the workshop was given by Rev. Taumafai Komiti, Methodist Church, Apia.

Following the blessing, Acting Director General of SPREP Stuart Chape welcomed participants and gave a vote of thanks to IUCN for identifying the importance of supporting protected areas and its continuing partnership with SPREP. He commented that the partnership between IUCN ORO and SPREP has seen the enhancement of the Pacific Islands Protected Area Portal ([PIPAP](#)), the 'one-stop shop' for all information on Protected Areas maintained by SPREP with partners and Members. Through [BIOPAMA](#), the EC-JRC is also contributing essential technical support to the PIPAP. *"The PIPAP, established prior to but then supported and strengthened by BIOPAMA, will play a key role as an interactive repository of data and learning tools for protected areas planning and management. It will continue to help measure our progress towards meeting Aichi Target 11 on protected area commitments"*. Mr Chape noted the role of the Pacific Islands Round Table for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas and the strong links between the BIOPAMA programme and this pre-eminent regional conservation forum. He further noted SPREP's role in assisting the work of governments with their monitoring and achievement of multi-lateral agreements, the SDGs and the CBD Aichi targets.

IUCN ORO Regional Director Mason Smith emphasized that protected areas are heartland work for IUCN. Across the Pacific protected areas are unique natural environments that require high-level innovative solutions to guide and inform the work of finding solutions with community and individuals as resource owners. He stressed that the programme is designed to meet the needs of the countries in the region, so the workshop has been deliberately structured to listen to the countries to help prioritise the interventions under BIOPAMA. He observed that *"In forging ahead, we need to pause and remind ourselves of the unique context of protected areas in the Oceania region that requires a high level of consultation and innovative solutions and approaches."* As an Implementing Agency, IUCN provides overall leadership and guidance and will strengthen existing relationships while forming new ones and making them as effective as possible.

ACP representative Edmund Jackson gave a vote of thanks to EC-JRC and IUCN for taking on the second phase of BIOPAMA as implementing agencies and assisting in achieving objectives set by the ACP Secretariat and the EU. He also acknowledged SPREP as the observatory host and regional implementing partner. His address also reiterated the importance of partnership. *"Essentially, each agency is a particular piece of the puzzle and the workshop will see where each of you will fit to help implement the BIOPAMA programme as best as possible. The implementing partners must ensure that everybody has a role to play"* Mr Jackson noted. His further remarks included the focus on the need to implement action on the ground for biodiversity conservation and that funds are intended to be dispersed in ways that consider the wide range of stakeholders and ensuring each with equal opportunity of access. He noted that the BIOPAMA Steering Committee would meet in coming months in Brussels and that participant input from the workshop would be critical for consideration by the Steering Committee.

Recognising the significance of the five-day workshop, EC-JRC's Stephen Peedell highlighted how the workshop would be a great opportunity to address the fundamental questions faced by the BIOPAMA programme. Mr Peedell posed the questions. *"How can we ensure that our improved knowledge of protected areas*

really does drive better decisions, better outcomes and improved effectiveness? How can we make that step from knowledge to action for a protected planet?” He concluded by recognising the positive relationship between the EC-JRC and IUCN ORO and SPREP in the region. He added that the EC-JRC can contribute to regional needs through its solid knowledge and science basis, to establish reference information systems, supporting key objectives of biodiversity and livelihoods, strengthening the work of the PIPAP.

In welcoming the participants, Afioga Taefu Lemi Taefu, Honourable Associate Minister for Natural Resources and Environment, Government of Samoa, acknowledged the significance of protected areas. *“The protected areas that exist today were established to protect the best remaining natural terrestrial, coastal and marine areas in our region. This is to ensure sustainability of these areas for the benefit of not only our generation but for many generations to come”* In his opening remarks, he also highlighted some of the challenges that were faced by Pacific island countries. *“One of the region’s major challenges to sustainable development, especially for small island developing states is the lack of data and information. The issue for Samoa is not the accessibility of data, but rather, the availability of data. This week is a kind reminder of what needs to be done”*. With these comments Hon. Associate Minister Taefu declared the workshop open.

3. Setting the scene

3.1 Introduction to the Biodiversity and Protected Area Management Programme 2017 – 2023

Regional Coordinator for the BIOPAMA Programme in the Pacific, Tony O’Keeffe, gave an overview of the BIOPAMA programme at global and regional scales. He highlighted the importance of BIOPAMA to IUCN and explained that BIOPAMA is a major part of the work of IUCN and how it contributes to IUCN’s delivery themes of Quality, Justice and Equity, Solutions and Capacity. He then gave a timeline of international conventions related to protected areas (PAs) and the relevant agreements related to PAs, as well as highlighting how BIOPAMA relates to and aligns with these. He reiterated that the programme builds upon BIOPAMA Phase I by adopting a more bottom up approach to needs assessment, data collection and development of tools and services to work more closely with national stakeholders. It will include closer communication and coordination between IUCN, EC-JRC, SPREP, UNEP-WCMC and other partners for more effective delivery of data and information for improved decision making and focus on management effectiveness and governance.

A key aspect of the programme is recognising the different operating contexts between regions and the importance of ‘tailoring’ delivery within the scope of the donor’s expectations and the project contracts. The Pacific includes all 14 Pacific ACP countries and with the addition of Timor Leste. IUCN leads the project with SPREP as the regional implementing partner for the Pacific. Protected area types and governance systems in the Pacific (including Timor Leste) primarily revolve around the recognition of traditional owners and those with customary resource usage rights, which makes local communities a priority area for attention and investment. Regional management issues and challenges also have their unique differences and distinctions, and these require thoughtful responses.

BIOPAMA aims to complement and align with existing platforms and initiatives, align with existing work and support implementation of relevant existing regional and national strategies and action plans, for example:

- Framework for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in the Pacific Islands Region 2014 – 2020
- NBSAPs
- CBD Aichi Target 11,12 National Roadmaps of Priority Actions 2017.

The two main delivery pillars of BIOPAMA were described - the Regional Observatories and the Action Component, and their respective roles explained.

The **overall objective of BIOPAMA** (2017-2023) is:

To contribute to improving the long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources in protected areas and surrounding communities through better use and monitoring of information and capacity development on management and governance.

3.1.1 *An overview of what BIOPAMA is and isn't*

BIOPAMA:

- Covers all protected area management categories and governance types
- Covers all biomes – marine, coastal, terrestrial and freshwater protected areas
- Works at different scales from individual protected area level to national protected area systems
- Focused on strengthening the governance and management of protected areas through the provision of information, capacity and targeted small and medium sized grants
- Builds on existing initiatives and work through and with partners.

BIOPAMA is **not**

- Restricted to any one type of protected area
- A financing mechanism for government-managed protected areas
- A general biodiversity conservation programme
- Intending to “reinvent the wheel”.

3.2 Workshop objectives, programme outline and expectations

Tony O’Keeffe provided an outline of the week-long workshop program with strong encouragement for participants to be fully engaged in this opportunity. He stated that participants should become familiar with the BIOPAMA programme and what it offers to the region. He also warmly invited participants to contribute input on ideas, direction and priorities at project level and wider. He also reinforced that the workshop provided an excellent forum to:

- Expand knowledge about regional protected areas thinking and activities
- Learn about related programmes and projects
- Share opinions and talk and plan with peers
- Bond as a collective team with the same goals
- Return to day to day work re-energised.

3.3 Protected Areas in the Pacific

Acting Director General of SPREP, Stuart Chape, provided an enlightening overview of context, challenges and needs relating to protected areas in the region.

KEY POINTS FROM THE PRESENTATION

- The Pacific Island region is an oceanic realm, which impacts on protected area management and conservation initiatives in the region. The Pacific area of SPREP members is 30 million square kilometres of EEZ with less than 2% land area from which 90% is customary land. There is a high reliance on natural resources with 70-80% of inshore fisheries catches used at the subsistence level.
- Ecosystem services have grown in importance over the years as development of the region progresses. Intrinsic value of biodiversity is supplemented by economic values that range from fisheries to tourism. Exploitation of natural resources impacts on freshwater supplies, occurrence of algal blooms in coastal areas, and habitat degradation, stemming from inappropriate development practices. Invasive species is the primary threat to endemic and native species. Increasing pressures of population growth and urbanisation, have led to increased pollution and waste management concerns.
- The IPCC 5th Assessment Report documented ecosystem changes and impacts are inevitable even if all critical commitments are met. Building protected areas into climate change adaptation responses as ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) options is crucial to addressing climate change impacts.
- The importance of working with communities and governments through connecting and supporting their needs and aspirations is strongly recognised.
- Working to scale was viewed as crucial including the whole of island approach. Improving knowledge base through surveys such as BIORAPs, State of Conservation of Oceania, NBSAPs and to effectively monitor the impact and progress.
- Invasive species must be addressed as they are an enormous threat to biodiversity and to the Pacific region economically.
- There is a need to strengthen management and capacity for protected area solutions that work in the Pacific context.
- What is the turning point of how many protected areas are needed to combat climate change given 17% is the goal for terrestrial protected areas? It was noted that an urgent approach must be taken, to ensure ecosystems retain their value and function. A proposal is being developed between IUCN and SPREP for a GCF project on coastal resilience-building. Emphasis is to not add any further stressors on those ecosystems of coastal, marine, freshwater, and forestry.
- The importance of securing sustainable financing was noted as where the links of protected areas to other ongoing critical issues such as climate change and resilience building.

3.4 A conversation with the BIOPAMA regional implementing partners

To provide participants with an overview of the main implementation tasks for BIOPAMA in the region, an interview style conversation was facilitated by Tony O'Keeffe with panel members comprising IUCN ORO Project Officer, Etika Qica, SPREP Protected Areas Officer, Vainuupo Jungblut and EC-JRC Senior Scientific Officer, Steve Peedell.

PANEL RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Implementing partners outlined their responsibilities to the BIOPAMA programme, how they interact with each other and the benefits their work can bring to the region:

EC-JRC

- The primary focus of the EC-JRC is its work on BIOPAMA and other EDF funded projects for sustainable development.
- The EC-JRC is expert in dealing with the complexity of available knowledge and understands the importance of disseminating it in a way that it is meaningful globally and regionally.
- They strive to achieve integration of information that already exists and is accessible, and ensuring it is in a presentation form for more meaningful decision making that will lead to positive outcomes.
- The focus is working toward positive outcomes for protected areas as well as people living in and around these areas by making improved information available. EC-JRC offers their technical skills, to address priority needs in the region.
- JRC has negotiated with IUCN ORO and SPREP in ongoing development of the BIOPAMA programme, has made team visits to the region, has given technical advice for PIPAP development and has commenced working on appropriate indicator monitoring tools
- JRC is an important expertise resource available to the region and is looking for explicit instructions based on priority regional needs to guide them in the technical support they are there to provide.

IUCN ORO

- IUCN is lead agency in implementing the project in the region with its partners SPREP and the EC-JRC. The programme focus needs to be guided by the aspirations and needs of stakeholders in the region.
- IUCN ORO will take the lead on the BIOPAMA Action Component AC through local management contributions to the grant making processes, however full oversight of the AC will be managed by the IUCN Global team.
- Key challenge will be building on the action component in terms of determining regional priorities, facilitating best practice and performing as the regional contact point for grant making processes and providing capacity building to support potential access to grants.
- The development of a State of Protected Areas report will be done in close collaboration with SPREP and JRC as well as other regional partners and stakeholders.
- Management effectiveness is an important element of projects funded through BIOPAMA so the region needs to agree on methodologies that are appropriate and practical to the Pacific context.

SPREP

- SPREP's main role is to further enhance the PIPAP and work closely with government members to help collate and improve their PA data and information to improve decision making. There has been continuous development of the PIPAP as a repository of information on conservation and protected areas for the region and this will continue.
- SPREP has a core focus on ensuring countries achieve their Aichi targets, deliver on their NBSAPs and meet other national, regional and international obligations
- Interaction has occurred with JRC through continuous development of the PIPAP
- SPREP will work with JRC to develop and sharing tools relevant to the region, government and other issues on connectivity, and ensure secure access to information.

- Ensure all regional stakeholders benefit from the PIPAP, while making it a one stop shop tailored for the region and based on identified needs.
- A rolling programme of country visits is planned to continue.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- Some countries are reluctant to spend time organising and providing data to what they see as an outside information system and need more evidence of how the PIPAP will benefit them. It is acknowledged that the PIPAP must be backed up by direct country liaison and technical assistance.
- The measurement of the area extent of PAs as a percentage of an entire strategic or geographic zone can be calculated and reported at different scales, ie; regional (Oceania), sub-regional (eg, Micronesia Challenge), national, district/provincial, island/atoll. The PIPAP needs to be able to distinguish these various scales.
- BIOPAMA to support the measurement of indicators of ecological health and quality to guide the development of an improved PA network

3.5 Panel Discussion – protected area types, circumstances and needs in the Pacific.

To provide participants with an overview of a range of PA issues being faced and addressed by practitioners from representative organisations, a question and answer panel session was facilitated by Andrew Foran, Regional Programme Coordinator with IUCN ORO. The panel itself comprised: Benedict Yamamura, Coastal Fisheries Information Officer, Ministry of Natural Resources & Commerce, RMI Marine Resources Authority, Republic of Marshall Islands; Kiji Vukikomoala, Co-ordinator, Fiji Environmental Law Association; Lolita Gibbons-Decherong, Program Manager - Conservation and Protected Areas Program, Palau Conservation Society, and; Nunia Thomas, Director, Nature Fiji-Mareqeti Viti.

PANEL CONTRIBUTIONS IN REPOSE TO QUESTIONS POSED

Ms. Nunia Thomas

- Nature Fiji-Mareqeti Viti is a membership-based organisation established in 2007 which focuses primarily on addressing terrestrial/island biodiversity issues, (90% of Fiji's endemic species are forest based).
- Biodiversity research in the past has been viewed as a foreign concept, however is now better recognised as important to build-up the analysis in the research sector to address biodiversity issues and capacity for government to address.
- There is not much ecological data for where species are breeding, including times and distribution, hence species monitoring is limited.
- With not much funding or capacity Nature Fiji-Mareqeti Viti are strategic in the selection of sites and how they can best manage these spaces.
- Focus is on building upon work already established or underway and showing that it is effective.
- Habitat loss and degradation is a key threat.
- There is no existing protected areas legislation for Fiji although there are legal instruments that help with conservation of forest reserves and catchment areas. These other instruments have protected some of Fiji's special places (and most of our IBAs and KBAs fall within

these areas), as multiple use Forest reserve or Strict Nature Reserve under the Fiji Forest Decree and Forest Bill; as a catchment area under the Water Supply Act

- In the last 10 years, conservation leases have been established, specifically for areas significant for conservation such as the Sovi Basin Conservation Area by the National Trust of Fiji and Conservation International; Kilaka Forest Conservation Area by WCS and Fiji's first Ramsar Site in the Upper Navua Conservation Area.
- It is recognised that understanding conservation is not limited to species but livelihoods around them. It was highlighted the importance of working with communities and different stakeholders to protect species particularly through creating relationships with landowners.
- An example was provided of protection where a group of sites were engaged under the Fiji Forest Policy concept of Permanent Forest Estates. Sites that were chosen were those earmarked for protection as a Forest Reserve or Nature Reserve versus areas favoured for logging versus sites at the periphery/ edge of existing FR and NR. Issues then investigated were: the potential pressure from socio-economic needs of the community; community perception of forest conservation vs forest conversion and ecosystem services; the types of livelihood projects that communities have implemented and how effective they have been towards raising the profile of the conservation area – has it been an effective livelihood intervention particularly for tourism, logging and protected areas and finally, recommending a way forward in terms of Permanent Forest Estates, using the tools of Socio-economic survey and Toolkit for Ecosystem Services Site-based Assessment.
- In regard to the process of selecting sites to work with in Fiji, under the EMA there is an environment council housing the protected areas committee comprising of government and non-government representatives. Through gap analysis of terrestrial areas in Fiji (critical species habitat, KBAs, ecological hotspots) priority sites are jointly endorsed for attention. Priority site analysis also occurred in conjunction with the Fiji National Environment Strategy, Fiji State of the Environment Report, Fiji Forest Policy, and work by National Trust of Fiji and USP, the NBSAP and Protected Areas Committee
- Through a recent review of a programme on sustainable livelihoods of 11 different sites in various sectors it was identified that communities must have ownership of projects. Prior research including the accessibility of markets and issues of sustainability are essential. Findings showed that women led programmes were more successful and livelihood projects do not always support conservation.

Mr. Benedict Yamamura

- The role of government in protected areas was explained, and how PAs can be improved within the context of the Marshall Islands which is that conservation and sustainable management is part of the Marshallese culture. The National Conservation Areas Plan provides a bottom up (community based) approach for planning, to identify and conserve culturally and ecologically significant areas.
- The Marshalls retain some of the richest biodiversity in the world and is also among the world's largest shark sanctuaries.
- RMI government and local government have broad rights to regulate land and environment and to make policy tools.
- The Marshall Islands Marine Resources Authority (MIMRA) is a semi-autonomous government agency, responsible for the conservation, management and sustainable use of living and non-living marine resources within the RMI EEZ.

- MIMRA is working closely with local communities to exceed national conservation targets under the SDGs and CBD by committing to the Micronesia Challenge, and the Reimaanlok (National Conservation Area Plan), which is now paired with the Protected Area Network.
- The current mechanism under Reimaanlok is a prime example of government / community collaboration, providing a unique bottom-up planning process to identify and conserve the most important and culturally significant natural areas. Local stakeholder consultation drives the process.
- This powerful approach to planning influenced the recent National Oceans Symposium - working with local communities and key stakeholders to raise priorities and key areas of concern particularly on climate change, sustainable fisheries, marine and coastal pollution, and coral reefs & marine protected areas.
- Capacity building was highlighted as one of many key areas to prioritize when it comes to addressing environmental issues.
- RMI recognises the importance of involving the community at the very inception of any PA process and identifying representatives of various groups for government to work with to help formulate management plans which are inclusive of gender, and youth.
- There is limited involvement with the private sector.

Ms. Kiji Vukikomoala

- Thoughts were provided on how protected areas governance can be improved. It was noted that one of the important aspects of understanding how PA governance can be improved is to first understand what governance is, the context of its application in protected areas, what some of principles of good governance are and how these can be evaluated.
- It has been suggested that governance is about power, relationships and accountability. It is about the processes and traditions that determine how power and responsibility is exercised, interactions among structures, how decisions are taken and the participation of stakeholders and citizens in decision making processes. Governance is a process that can be undertaken by several actors and is not solely tied to the institutions of government. The process can be difficult to observe and therefore one of the way in which you can evaluate governance effectiveness is to look at the frameworks or processes in which the process rests eg. Agreements, procedures, conventions, or polices that define how decisions are taken and how accountability is rendered.
- Fiji has a wide range of laws that can cover the protection of land, sea and traditional resources.
- A good starting point and one that FELA tends to use when conducting legal and policy review is to evaluate the powers that are utilised for protected areas management. Some of these powers include: regulatory powers including law enforcement power for conservation purposes, use of land and resources for health and safety; planning powers – powers related to the systems as a whole and development of management plans; spending powers – related to resource management/ interpretation programs for development, maintenance, law enforcement etc.; powers to enter into agreements.
- The exercise of these powers can then be assessed according to agreed principles of good governance eg, fairness, accountability, legitimacy and voice, performance and direction.
- In Fiji, there is no standalone legislation for protected areas however it has a broad range of laws that prescribe several legal mechanisms for the protection of land, sea, species, traditional/sacred sites etc. Fiji's PA mechanisms can be identified as informal, - customary

conserved areas, locally managed marine areas, establishment of ‘tabu’ areas. There may also be formal protection through statute and regulatory powers through leasing mechanism, covenants/agreements, declarations.

- A key characteristic in Fiji is its dual government system, with the incorporation of customary and western or formal type influences. A limitation however is the lack of legislation to bridge the two concepts. This features strongly in marine protection where the State has asserted ownership over Fiji’s foreshores, sea bed and resources but recognises customary rights to access marine resources. For Marine protection the challenge in this dual system of governance is the limited number of mechanisms in the formal system to create the bridge between customary and modern law. Locally Managed Marine Areas are a good example of a way in which to bridge the gap but LMMAs are not recognised in formal law to date.
- The Constitution of Fiji continues to recognise customary ownership of land however administration and control over most of native lands lies with a statutory body, the iTaukei Lands Trust Board. The law that establishes the TLTB is subject to a number of other laws including the mining act, state acquisition act which means that PAs established through the leasing mechanism offered by TLTB can be vulnerable to other matters of national interest.
- While traditional law exists alongside national law, the issue of violations of these different laws in terms of fines, can be fraught. In Fiji, the state assumes ownership for marine bodies and resources although it recognises the customary rights and access to marine resources adjacent to foreshore of land. There is recognition of right to access but lack of recognition for enforcement. Gaps through traditional law and formal law have been identified. Different ministries have different administration responsibilities, ie; the foreshore is administered by the Ministry of Lands and that consent is required by traditional owners through the Ministry of Lands, while the Fisheries Department will also need to be involved through fisheries impact assessments.
- Some of the key weaknesses of the existing PA mechanisms in Fiji include:
 - failure to establish a network of MPAs and a lack of systems planning and strategic planning, ie; PAs appear to be created on an ad hoc basis rather than in accordance with a robust plan often results in conflicting management decisions
 - there are a wide range of laws and policies that are relevant to PAs in Fiji which presents a considerable challenge in ensuring that all laws are harmonised, that they are made.
 - Limited institutional options provided by existing legislation to create a separate, independent agency tasked with establishing and managing MPAs.
 - There is a lack of effective and mandatory requirement for coordination and consultation between relevant stakeholders in the establishment and management of MPAs. Little to no sustainable financing arrangements for MPAs.
- Some of the recommendations that may improve PA governance for Fiji could include:
 - Development of a comprehensive PA policy or clear legislative direction setting out the purpose and objectives for PAs, establishes clear authorities to manage PAs and includes citizen participation and promotes coordination and consultation between government agencies to ensure that activities authorised by different agencies are consistent with and do not pose a threat to MPAs.
 - Development of new primary legislation for protected areas. A key aspect would be harmonising all related legislation.

- Strengthening legal arrangements for advisory bodies like the protected areas committee to strengthen its ability to provide appropriate and suitable technical advice as well as to support PACs capacity to effect change.
 - Enabling formal recognition of voluntary conserved areas including existing property rights, conservation, livelihoods and other relevant gains that have been made through these existing mechanisms
 - Identifying adequate resourcing/ sustainable financing to support the full spectrum of activities associate with PA development, management, enforcement, education and research.
- A stand-alone protected area legislation is a slow topic of consideration including which agency would enforce. It was viewed that Fiji needs to first see which direction it will take and then assess whether to develop legislation, and how to harmonise the different laws.

Ms. Lolita Gibbons-Decherong

- The perspective of livelihoods improvement from the experience of the Palau Conservation Society was addressed. *“Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day, teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime”*
- It was noted that there are 46 legally designated protected areas, 34 of these participate in the Palau Protected Areas Network.
- Palau has set monitoring protocols applied to marine and terrestrial protected areas and uses socio-economic indicators.
- At site level, the Palau Conservation Society, factor in socio-economic indicators within their own projects, such as island ecosystem project measuring impacts on the quality of life, including opportunities created by the project. There is a contribution of project support protection of cultural users and how to protect or enhance tourism opportunities.
- Improving local livelihoods linkages requires the establishment of new relationships with communities, and communities sharing similar interests, ensuring accountability. Specific benefits include securing local agriculture crop stock, increasing crop yields, reducing water borne diseases, and income opportunities. Broader benefits include good management of protected areas, creating avenues for financing associated with protected areas, and helping communities with capacity building, community monitoring, and training.
- The Palau Shark Sanctuary has fostered the establishment of shark focussed NGOs that have helped conservation efforts through educating tourists, monitoring and promoting shark education during shark awareness week. Palau is a member of Green Fins, which has active engagement in the tourism sector of ensuring diving is carried out with best practice. There are also trade assessors to conduct assessments of diving operations on an annual basis.
- For Palau, success with protected areas must be whether protected areas are meeting the intended purpose the community has set it aside for. How much the community is showing care for what happens to the protected areas and ecosystems and whether the area is showing improvement and whether habitats in the area are functioning in a healthy manner.
- A priority challenge is actually accessing protected areas that are more remote so that follow up effectiveness assessments on projects can be done.
- Another measure of protected areas success has to be that it is sustainably supported by technical, political and financial sectors.

3.6 International support initiatives for protected areas

3.6.1 *Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)*

Sarat Babu Gidda, Head of the Conservation & Sustainable Use Unit, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) provided a heartfelt presentation urging member countries, partners and stakeholders to collaborate and share resources and effort to successfully meet their commitments to Aichi Target 11 (protected areas focus) by 2020.

Mr Gidda advised that Phase 1: 2015-2016 was primarily about collecting information on the status of each element of Target 11 and determining focused actions as country driven processes. Phase 2: 2017-2020 concerns the concentrated focus on active implementation of the elements of Aichi Target 11.

He provided a set of snapshot graphs and statistics displaying regional progress toward meeting the various elements of Target 11. While some positive progress was shown ie; total regional marine protected area extent) several achievement shortfalls were highlighted such as underuse of funding allocated to countries under GEF 5 to address the challenges in the region and the need to increase the application of PAME assessments to determine whether PAs are meeting effectiveness criteria.

Focussed actions are needed to fill implementation gaps and will require: technical and financial support; monitoring and reporting; all relevant partners, including government, ministries, departments, GEF implementing agencies, regional organisations, bilateral and multilateral funding agencies, the private sector, and conservation and community organisations working together.

3.6.2 *IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas WCPA*

Ms Penelope Figgis, Regional Vice Chair, Oceania, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, provided an overview of the WCPA and what it sees as regional priorities and opportunities. As a long-term conservation advocate and WCPA contributor, she described the WCPA as a platform for harnessing, matching and exchanging capacity across the region and leveraging new partnerships. It is a global community working for conservation outcomes, providing tools, expertise, collegiate sharing and mutual survival sanity.

The WCPA is a leading global knowledge network of protected area specialists comprising 2500 individuals from over 140 countries and encompassing numerous expert working groups. A key driver is Aichi Target 11 particularly the building and scaling up of networks of PAs. Connectivity issues are a priority as are improving recognition for Other Effective Conservation Means (OECMs)— other types of ‘protected areas’ that do not lie neatly within the ‘traditional’ measurements for PAs.

She made mention of the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Programme (the ‘IUCN Green List Programme’) which aims to improve the contribution that equitably governed and effectively managed protected areas make to sustainable development through the conservation of nature and provision of associated social, economic, cultural, and spiritual values. She also mentioned the WCPAs focus on a programme concerning natural solutions, governance, health and urban alliance known as #NatureForAll.

Ms Figgis advised that her main professional and personal goal through the WCPA was to see the creation of a regional knowledge network that can harness capacity across the region, address capacity exchanges, leverage new partnerships and be a platform for matching capacity need with available support opportunities.

3.6.3 United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre UNEP WCMC

Ms Heather Bingham, Protected Areas Programme Officer, UNEP-WCMC outlined the role of UNEP-WCMC in BIOPAMA which is to help address challenges identified in collating, managing and analysing protected areas data. UNEP-WCMC will contribute to this by: providing training to the Regional Observatories on PA data collection, management and analysis; improving the data in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) that feeds into the Digital Observatory for Protected Areas (DOPA); and helping to streamline data collection and data sharing processes among ACP countries. Data reporting to the international body plays a significant role in providing an all-encompassing analysis of progress of protected areas and what issues will need to be continued to be addressed in order to continue effective protection

Ms Bingham advised that the WDPA for Pacific Island information includes 550+ protected areas listed and that 41 percent of data on protected areas in the region comes from national governments (the rest from secretariats and NGOs) with the last years of update ranging from 1987 to 2018. The WDPA is the only global authoritative data base on terrestrial and marine protected areas. It includes protected areas that meet the IUCN definition of protected areas and can also include any government's designation of a protected area, if it meets the IUCN standard. The WDPA includes Indigenous Community Conserved Areas ICCAs. It also includes sites with national, regional and international level designations and provides the ability to carry out gap analysis and identify priorities within regions. The WDPA helps track progress of achieving sustainability goals 14 and 15 and CBD Aichi target 11 and the information informs the reports that CBD member states receive on their achievement progress.

She also noted to the workshop that the Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness (GD-PAME), an official CBD reporting requirement is officially closing in July 2018. The information used will inform the UN List of Protected Areas. The GD-PAME seeks information on whether a PAME assessment has been carried out for a given site.

Ms Bingham identified several issues that affect the quality of the PA information on the WDPA.

- Status changes of protected areas are not always reported, causing issues in tracking data of their success in protecting the environment.
- 42 percent of listed PAs do not have defined boundaries.
- The completeness of descriptive information is uneven.
- OECMs are not well captured at this time.

Of particular relevance for the Pacific was the issue of recognition of OECMs. The CBD Parties will consider guidance from the IUCN WCPA Taskforce on OECMs at the COP in late 2018. This guidance identifies that any governance type can be considered and once a country meets the amended standards they can then begin submitting data on these areas to UNEP-WCMC to be recorded for progress analysis.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- The larger MPAs with defined boundaries such as the Cook Islands and Palau have deposited boundary information with UN-DOALOS. It was confirmed that this information is also incorporated in the WPDA database.
- The Digital Observatory of protected Areas DOPA is an allied set of web services and applications that can be used primarily to assess, monitor, report and possibly forecast the state of and the pressure on protected areas at multiple scales. It uses the WDPA as its based plate of PA information.

- The only information being sought through the current PAME assessment process for GD-PAME is whether a PAME assessment has been carried out for a given site.
- Some of the larger MPAs with defined boundaries (Cook Is and Palau) have deposited boundary information with UN-DOALOS and the UNEP-WCMC has included that information in WDPA.
- Countries recognise that they need to improve the quality of the reporting on PAs.
- Within Palau's national marine sanctuary lie several smaller MPAs that are not reflected in WDPA for various reasons and there is a need for guidance on the format and types of data that is required by UNEP-WCMC to ensure all PA situations are displayed.
- Regarding SPREP's regional role and its agreement with UNEP-WCMC to act as the regional PA data node:
 - SPREP, through its close connections with governments, is in a strategic position to help Pacific Island members analyse and report PA information clearly and consistently through the efforts of the PIPAP and the Inform project.
 - some government structures don't easily allow for the identification of the right official to authorize reporting to SPREP
 - stronger guidelines for effective reporting need to be provided, both in authorizing information to be given to SPREP's inform project as well as to the international body
 - SPREP will assist in collating PA progress information from observers and train these members in proper observation and tracking methods

4. Needs, priorities and aspirations for enhancing protected area governance and management

The objective of this session was to stimulate contributions from workshop participants on those issues that they believe are priority needs and where their aspirations for PAs lie. The session was convened as breakout groups with country representatives working either singly or with another country to provide input using the trigger of four thematic areas: planning and management; data & information; effective governance, and; capacity building. The key input is summarised as follows:

Planning and management

- There is high value in fostering local expertise in planning and management of protected areas to enable bottom up approaches in PA governance and implementation - starting from villages and local communities and working up to national governance implementation plans.
- The creation, implementation and monitoring of management plans is a widespread need.
- The high need for establishment of environmental conservation trust funds for improving the sustainability of many of the environmental programmes throughout the region.
- Communications between partners, countries and local communities is crucial to improve enforcement of protected areas and policies.
- Many national legislation and provincial by laws that directly affect, or have influence with, PAs (egs; fisheries, forestry, agriculture, mining, planning) require review and updating to ensure they align and cross support each other. In some cases, specific national legislation is required to deal with PAs.

Data and information

- There is often a lot of data and information available, however the information is not always centralized or easily accessible and support is required to analyse the data for effective and timely reporting.
- Improved data reporting to both international agencies as well as to local communities is required to demonstrate the state of progress of national programs and ensuring confidence in funding efforts.
- Assembling base line data of protected areas community-based PAs is a key challenge but is an essential task in building community engagement and understanding and setting suitable management rules.
- For countries that have large bodies of data and information, there is a need for support with its analysis and interpretation for decision making.

Effective governance

- Leaders need to be able to see more of the economic benefits of protected areas and resource management to gain sustainable financing for these programs.
- PA typologies that suit the context of each Pacific country need development
- The engagement of traditional leaders and communities is fundamental for ownership, inclusiveness and long-term sustainability of PA networks and this includes all aspects of PA establishment and implementation.
- The inclusion of women and youth in conservation efforts is an essential success factor.
- Local management committees are a critical governance structure.
- Where multiple laws have influence on PAs, communication and coordination between responsible agencies is critical. National PA technical working groups that are established in some countries are a useful model to address governance issues and coordination issues.

Capacity building

- Capacity building is always raised as critical need for key national stakeholders yet is limited (compared to size of the need) in terms of useful opportunities available. Many countries have good planning frameworks but lack capacity to deliver effectively.
- Training staff, including management, administration, site directors, and enforcement officers, and including project management skills, to reduce reliance on 'outside' specialists.
- Community based PAs require capacity development in management planning as a key priority along with the use of data collection tools monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of actions.
- Greater capacity to enforce management plans and the rules involved is widely required
- As this workshop has borne out, sharing information between peer networks of PA practitioners both nationally and regionally is highly useful and informative and should be extended where possible to similar sharing forums can be convened for community level stakeholders.
- Academic curricula from school age to tertiary, needs to be boosted to foster understanding, support and capacity in the value of PAs.
- Access to a regional roster of experts would be a useful resource for countries particularly tailored support for problems that are quite unique.

5. Pacific Islands Protected Area Portal PIPAP

5.1 PIPAP overview

The Pacific Islands Protected Area Portal (PIPAP) is the central data and information management tool for Pacific island protected areas housed within the regional observatory that is hosted by SPREP as regional implementing partner for the BIOPAMA programme. As the person responsible for overseeing its development, Vainuupo Jungblut, Protected Areas Officer at SPREP, described the PIPAP as an all-in-one source and display of relevant, open-source and other specialised information from a variety of sources that concern PAs.

The PIPAP is continuously updated and enhanced to ensure it functions as a user-friendly hub and meets user needs and priorities. It is being strengthened as the preferred repository for storage, sharing and long-term backup of Pacific Islands PA data which can assist PICs to meet their national priorities and international reporting obligations. Most importantly, it is intended to be a decision-making tool.

Ainsof So'o, Systems Developer and Analyst at SPREP, provided a visual run through of the new PIPAP website. The richness of available PA thematic and topic resources was demonstrated by the navigational panes on the home page. PA statistics and other information are based on the WDPA as well as being well integrated with existing SPREP information systems. The new PIPAP features: improved page speeds (CDN); mobile phone friendliness; use of free and open source software - Drupal CMS; secure – https, login required; website monitoring – status cake, and; website statistics based on Google analytics.

Moeumu Uili, Principal Parks & Reserves Officer, Samoan Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment (MNRE) advised that their team has been working closely with the PIPAP team to work to improve the information sets on PIPAP and identify where data rectification is required. She noted that the PIPAP shows 84 PA records for Samoa however there are gaps where information needs to be updated. Typical inaccuracies or discrepancies (compared to nationally held, or known, records) include differing records for the area size of PAs, boundary demarcations, different site names and even geographic location.

The key point made by the SPREP PIPAP team was that it is strongly reliant on users to help inform and improve the portal content and functions. For example, it was noted that a registered user could add the necessary information to a map and or send through information to the PIPAP team to be published in the portal. Apart from information which is already publicly available, SPREP has a mechanism to verify with national focal points any information being submitted, before such information is posted in the portal. Data sharing agreements which are being used in the Inform project (see below), may be explored as an option to limit access for certain types of information in PIPAP that countries may not wish to share publicly.

5.1.1 Inform Project

Paul Anderson, Inform Project Manager at SPREP provided an overview of this closely allied initiative that the BIOPAMA observatory host SPREP had recently commenced. He used the catch-phrase *'If you can't measure it, you can't effectively manage it'*. The Inform project enhances access to environmental information for planning, reporting and decision making. There are 14 major international agreements that most Pacific Island countries, PICs are a member of or party to, and have an obligation to report on. The Inform project will work alongside BIOPAMA and with the PICs national data collection processes to facilitate regional data collection and its management.

The Inform project has developed national databases which link to new national reporting systems for monitoring the state of the environment in the Pacific by making national and regional data accessible

through a web-based system. The Inform project consists of a data portal, established for each PIC, for secure data storage, sharing and use, particularly for decision-making. The key features of Inform are that it has developed a reporting tool using consistent indicators for reporting mandates. As a repository and publishing platform it reports and presents data in an understandable way. Data types and access can be private, interagency or public.

It was suggested that cloud hosting and storage can be a beneficial data management system solution for PICs. Data can be reused for new purposes and cloud storage allows for a safety back up to hardware failure or even the need to have country-based hardware at all. This system should help to incentivise members to help keep the Inform database up to date to protect national information.

The parallels between the aims and work of the regional observatory via the PIPAP and the Inform project were abundantly clear and there is a strong intention by SPREP to ensure that these two systems are co-supportive and do not duplicate effort.

5.1.2 Practical review and input on PIPAP

The objective of this session was to allow workshop participants to explore the PIPAP themselves and to identify content, format or functions that they believed were required to improve the PIPAP to address their specific needs. The session was convened as breakout groups with country representatives working either singly or with another country to provide input as they perused the PIPAP.

The input and responses are summarised as follows (recorded content provided in Annex A):

General

- BIOPAMA needs to improve how it explains the need and value for improved PA information to higher level ministry representatives.
- While the PIPAP seems like a good centralization centre for PA information, BIOPAMA needs to ensure that the outcome of information gathering is accompanied by a clearly stated purpose and benefits explained.
- Relevant government ministries and interest groups need to be helped to better understand how they can use the information displayed on PIPAP to assist their local communities and PA networks.

Spatial (maps) information

- General concern about the accuracy of PA information (# this is largely reliant on countries reviewing their information and ensuring that update needs are informed to UNEP-WCMC and JRC via SPREP).
- Users want to be able to add PA shape lines to existing national maps (# if a registered user has appropriate software, they could add the necessary information to a map and/or send through to the PIPAP team to be published in the portal).
- The base map for the 'draw polygon' tool should focus on Pacific as it currently shows repeating global map and the toggle image options are not clear.
- Inclusion of satellite imagery like Google Earth and topographic maps would enhance the illustration of the natural terrain.
- Include information, or links to, information about climate change issues.
- Important to include Key Biodiversity Areas KBAs and otherwise special and unique area, as layers.
- Need ability to add in customised map layers **such as** - significant species, vegetation and habitat types, forestry practice areas, planning/regulatory information (what activities can be done in certain areas).

- Need for human uses to be included so that effort can be made where the threats exist.
- Need to be able to delineate between terrestrial and marine PAs.
- Protected areas from traditional means may not involve boundary maps but landmarks instead, so there needs to be an option for submitting PA information to SPREP using traditional, chief-endorsed, landmarking systems.

Content

- Information and data must tell us something useful and relevant so what is included in the PIPAP must address national targets, ie; from *Knowledge to Action*.
- PICs must have an opportunity to review and comment so there needs to be clarity about focal points of contact and the mechanism for providing feedback.
- National level descriptive text is more important than regional summaries.
- More information about smaller locally managed PAs needs to be included.
- Best practice guidelines could be easily uploaded.
- Add information resources concerning economic impacts both positive and negative as this is a common political incentive in adopting positive policy measures for PAs.
- Information concerning social benefits must also be presented.
- Effective tool/s management are required.
- National project documents relating to PAs could be included.
- List of Oceania wide (incl. Australia and New Zealand) opportunities available in government agencies for exchanges and secondments including scholarships).
- Include a register of experts available to assist PICs for particular issues – develop a template that includes details of qualifications, expertise, availability, regional knowledge.
- Include links to IP addresses of where information is being sourced / accessed.
- Meta data must be available and easily readable.
- Webinar and chats options would be beneficial.

Display

- General request that portal is made more interactive and user friendly.
- Improve visual representation of existing information through applied graphic techniques.
- Allow for good zoom in function on the home page.
- Provide a function that can show time frame and progress for protected areas establishment.
- Need for more enhanced visualisation particularly on maps.
- Maps need more demarcation graphics (colours) and legend items need to be more comprehensive to add informative details about the general environmental features.
- A need for a function that allows for summary information to be displayed.
- The drop-down menus do not display correctly in all browsers.
- In some cases, there may be a need to display information (ie; an MPA) in a way that does not draw in unnecessary attention to its status due to local interests, and maintaining trust, so a boundary map may not be used per se but other descriptive text could be used.

Accessibility

- Include ways to access portal information in areas without good power or internet access such as via offline methods.
- Ensure that access to sensitive information is restricted, eg; local fishing spot information is not able to be shared unless agreed (# national focal points will be consulted prior to any information being accommodated in the portal).
- Public access can be restricted, and data sharing agreements can be established.

- Consider the issue of any existing national government protocols concerning approvals around the sharing of information.
- There is a national level need to improve the ‘surrender’ of useful information for general use.
- Countries could have cross links between PIPAP and their own national data-bases.

Usability

- General queries about the desired target audience for the PIPAP as it appears to be targeted at the technical level.
- Navigation instructions to ensure users can use the portal effectively, but mostly, ensure site navigation is as simple as possible.
- Target ‘grassroots’ users and ensure functions are simple and user friendly.
- Countries see a benefit in that SPREP has responsibility for maintenance and cost of the PIPAP on behalf of PICs.
- High resolution drone imagery can be uploaded and shared with PIPAP if the users licensing allows this.
- A PIPAP App would be a convenience for phone users.

6. Information systems for protected areas

6.1 Overview by EC-JRC

A presentation on information systems for protected areas was given by Stephen Peedell, JRC Senior Scientific Officer. The key message from this presentation was that JRC’s role in BIOPAMA is to help the ACP countries to address their data and information needs through the development of the BIOPAMA information systems for the Regional Observatories, in partnership with the participants and for the participants. The JRC mission is connected to the European Commission’s policy objectives of international and mission of sustainable development and offers a service for science and knowledge. It is independent of member states and business interests. JRC has access to comprehensive data and analysis resources enabling systematic planning and monitoring over time on land and seascapes.

A key focus of BIOPAMA is to focus on the integration of information that is already in existence and that information improvement is driven by regional needs. PIPAP is the platform for Pacific regional data and complements the global expertise and resources available through the JRC with its more tailored functions. BIOPAMA provides a platform to consider what tools will assist in achieving raised conservation aspirations and addressing pressing needs in conservation and protected areas to achieving targets such as Aichi Target 11 by 2020.

As BIOPAMA works across 79 ACP countries, JRC faces many different and unique challenges. From previous experience, the importance of combining diverse data sources from high resolution imagery to socio-economic and management surveys, and then portray these effectively as maps, indicators and infographics is well acknowledged to better communicate to decision makers progress on targets as well as gaps. These help to tell stories about the different ecosystems, visually which can convert good science into simple and effective presentation formats.

SPECIFIC POINTS FROM THE PRESENTATION

- As BIOPAMA has progressed the focus has moved from gathering data to using the data for applications, which informs the BIOPAMA tagline “From knowledge to action”.

- The Reference Information System RIS is the engine room beneath the regional observatories and is built on open source and open standards. The RIS has involved website designers to understand and improve the user experience and user interface, with the aims to connect, contribute, analyse, explore and learn.
- The RIS allows for:
 - **Connection** through a platform called ‘Yammer network’ – social network for protected areas and a practical way for sharing knowledge (like a professional facebook). Currently 700 PA professionals are registered on this platform.
 - Connect systems with PIPAP – with national level and local level data.
 - Using tools to connect information with people, and people with people.
 - Connecting with news and opportunities direct from CBD, BIOPAMA etc.
 - Development of ‘story maps’
 - Use of powerful “big data” processing engines such as Google Earth Engine for large scale analysis
 - Inclusion of community data including the use of platforms such as OpenStreetMap.
 - **Contribution** of content on PAs in a structured way through Geonode – a well-designed data store allowing data to be managed and selectively shared online where appropriate
 - **Analysing** through: Accessing data and improve monitoring and understanding for management effectiveness, including IMET and other Protected Area Management Effectiveness (PAME) tools.
 - Using, refining, adapting and improving existing tools and growing the capacity for their use.
 - Links to site-based operational tools such as SMART
 - **Learning** through: Enabling target-based approaches.
 - Exploiting the opportunities from the EU space programme Copernicus – not only the regular satellite imagery but also specific products such as landcover change information from the Copernicus Hot-Spot service, with ongoing mapping taking place for Timor-Leste and a large part of the Solomon Islands.
- Globally harmonised metrics such as those available through DOPA are currently limited by spatial data resolution to analysing areas over 50 square kilometres. PIPAP is the platform that can pick up greater detail for the region.
- The PIPAP can support the action component of BIOPAMA for the region through providing and demonstrating robust evidence to support grant applications in terms of needs and priorities in the region.

6.2 How can information lead to better conservation outcomes?

Andrew Cottam, JRC Biodiversity and Information Specialist European followed Steve Peedell with a detailed presentation on how the use of integrated information can lead to better conservation outcomes. He explained that the current tools of RIS, through the PIPAP, presents information in dashboard style which can and should be used for conservation gain. He stressed the importance of explicitly linking information with an outcome and a focus on conservation targets that express what is trying to be achieved. Otherwise information collation carries the risk of having information purely for information’s sake.

The main aspect concerns content and ownership and being able to collectively share data where appropriate. Tools allow those areas to be highlighted that are not being active or effective. Information can be used towards conservation action for monitoring and achieving conservation targets. The PIPAP can help measure progress linked to targets at the national, regional and global levels. Policies are linked to

targets and indicators to help measure progress for direct conservation action. The example of the Regional Framework for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in the Pacific Islands Region was given as an ideal and logical strategic reference point on which to build progress measuring tools that can display knowledge and maps.

6.3 Systematic conservation planning

A presentation on systematic conservation planning was given by Jennifer McGowan, Spatial Planning Technical Coordinator with The Nature Conservancy/University of Queensland. She explained that a starting point for protected areas is the dialogue with governments and stakeholders about what the problems and priorities are and looking at the network rather than the specific site. The value of examining and looking at an issue comprehensively through a spatial planning lens is to inform and guide decision making about what areas should be prioritised using a process that is equitable and meets the values, resource needs and priorities of a community.

The example of Marxan as a spatial planning tool <http://marxan.net/> was discussed. Marxan is the most widely used decision support software for conservation planning globally and is used in 184 countries to build marine and terrestrial conservation systems. Marxan integrates data on biodiversity, socio-economic impacts, and human values to meet conservation targets and build representative and efficient PA networks for biodiversity and people. Solomon Islands, Fiji and Papua New Guinea have used Marxan and systematic conservation planning methods in the past. Representatives from Vanuatu and Nauru expressed specific interest in learning more about how to use Marxan in PA planning.

GENERAL COMMENTS on 6.2 and 6.3

- It was noted that the use of systematic conservation planning tools is an invaluable and relatively simple process that will assist countries in identifying their priority targets and it should have been getting done prior to this point.
- If the region really wants to do PA work properly as well as meet targets, then support tools like Marxan are essential for structured and transparent decision making.
- The MaCBIO project has been helping countries in the Pacific with data acquisition and bioregionalizations, as well as establishing well-defined design principles for PA networks at the country level. These outputs have proved invaluable towards the planning of marine and terrestrial PAs. Countries in the MaCBIO project are well positioned to advance with spatial prioritization as the next stage of PA planning.
- Training in the use of such tools and other conservation planning information systems was highlighted as a major request. It was suggested that online training and case studies be made available on the BIOPAMA and PIPAP websites.
- Fiji has undertaken systematic planning methodologies previously and advised that the targets required for conservation priorities quickly become apparent using tools like Marxan– the methods do work to locate important areas.
- While the role of Marxan and other software was acknowledged as important for PA planning, it was noted there is a capacity gap with the ability to interpret and integrate the numerous information sets available into a structured planning process.

6.4 Practical review and input on the World Database on Protected Areas WDPA

Heather Bingham introduced a practical session where workshop participants from each country were assigned large format paper maps depicting their PA network as currently recorded by UNEP-WCMC and illustrated on the WDPA. The maps were examined to assess the accuracy of information they depicted. The session highlighted that some of the information on the maps was out of date, incomplete, inaccurate or may not have captured the full suite of sites that are undertaking some level of PA activity. The exercise was largely concerned with focussing participants on looking at the current quantitative elements of PA information (site location – polygon or point, size, ID number, etc), rather than the qualitative aspects of PA reporting. The information available on the PIPAP was used to cross reference with the paper maps.

It was evident that few participants were particularly familiar with the current information that is given for their countries on the WDPA. As the WDPA is the fundamental PA information set used for national reporting to international agreements and forms the base reference data for the JRCs work and the PIPAP, it is critical that countries contribute to UNEP-WCMC such information that will improve its overall quality and usefulness for decision-making. One of SPREP's key roles in BIOPAMA is to act as the regional 'agent' for assisting countries in collating their PA information and appropriately passing this through to UNEP-WCMC to be lodged on the WDPA.

SPECIFIC POINTS FROM THE PRACTICAL SESSION

Many specific comments and corrections were noted by countries during the practical session and this information was provided directly to Heather Bingham.

- PA networks throughout the Pacific ACP countries can be significantly comprised of areas that involve community-based management. While these areas do not often account for substantive geographic area (mostly small sites), they are one of the main missing elements in the WDPA information sets.
- Locally managed marine areas LMMAs, a well-known form of community-based resource management, are often subject to some quite complex consent processes regarding the acceptable level of information about them being made available on any public forums.
- Many of the data entries on the WDPA need to be standardised, especially the names.
- Some countries identified quite large information gaps between the what is contained on the WDPA and the national situation.
- Country data compilers and submitters require specific assistance in determining how to identify or calculate the exact extents of area that are considered protected in a 'protected area' as well as more general guidance on how to best collate PA information.
- The audience for the information contained on the WDPA was questioned – who is it to be most useful to?
- PIPAP to consider customisation of PA information display for each country, ie; at the EEZ level; at the local level; the atoll level, and; community level. Countries should also seek to develop their own PA recording systems that account for the unique circumstances of their networks and communities.
- Information about whether management activity is occurring and then whether it is effective is important.
- Metadata about who submitted information, and when, would be helpful as well as notes about update points.

7. Protected Area Management Effectiveness and Governance Tools

7.1 Overview

Fiona Leverington, Director of Protected Area Solutions Pty Ltd provided an overview on the importance of conducting Protected Area Management Effectiveness (PAME) activities as a means to monitor and evaluate PAs. Experiences with management effectiveness assessment in Papua New Guinea were used as examples with information provided by Nate Peterson, GIS and Conservation Information Manager, Pacific Division, The Nature Conservancy and Jim Thomas, Chief Executive Officer, Tenkile Conservation Alliance, Papua New Guinea.

Fiona explained that there are considerable differences across scales and context and that a one size fits all approach can't be applied uniformly, particularly in the Pacific region. She noted that certain cultural contexts can make it hard for mistakes to be admitted, however admitting things are not going well and according to objectives is important, as well as documenting successes and prioritising needs. It was also noted that most management effectiveness tools can be difficult for the average user. Reporting on management effectiveness is a requirement through the World Bank and GEF where management effectiveness is an integral part of their process to help track improvements and investment benefits. It is also integral to NBSAPs as well as international agreements, particularly CBD Aichi Target 11.

Additional note to presentation from EC-JRC:- Although not yet used within the Pacific Region, a comprehensive approach to management effectiveness assessments, the Integrated Management Effectiveness Toolkit IMET, has been developed in BIOPAMA by EC-JRC and partners. Widely used in Central and West Africa, it complements other PAME approaches, providing a common baseline of METT-level indicators, with additional emphasis on statistical analysis of results and on additional modules for governance assessments. Whilst not intended to replace existing approaches, testing of IMET in other regions of BIOPAMA is foreseen and can be supported with BIOPAMA project resources.

KEY POINTS FROM THE PRESENTATIONS

Fiona Leverington

- Evaluations should be useful and relevant, not absorb too many resources and build on existing information processes and make it simple.
- The most useful element of PAME is the participatory aspect - getting people together and talking.
- The methodology must be robust and in published form with good indicators, which includes cultural management and socio-economic relationships. Methodologies range from Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation of Protected Area Management RAPPAM (somewhat outdated) to Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool METT (which is a current requirement of the GEF for funded projects).
- The METT can help compare progress overtime, ensure adaptive management and accountability, with basic information, questionnaire and threats assessment.
- A key aspect of the process is to ensure that information is contextualised to the community both in language and accessibility, particularly through the consultation process and in the reporting back for ownership and accountability.
- Effectiveness queries include:
 - Design of the PA – does it work
 - Adequacy and appropriateness of the management of the PA
 - How is management done
 - What is the type and quality of governance (eg; in the Pacific it is often a partnership, shared or mixed governance model)

- Quality of governance is framed by:
 - Who is making the decision – leadership
 - Degree of legitimacy and voice of stakeholders - do they have a voice to speak and be heard, equity for power and opportunity and direction
 - The presence of some type of plan
- Need to talk about and record the changes being seen – why is it happening?
- Language used must be of a type that can be understood by those who are being asked about their management and results communicated back in a form that can be accessed.

PNG example – Nate Peterson, Fiona Leverington and Jim Thomas

- The vastness of Papua New Guinea was depicted with a land mass comprising 84 percent of the total Pacific region, with 72 percent of the population for the Pacific of 8 million people, from which 80 percent are living at the subsistence level. There are rich natural resources. This creates complex and dynamic environmental challenges and stressors.
- The Protected Areas Policy is a guide for PNG in the development of a legislative and institutional framework for protected areas. It provides guidelines for selecting, designing and managing protected areas; covers sea and land and includes World Heritage, Ramsar and other international declarations. The policy: clarifies processes to declare protected areas and complements other legislation; requirements for maintaining and sustaining biodiversity, and; enabling stakeholders and partners to work together on protected areas.
- There are currently 1,777,089 hectares of designated terrestrial protected areas (3.8%) and 514,728 hectares of designated marine protected areas (0.2%).
- Supported by GEF, the PNG PAME assessed 58 protected areas, all being gazetted protected areas in PNG. The methodology used was a modified version of the METT to incorporate contextual approaches needed for effective engagement with communities.
- At national level there was no official, acknowledged list of PAs and limited knowledge of who was managing them. PA names have changed. Original management committees have lapsed as older people have passed away and not been replaced.
- From the community consultations undertaken most people were enthusiastic about the values of protected areas and appreciated the benefits provided by their protected areas.
- In terms of perception of threats, climate change and severe weather were viewed as the highest level one threat with energy production and mining the lowest. In between were issues raised about pollution, natural values, cultural values and socio-economic values as a source of their livelihoods, and clean water. With population growth people felt threatened with the number of outsiders coming into their communities from other areas, with hunting and fishing as threats that required greater enforcement.
- Another key aspect of the consultations is that, while many PAs have no paid staff, communities did not expect the government to do everything, as they came up with many actions themselves. However, they do require sustainable support, advice, capacity development and resources assisted by government.
- Key outcomes of this PAME were: gaining a better understanding of all protected areas and their management; the ability to set management priorities for the future, and; gaining a better understanding of what makes for a successful protected area.
- Overall, many PAs were not performing well with their management with only the bigger, more 'renowned' PAs being effective.
- It was noted that despite the many threats and impacts, most protected areas still contain many of their original values in good to very good condition, and most customary landowners are supportive of the protected area model over any other form of land/ sea use.

- The need for clearly defined and enforced protected areas was recognised and that they must be backed by active management committees and a reliable ‘ranger-type’ workforce where government has a key role.

7.2 Practical session on management effectiveness

Following the presentations, a practical session enabled participants to consider the following questions:

- What methodologies are being used in the Pacific to measure management effectiveness?
- Should countries try to have a similar (harmonised but not identical) methods?
- Does your country have a good idea about their management topics and standards? How are these applied to community-based areas?
- How often should the assessments be done?
- Should PIPAP include and analyse management effectiveness data for the whole region?
- What would be the purpose of using this information?

SPECIFIC POINTS FROM THE PRACTICAL SESSION

- Management plans remain a critical gap, especially those that are in written form. However, a METT type process could also be used to stimulate the development of a more structured management plan, with simple indicators, based on review of existing traditional and/or ‘ad-hoc’ management regimes.
- Many participants acknowledged that management effectiveness assessments were lacking, saw the benefits associated with them and expressed a strong desire for these processes to be undertaken, with suggested cycles being 3-5 years.
- Few participants were aware of management effectiveness assessments being conducted in their country (albeit that some assessments may have occurred but did not necessarily involve those attending this workshop).
- There have been some quite specific assessments that involve looking at management activities (eg; IBA monitoring programme gave a few indicators and it was used for birds).
- Communities have low capacity to monitor their management effectiveness and there is a need for assistance to countries on how best to create and implement suitable assessment processes that are customised for their circumstances and communities.
- A certain point of standardisation at national level of both management plans and management assessment processes, was recommended.
- Some key elements to be assessed included: existence of baseline bio-physical information; financial sustainability; community development and benefits; workforce; patrolling and enforcement; commitment;
- The PIPAP is a useful repository for displaying assessments.

8. BIOPAMA Action Component

8.1 Action component overview

A presentation on the Action Component AC was provided by Tony O’Keeffe. The aim of the presentation was to present the basic principles and objectives of the AC as outlined in IUCN’s contract with the EU and to get the participants’ input on the proposed criteria and to capitalise on the learning from other grant mechanisms. He advised that while the presentation covered the fundamental aspects of the AC as a specific grant making facility, an operational manual currently being finalised will set out the final details of the granting mechanism. The total Action Component is Euro 20 million for all 79 countries and is a competitive process.

BIOPAMA will support specific actions on the ground and on the water aimed at strengthening protected area management effectiveness and governance. Priorities are informed by: management and governance assessments; regional and national strategies and plans; and the regional observations. Input recorded from this workshop is will also contribute to the shaping of final areas of investment priority. The grant-making mechanism is built around similar grant building systems from the region and internationally.

IUCN’s regional role in the process is to ensure regional priorities are communicated to the BIOPAMA steering committee. It will also ensure wide spread communications and engagement about the calls for proposals, which are done at a global level. IUCN is planning to implement a portal and manual in order to answer questions presented by members of the region regarding how to acquire funds and the regulations applying to their distribution. IUCN will provide information and support to the region prior to the call for grant applications occurs to ensure there is a strong pool of eligible proposals coming from the Pacific region.

8.2 Review and input on the action component

The objective of this session was to allow workshop participants opportunity to reflect on and identify actions that they believed were high priority for targeted investment to improve PA management and governance. The session was convened as breakout groups with country representatives working either singly or with another country to discuss and record priorities. Issues of grant making process and eligibility questions were also recorded.

8.2.1 Process issues

- The target AC activities must be tailored to assist the Pacific context and identified needs.
- There are a number of programmes and projects that can provide on-ground support to aspects of protected area governance and management, so it is critical that the BIOPAMA AC can support those PA demand niches that are critical but are currently under-supported or not supported at all.
- IUCN will be expected to build capacity of local and national NGOs so they have equitable opportunity to apply for, and manage, grants.
- Activities supported should link to activities already identified in NBSAPs and other policy documents approved by national government relating to PAs (i.e.; meet country priorities.
- How are ‘priority sites’ to be identified for the AC? What are the criteria?
- Do PAs that are the subject of an AC application have to meet an IUCN PA category as well as the IUCN PA definition, to be considered?

- The grant making operational manual needs to be complete and published before applications are called so that all potential applicants understand the entirety of the process and implications.
- Should the application process even need to be a call? Why not an ongoing recipient program which could continually take proposals from the regions until the funding was depleted to allow proposals to be fully fleshed out and potentially for proposals brought up close to the deadline to have time to be created and submitted.
- Pacific countries have a standard process that applications are accompanied by endorsement from relevant government ministries. This also supports the desire for consensus on goals and priorities between NGOs and the National governments but not necessarily bound up in each other's actions and authority.
- Does the EU have a requirement that any sub-grant provision over €10,000 is required to be done through tender process, which would negate most small organisations due to their inability to undertake tender processes and the management burden for the grantor to conduct tendering processes.
- Is co-financing required?
- Need for information sessions to interested applicants prior to calls for proposals and provision of detailed guidelines to remove any grey areas, confusion or misunderstanding about eligibility or potential activities.
- It is critical that regional and national partners, such as the larger conservation organisations with effective working relationships with local communities, smaller CBOs and in some cases national or provincial governments, can be positively involved in the AC.
- Desire by national NGOs to be given positive funding consideration in terms of their ability to strengthen their own organisational capacity as well as delivering field activities. The rationale being that they would then have the boost resources to continue to provide on-going support and technical assistance to the project past just the lifetime of the grant funding.
- A priority would be obtaining secure financing for organizations so that when the grant money for a project ends, that organization does not just cease to exist, and instead has the resources to identify and begin their next project or continue to provide on-going support and technical assistance to the project past just the lifetime of the grant funding.

8.2.2 Eligibility issues

- All national government ministries (those with responsibilities for protected areas) want to know if they are eligible to apply for grants.
- Small organisations and local communities are usually the ones doing field activity relating to protected areas, but often have less capacity, particularly for writing proposals, managing funding and reporting. They should not be disadvantaged in terms of equitable opportunity to access grants particularly as the eligible entities range from large to small organisations and institutions.
- Previous experience with EU grants has shown them to have strict eligibility criteria which reduces the ability of community-based organisations (CBOs) and smaller local NGOs to apply.
- National NGOs, academic institutions and some BINGOs often assist local communities with field activities and they also act on their behalf to seek and manage funding that supports the

field work. Can these mid-range organisations seek, distribute and manage funds on behalf of local communities or small CBOs?

- The eligibility requirements of being a member state in the EU and being established in an ACP country would seem to cancel out the other eligibility opportunity for most of the organisations listed in 3.2.1 d of the grant making processes section of the BIOPAMA II Description of the Action document.

8.2.3 Potential activities

In the context of protected areas priority action in the Pacific ACP region, and taking account of the general focus of the BIOPAMA programme investment priorities through grant making, the main activity themes that emerged from the workshop input are summarised as follows:

- Increasing the number of PAs established and recognised through national laws or other accepted national planning instruments.
- Development of management plans, including how to make and implement these.
- Ensuring the community voice is heard and considered in relation to PAs.
- Inclusion of traditional knowledge about management practices.
- Enforcing the rules of management plans.
- Capacity development in all aspects of PA management and governance and particularly for stakeholders at the PA site level.
- Capture of baseline site information.
- Understanding of how to monitor site conditions and adapt to new information.
- Understanding, and undertaking, management effectiveness assessments.
- Health and livelihood improvement measures that help increase support for conservation objectives.
- Establishment of trusts to support protecting key areas.
- Specific site actions including site surveys, invasive species management, restoration of degraded or depleted forest or marine areas.
- Creation and dissemination of awareness raising materials about PAs.
- Peer learning opportunities.

The priority needs list above characterises the current developmental stage for most of the protected area networks in the Pacific, the predominant role of local communities and the relatively resource constrained and remote circumstances in which they strive to succeed.

The following list records the finer detail of the input provided by participants on priority PA needs.

| BIOPAMA investment objectives | Examples of activities, or focus issues, identified by workshop participants |
|--|---|
| Enhancing management and governance of priority protected areas by addressing existing limitations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Training of rangers (includes provincial level conservation officers and community representatives that are forest and/or fish wardens). ➤ Competency development of rangers through peer learning networks, exchanges and on the job training activities. |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Equipping of rangers – suitable personal safety gear, GPS, communication equipment, photo monitoring equipment (possibly vehicles, boats). ➤ Training of local governance bodies in aspects of priority PA management relevant to their situations, ie; village, atoll or island councils, management committees, chiefs, large landowners. ➤ Provision of project management and technical training to reduce need for national or international expertise to be brought in to fix problems or do jobs on behalf of local people. ➤ Establishment of conservation trusts to provide critical funds to ‘seed’ and then maintain projects. |
| Enforce the legal framework for effective conservation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Development of law enforcement guidelines. |
| Support local community initiatives aiming to enhance the livelihoods of local people whilst effectively contributing to protected areas management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provision of water tanks, establishment of alternative food sources (aquaculture, seaweed farming) ➤ Provision of boats that enable communities access to offshore fishing to protect nearshore reef and lagoon resources |
| Long-term conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and natural resources in priority protected areas and surrounding communities is improved. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Completion of PA establishment processes for sites that are already partly progressed along the establishment process ➤ Restoration of ecologically important areas within and around PAs particularly degraded ecosystems such as harvested forest areas, stream banks, beaches, mangroves and foreshores |
| Enhanced capacity of national PA agencies to use appropriate assessment tools (IMET and MEAs, social and governance assessments) and use the results from those assessments for planning and decision making. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Training in protected area management implementation work including PA management standards and PA management effectiveness and performance monitoring systems ➤ Develop and implement national PA training modules and curriculum that are accompanied by hands-on site based practical activities |
| Sustainable livelihoods of local communities, vulnerable peoples and indigenous communities are enabled through targeted field-action interventions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Habitat restoration and re-stocking |
| Protected areas planning and management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Building capacity in local expertise in planning and management of protected areas |
| Effective governance arrangements involving local people living in and around protected areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Policy and legislation reviews involve the community level for equity, capacity building and raising awareness ➤ Development of suitable governance arrangements including co-management ➤ Making conservation agreements for customary landowners and communities ➤ Establishment of national PA committees to strengthen PA governance and advocacy |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Law enforcement, particularly to control wildlife trafficking.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Enforcement of management plans – regular surveillance, patrols and clear information developed about the location, importance and rules applicable to PAs ➤ Establishing demarcation boundaries of areas for sustainable use of resources and those areas solely for conservation within or adjoining protected areas |
| <p>Mitigation of threats in protected areas located in priority conservation landscapes.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Management of specific threats to important species ➤ Management actions for specific species particularly endemic species ➤ Control of invasive plant and animal species, eg; predator proof fencing to support protected area management |
| <p>Enhancing institutional and legal frameworks of national and/or regional institutions playing a key role in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development by providing capacity development, training materials, and technical advice.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Integrating community conserved areas into the national PA network through acknowledgement in national legislation or other effective means of formal inclusion in national systems ➤ Establishment of national PA working groups to support PA management and governance |
| <p>Measures to strengthen the knowledge base with regards to a priority protected areas, potentially including collection of baseline data in places where this information does not exist, monitoring activities including through IMET, MEAs, Social and Governance Assessments to address identified governance and management problems through targeted field actions.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Training on methods for data collection and site monitoring ➤ Training on monitoring methods to evaluate the effectiveness of community-based PAs ➤ Training for increased local capacity in specialist areas i.e. ecology, taxonomy and GIS ➤ Development of national KBAs and habitat mapping (not just forest cover) ➤ Obtain base line descriptive data and produce maps and storyboards of community-based protected areas ➤ Conduct management effectiveness assessments and evaluations using hands on participation and training with the analysis tools ➤ Conduct socio-economic assessment for PAs ➤ Conduct data collection, baseline ecological surveys, stock assessments, biological studies, habitat and species monitoring ➤ PA boundary delineation including special area demarcation |
| <p>Creation of key essential infrastructure for management, patrolling, anti-poaching operations, visitor's management as well as obtaining key essential equipment to ensure the effective implementation of these field operations.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ranger house, power source, signage, computers, storage, lights, GPS, access infrastructure (for community, visitors, managers) |
| <p>Top-up or complement investments from national agencies and/or NGOs oriented to enhance planning, management and governance of protected areas;</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conservation trust funding |

| | |
|---|---|
| Support on the ground actions aiming to increase the livelihoods of local communities living in and around protected areas in priority conservation landscapes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provision of essential infrastructure (water, power, access) to enhance community health and quality of life |
| Capacity-building of managers and/or rangers on law enforcement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Improving management capabilities would be a priority because of the logistics of remoteness and difficulty of providing consistent external support ➤ Training of communities in ecosystem monitoring ➤ Skills building in compliance and enforcement of PA management rules |
| Revision of the legal framework | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Review of existing PA relevant policies and legislation at national level or provincial by-law level ➤ Development of PA legislation where it does not currently exist ➤ Revision of relevant legislation relating to PAs ie fisheries or forestry Acts |
| Intelligence linked to combat illegal poaching and wildlife trafficking | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ensure communities, NGOs and national government have access to, and competency in using, a range of resource usage and activity monitoring tools (ie; fishing logging, land clearing) |
| Dialogue with communities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Engaging traditional leaders and communities in PA priority setting and legal and policy development is vital for ownership, inclusiveness and long-term sustainability ➤ Provision of fora that enable sharing of lessons and experiences ➤ Recording traditional knowledge and use in management practices |
| Equipment's and material provision and maintenance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ranger house, power source, signage, computers, storage, lights, GPS, personal safety gear, GPS, communication equipment, photo monitoring equipment, vehicles and boats (although ongoing maintenance, parts, fuel is a concern) |
| Support for deployment of management effectiveness assessment tools (IMET or equivalent) as precondition of grant acceptance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conduct management effectiveness assessments and evaluations using hands on participation and training with the analysis tools |
| Elaboration/updating of Management Plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Completion of PA establishment processes for sites that are already underway on the process ➤ Developing management plans is a significant priority as it includes much of the action work such as enforcing PAs, mitigating and adapting to climate change, strengthening data, and monitoring and evaluation ➤ Turning verbal management plans (common form) into more concrete, written plans with maps and rules ➤ Establishment of simple, relevant management plans that reflect the traditional rules and support conservation management, livelihood and investments ➤ Development of management plans to include PA design using hands-on training |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Assist sites, through specific field activities, in better documenting their community-based resource management areas in terms of bio-physical location and values, traditional knowledge and practices, management objectives and outcomes, and governance structures</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Documentation of traditional knowledge through interviews and videos ➤ Undertake BIORAPS as a means to involve local communities in management dialogues ➤ Target surveys for endemic species including camera traps for fauna surveys |
| <p>Support existing community fora with planning and implementation of conservation and sustainable livelihoods activities, considering climate change challenges and opportunities</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Convening forums to enable community to tell government what the issues and needs are so that they can be included in management approaches. Issues could include climate change, flooding, illegal fishing, logging, limitations to water access, income limitations. ➤ Inclusion of women and youth in conservation planning discussions and practical efforts |
| <p>Support community-based organisations operating in and around PAs in business planning (including value chains, tourism management, etc.) and enterprise development.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Education to inform business and investors about other sustainable investment opportunities other than just ecotourism ➤ Establishing innovative financing/income generation mechanisms – egs; breadfruit farming, sustainable fish markets ➤ Improved management and delivery of ecotourism ventures ➤ Establishment of trust fund mechanisms ➤ Effective marketing to attract paying visitors/users. |

Note that many additional issues were raised by participants at the workshop, however, while valid, they were considered beyond the scope of the BIOPAMA programme Action Component. For example, this included issues such as: improving organisational function or cultures; the sharing, collation, storage, organisation, accessibility and analysis of relevant data and information (should be addressed through the activities of the regional observatory).

Some examples of key activities identified as national and regional protected area priorities, that are currently not being addressed effectively, but that don't fully align with the BIOPAMA grant making focus interventions.

- Training in the design of PA's and PA networks using spatial planning tools
- Community awareness to promote purposes for varied conservation methods
- Widespread national education on protected area values through schooling curricula
- Developing ranger programs
- Improving national institutional communication and coordination across the range of laws relevant to PA's
- Making conservation agreements for customary landowners and communities
- Integrating community conserved areas through acknowledgement in national legislation or effective means of formal inclusion in the national systems

9. Workshop summation

The workshop summation session was led by Tony O’Keeffe. He advised that the drafting of a workshop report (this report) is a key outcome that will be used to guide the BIOPAMA priorities and workplan for the region. The workshop had also provided information, ideas and directions that support related initiatives including the 2020 milestone for CBD Aichi Target 11; the PIRT PA Working Group; various national commitments, and; other projects. The BIOPAMA Global Steering Committee will be informed of regionally important context, priorities and practical delivery issues regarding the Regional Observatory, Action Component, and management effectiveness and governance.

Specific input points, requests and recommendations on these topics are provided within the content of this report. Additional action points were identified during the workshop conclusion session and are outlined as follows.

Some clear-cut immediate actions included:

- Establishing a clear core vision and purpose for the PIPAP based on what the region needs and wants to achieve for its targets.
- Finalisation of a register of country focal points for PA issues.
- Clean up of national baseline Protected Area information resources including lists, maps, and metadata for submission via SPREP (and with assistance from SPREP) to UNEP-WCMC for updating of the WDPA.
- Management effectiveness guidance and training to support countries in suitable bottom up approaches as well as assisting PA network planning, local management and funding prioritisation.
- The sharing of required information tools, guidelines as well as success stories and including the identification of funding opportunities and help networks.
- Developing a consolidated list of regional priorities that could be considered through the BIOPAMA Action Component and referring these to the BIOPAMA Steering Committee.
- Urgent imperative for more explicit information to ACP countries about the final administrative mechanisms and typical interventions (relevant to the Pacific context) under the Action Component. The finalisation of the Operating Manual for the Action Component was also highlighted and that it needed to consider any concerns expressed by the region.
- Achievement of CBD Aichi Target 11 by 2020 is a key driver for implementation of actions by countries utilising BIOPAMA support.
- Promoting the values and benefits of protected areas.

Other actions identified included:

- Ensuring that the process of sharing information and advising updates, milestones and progress relating to BIOPAMA activity occurs and that greater collaboration, networking and communication happens more often than it has in the past.
- Setting and notifying the programme of SPREPs expanded country visits to support PA information improvement.
- Establishing a clear core vision and purpose of the PIPAP based on what the region needs and wants to achieve for its targets.
- Confirming the types of customised PA information tools that would be useful in driving conservation outcomes and determining their plan for development.
- Setting specifications for the technical support to the regional observatory / PIPAP via EC-JRC resources that are working and assisting each other very closely.
- EC-JRC will move forward with establishing a direct financial support to the development of PIPAP, funding technical development resources within SPREP.

- Developing the brief for, and preparing, a State of Protected Areas Report linked to the 10th Pacific Islands Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas to be hosted in 2020.

Other points contributing to the summation included:

- All the detailed workshop presentation materials are available on <https://biopama.org/node/254>
- Use the resources that were presented at the workshop and evolve the tools with greater feedback from the countries to tailor it to the needs of the Pacific.
- Tools for analysis need to be usable and actionable and a means for storytelling and key messages. It is important to note institutions beyond the region want to hear and learn from the Pacific stories and experiences.
- Facilitate more face-to-face interaction through consultation and training and identify those people in countries that should be benefiting from information services training for conservation purposes.
- Reference was made to the term ‘other effective conservation measures’ OECMs and its draft definition of ‘*a geographically defined space, not recognised as a protected area, which is governed and managed over the long-term in ways that deliver the effective and enduring in-situ conservation of biodiversity, with associated ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values*’. International acceptance of this term is highly relevant to the Pacific PA context as it is a means to enhance national reporting on Aichi Targets and in fostering support for necessary actions for areas that fall into the OECM category.
- Closing remarks noted the importance of making the BIOPAMA project move from knowledge to action. A key aspect for the future is sharing the experiences from PIPAP and the Inform project to demonstrate how these portals have been used for action and how it is applied. A follow-up workshop during next phase implementation of BIOPAMA would enable progress and achievements to be displayed and reviewed.
- The importance of capacity building tracked against targets and indicators which are linked to impacts was noted.
- It was also observed that the Pacific workshop model is one that should be followed and continued with consideration of an invitation being extended to other regional observatories.
- Emphasis was given to the focus on capacity development for management effectiveness and on how SPREP and IUCN would assist in its delivery in the region.
- The role of government was emphasised as important for the leadership role and their coordination processes to support partnerships at the national level with communities and NGOs respectively particularly for the Action Component.
- Appreciation was conveyed by many of the participants and organisers for what had been an inspirational workshop and a large forum focussed on protected areas that does not occur that often. It was found to be quite encouraging particularly listening to each of the countries experiences and the role of communities and partnerships of working together at the local level and also the level of leadership and recognition by government.

Annex A: Country case studies

1. Large Marine Protected Areas – the Cook Islands’ experience with Marae Moana

KEY POINTS FROM PRESENTATION by Kevin Iro, Cook Islands Ambassador for Marae Moana

- Marae Moana legislation was passed in the Cook Islands Parliament in July 2017. The process from concept through to Parliament comprised of 10 key stages, which involved multiple stakeholder consultations. Traditional leadership and their inputs from the House of Ariki and other traditional title holders provided critical support throughout the process. Marae Moana was also strongly championed by the Cook Islands Prime Minister.
- The approach taken to Marae Moana was to change mindsets and introduce new concepts, noting that many Cook Islanders were not aware of the vastness of the Cook Islands EEZ of 2 million square kilometres. Key to the process was viewing the marine protection process in a holistic manner (Whole-of-Domain) noting Marae Moana translated means ‘Sacred Ocean’, identifying the different components of the protection process. Education and awareness was an important part of the consultation process and key to progress of the Marae Moana initiative with different island groups.
- Governance of Marae Moana includes the Marae Moana Council, the Marae Moana Technical Advisory Committee, and the Marae Moana Coordination office.
- Challenges now include requests from islands for development of marine spatial plans for adjacent coastal/ocean areas, which requires technical and resource support. The Marae Moana Council has tasked the Technical Advisory Committee with consulting the different islands and assessing what the needs of each island are.
- Another critical challenge has been the engagement and follow-up consultations with many of the outer islands, particularly in the Northern Cook Islands of Penrhyn for example which can cost up to NZD\$ 3,000 per person for airfares return from Rarotonga. Flights or boats can be limited with one-week excursions extending to six weeks due to connectivity and /or availability of connecting transport.
- On the issue of sustainable financing it was noted that it is included in the legislation and seeking mechanisms to help for what needs to be done like on GIS work and surveillance. In the Cook Islands there is the means to raise funds through the tourism sector which is 70% of GDP. The key issue is to help other entities with what they want to start. Finance is a key issue as everyone is looking to implement projects. Argument with government is the environmental protection expenditure or investment (EPE or EPI) in terms of how much is invested by governments on the environment and what is the commitment of local budget spent on the environment.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- Managing coordination across the many different agencies/entities involved in Marae Moana relies on excellent levels of messaging to all stakeholders and recognising that Marae Moana means different things to different people. It also relies on getting an agreed work plan in place that involves all government agencies for coordination, assistance and implementation (budget and activities-wise).
- Sustainable financing is included in the legislation to continue support of the Marae Moana work and needs (fundraising); The Marae Moana team is looking at a mechanism that taxes tourists that could be directed to a Trust Fund for sustaining Marae Moana work. They are also looking to examples from Scandinavian countries where a percentage of national GDP is set aside for

environmental protection/conservation (i.e., not relying on external funding to keep activities going).

2. Palau's Protected Area Network PAN

KEY POINTS FROM PRESENTATION by Lolita Gibbons-Decherong, Program Manager, Conservation and Protected Areas Program, Palau Conservation Society

- Conservation is a fundamental cultural value of Palau with the expression of “Consider tomorrow’s meal” shared by elders. Sustainability is a Palauan value. Conservation work is ingrained within Palauans – they already understand the value of conserving, so it is easy to promote ideals of conservation among the population.
- Palau PAN is a partnership between three institutions: National government, the PAN office, and State governments. There is a domestic fishing zone that is managed by the national government. The PAN sites are managed by the local government. The States are the resource owners, and national government helps with funding and technical assistance – this is both an important distinction as well as partnership. National government and traditional government work toward parallel agreements and usually there is agreement
- Palau’s Protected Areas Network (PAN) sites are local sites managed by local/state governments, with funding and technical assistance from national government. Protocols have been set for marine PAN sites, but not yet for terrestrial sites.
- History:
 - 2003 – PAN Act became law – provides national government with a way to help local communities to manage resources. Many communities already had protected areas before the act was passed, but national support was provided through the bill.
 - 2006 – Micronesia Challenge created: challenged for 30% terrestrial areas and 20% marine areas protected in Micronesia.
 - 2008 - PAN funding amended to include the Green Fee, and how this funding would be collected
 - 2009 – Green fee collection started. Through the Palau national Green Fees, PAN receives US\$15 for every US\$100 received with the annual budget cap of US\$ 2 million to PAN from the national government.
 - 2010 – Reserve of Melekeok state becomes first PAN site
 - 2012 – PAN funds board was established and organised and began dispersing funds
 - 2017 – Ngatpang became the 15th state to establish a PAN site – only one state left to establish a PAN site (there is a community managed site but there was a conflict of land tenure and so it was not considered a conservation site).
- The PAN site designation process involves:
 - firstly, the site is nominated as a PAN site
 - nominated site goes through approval from MNRET and PAN office and is assessed based on IUCN criteria
 - once it is approved, it progresses to award start-up funds from the PAN fund
 - then PAN office supports the site based on national law and regulations
 - this 4-stage cycle repeats itself, with data reviewed every quarter
 - # a technical committee is made up of technical experts from agencies and NGOS
 - ## a management Committee is made up of governors, traditional leaders and Palau Public Land Authority reps
- The purpose of the Protected Areas Act 2003 is to enhance state-based conservation and includes protected areas in national waters.

- The Palau National Marine Sanctuary and Domestic Fishing Zones are managed by national government. 15 of the 16 Palau States now have PAN sites established.
- Traditionally managed areas have long been in existence before PAN.
- Progress noted of 41 percent of the total marine area and 10 percent of total terrestrial area protected.
- Only PAN sites are considered part of the Micronesia Challenge MC.
- The Palau International Coral Reef Centre conducts surveys every 3 years. Surveys identified that communities are happy with job opportunities that have been created through PAN. Approximately 100 people are employed by PAN, which is significant considering the size of communities. Coral is greatly valued as it is the home of fish that people eat, and PAN sites are contributing to higher fish biomass.
- Next steps for the PAN include: capacity development of the PAN office as there are 5 staff serving 15 states and 35 sites; the institutionalising of training for site managers and designing a suitably useful and relevant curriculum); and exploring sustainable financing mechanisms for PAN sites.
- The more the PAN sites expand, the more money they need to maintain and manage the site, which presents a challenge for Palau's PAN. Most of the sites have doubled their annual budgets, and 100% funding has never occurred. This limited funding means there is a need to work with communities to prioritise what is most important to fund. National congress put a \$2 mil cap on PAN funding, so PAN may need external funding to continue to grow. This approach is supported by traditional leaders.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- Protected area management report is done every 3-5 years. They are still struggling with ecological monitoring, but there is progress. This is partly due to limited scientific experts on the islands.
- The Palau Pledge was recently launched however it is not a financing stream for PAN
- The "Green Fee" is an environmental protection fee charged to arriving visitors to Palau. This arrival fee does not prevent individual states from levying separate fees for tourists' visits to sites within state boundaries regardless of whether the site has joined PAN.
- PAN is also investing its own funds to reduce being reliant on the Micronesia Conservation Trust and Green Fees
- The 10% terrestrial protected cover figure is just for areas that are part of the PAN. Only PAN areas are considered under the Micronesia Challenge because the Micronesia Challenge requires effective management (for funding), and it is not known if other protected areas have active management.
- PAN sites undergo PAME assessments every 3 years (assessing natural resources, infrastructure, community effects).
- The parameters and percentages in the PAME scorecard of the profile for Melekeok state were derived using tailored survey sheets that suited the respondents - leadership and key people in management of a PAN site. There are specific questions under each topic eg. for enforcement - is there a loss of regulations over the site.

3. The Samoan experience with protected area management

KEY POINTS FROM PRESENTATION by Moeumu Uili, Principal Parks & Reserves Officer, Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment MNRE

- Protected areas and related activities are mandated by the Government of Samoa through the Parks and Reserves Act, 1974. In 1978, Samoa became the first South Pacific Island country to establish a national park - O Le Pupu-Pue National Park. In 2018, Samoa's 120,000 sq km EEZ was declared a whale, dolphin and turtle sanctuary.
- Current Terrestrial PA coverage is 25.1 % but current figures for coastal waters and marine areas are not available
- Partnerships are a key aspect in executing protected area activities with civil society, village councils, private sector and locally based NGOs such as Conservation International and the Samoa Conservation Society.
- A notable and well managed privately-owned PA is the Malololelei Reserve, owned by Bluebird Lumber Ltd
- With obligations to various international conventions, the priority is on the improvement and updating of information through gathering of partners, collation of information obtained and validation before sharing.
- Historically there have been issues with communities being over promised benefits causing difficulties of establishing or maintaining conserved areas and issues with communities not abiding rules and conserving agreed land.
- MNRE values the benefit of having agreements with communities in place to ensure both parties meet their mutual obligations and targets to be achieved.
- Established conservation areas led by communities, such as the Uafato Conservation Area has not only preserved habitat of the rare Manumea bird, but has generated income through ecotourism activities
- Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries contributes to national Aichi Targets through their facilitation of the establishment of 62 village fish reserves over 102 participating local villages under community-based fisheries management approaches. Some of these areas implement coral replanting and monitoring.
- Good relevant policy is important for establishing protected areas, as well as having clear terms of reference for a protected areas committee in order to improve coordination and use available funding to implement conservation activities.
- Capacity of communities to access funds is an area that requires focus as communities do not always have the capacity to access funds due to lack of skills and knowledge including proposal writing.
- Challenges faced by the Ministry, and particularly the team responsible for protected areas include:
 - lack of dedicated staff for effective administration for the management of protected areas data
 - lack of a centralised information system in place as well as having no dedicated GIS specialist; would like to see KBAs displayed as a map layer on national PA information sets.
 - lack of a system for assessing and monitoring management effectiveness and economic value of protected areas
 - need for strengthening coordination between stakeholders
 - need for guidelines to establish and manage Samoa's protected areas
 - need for the finalisation of the Environmental Management and Conservation Bill to enable better enforcement of protected area laws and to help guide activities

- Some lessons learnt include:
 - Projects have limited sustainability in continuing work after funding and project life has ended – need to avoid the 'project cycle mentality'
 - Data management must be improved
 - Adopt method used by MAF who build from small projects and ensure long term support with partners. The model is that conservation and reserves for marine and fisheries are achieved by working with many small communities on small projects with achievable targets, giving higher chance of success as opposed to working with fewer larger scaled areas.
 - Make better use of available funding - GEF-SGP, GCF etc.
- Successes include:
 - completion of BIORAPs to inform decision-making on establishing PA and/or improving PAs
 - development of CBD Aichi target 11 Roadmap for PAs, 2016
 - establishment of the first privately owned Nature Reserve in 2015, followed by establishment of several Community Conserved areas
 - Adopting the MAF approach of working with smaller communities in larger numbers, rather than fewer but larger areas, in terrestrial PA work.
 - PAME-RAPPAM tool used in 2008 to make rough comparative analysis of PAs in Samoa

Following the presentation, MNRE hosted a field trip to three PAs – a community managed area, a privately managed area and a government managed area.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- Participants expressed great appreciation to the MNRE for the field tours organised to the Moata'a mangrove walk, the privately owned Malololelei Reserve and Le Pupu Pu'e National Park. Noting the positive aspects of the tour and the experience by all participants, feedback observations were shared to contribute to ongoing management considerations for the sites.
- It was suggested that establishment of buffer zones for the protected areas could help avoid any possible damages and harm that can occur to the protected areas. It was noted that Samoa is currently working on management plans for all three PAs with local communities and there is continued effort to integrate issues identified, in the management plans being developed. There are benefits of establishing buffer zones in mangrove areas to provide boundaries for villages while ensuring that pressures onto the conservation areas are kept to a minimum.
- African tulip tree is an evident threat and SPREP is in a good position to assist in eradicating these invasive species
- It was suggested that to support tourism development within communities a tourist guide be available, where communities can develop activities to generate income and make visitor experiences richer. The bird watching station at the Malololelei Reserve to consider visual bird guides on the existing rails, with information on what types of birds to look out for, especially the rare Manumea bird.
- Noting the beauty of the coastal walk of Le Pupu Pu'e National Park it was suggested that visible warning signs are used, to minimise risks of its public access location near precipitous sea cliffs. Where there are waterfalls and pools, placement of clear signage for no jump zones would be advisable.
- It was also noted that waste was an issue at Moata'a and that a waste management plan be developed for key areas to minimise rubbish and dumping in appropriate locations.
- Dry rivers had been observed during the tour and information was sought to explain their status. noted a study is being conducted to identify the stressors on water catchments. They are

currently investigating river streams, comparing community observations from the past and the present. In the past rivers never dried up but are now commonly occurring, suggesting impacts of climate change. Furthermore, the water resource division of MNRE are now working with communities to protect the water catchment areas, with holistic coverage inclusive of water source and water catchment areas.

- MNRE are utilising ‘Skyeye’ through water resource division, to develop 3D modelling of community lands, to gather information that feeds into the planning and improvement of management of protected areas.
- Education with communities on the effects of their actions, developments and climate change are being carried out to help communities understand the linkage of unsustainable development and water availabilities.

4. Experiences with managing protected areas in the Solomon Islands

KEY POINTS FROM PRESENTATION by Agnetha Vave Karamui Solomon Islands, Chief Conservation Officer, Protected Areas, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management & Meteorology MECDM

- In the Solomon Islands the national government through the MECDM has the mandate over protected areas with the NBSAP setting the targets of 10% terrestrial and 15% marine by 2020 and supported by a two-year work program centred around management of natural resources
- The government is responsible for most PA planning and policy work at the national level and provides facilitative support to on ground management and planning. Much of the field work support is undertaken by partners such as NGOs (e.g.; Solomon Islands Community Conservation Partnership) and CBOs that have operated in Solomon Islands for a long time. There are also numerous projects via donor investments and work by research institutions.
- The Nature Conservancy is a key national NGO and engages communities on protected area management and uses many tools to connect communities to decision making and helps provinces to protect key biodiversity areas.
- More recently, the GIZ MaCBIO project, implemented by IUCN, has assisted the Solomon Islands to make significant progress in marine spatial planning and associated policy positions for marine protected areas.
- In 2012 with the help of researchers, a rapid assessment of key biodiversity areas identified 36 KBAs from which 9 of these are now prioritised. In 2014/2015, there was a review of assessment of protected areas with at least 400 sites of locally managed areas subsequently identified. Ninety-five verified PAs have been submitted to PIPAP and WDPA which constitutes 3% terrestrial and 1% marine. In 2018, five submissions have been made to be covered by the Protected Areas framework which constitutes 8800 hectares and would bring the terrestrial PA extent to 5%.
- The Protected Areas Act 2010 provides objectives and guidance on what protected areas are. The Act covers significant genetic, cultural, geological, and biological resources; unique and important habitats for plants and animals; special measures that need to be taken; and the classes of PAs (Nature reserve, National park, Natural monument, resource management area, closed area). National government just provides facilitative support to management and planning.
- The Act notes the threats from logging and it is compulsory under the law that there is no mining or logging within 100meter buffer zones. The guidance provided also outlines what is required to apply for a PA which must be formally documented including consultations and minutes of meetings.

- The Protected Areas Act has been principally trialled with the Arnavon Islands community. It took three years from submission to designation to declare it as a protected reserve under the Act. Since designation, greater turtle nesting success has been reported and a network to enhance representation of women in management has been established. There are 11 rangers on the ground with the formal rangers paid by the reserve management through an endowment fund. A recent poaching incident resulted in 4 offenders taken to the magistrate court to pay \$2000.
- Key challenges include the logging of sites across Solomon Islands. There are gaps in the legislation between environment and forestry. Once an application is submitted there is no temporary order to stop mining or logging to cater for the time of consultation, which can be long and extensive to verify ownership. The lag in time threatens losing potential forest reserves to logging in the meantime. Many sites submitted for consideration to be designated as PAs are undergoing logging, which means the sites may be degraded or lost before protection occurs. Communities are essential in combating threats. Mining is proposed in two key biodiversity areas and a world heritage site has logging and mining on its fringes (East Rennell Island).
- There is a great need to enhance and hasten the PA declaration process for application, verification and gazettal, as well as strengthen PA management, including building capacity for management.
- In terms of integrated forestry management, the Sky Islands initiative is to enforce laws against logging above 400m elevation (which comprises 21 percent of the national terrestrial area and contains high biodiversity areas). Support for community level management of protected areas is still a major priority in the Solomon Islands.
- Most of the work done with PAs and conservation is at the community level. The purpose of management plans is for communities to explain to government what they require are and also their management aspirations. This includes the mapping of boundaries and putting lines on maps showing where traditional areas lie. The maps must also be verified by chiefs and all of their descendants to seek consent. This process is often difficult, and the approving government agency does not necessarily have expertise in the specific traditional knowledge and customary arrangements for a particular area.
- The moving of informal to formal recognition is at a critical point in time in PA designation. There needs to be sufficient investment, focus and attention to secure key biological diversity sites protected areas for people now and in the future.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- The input of traditional knowledge in the PA designation and management planning process mostly involves the identification of boundaries and location of special traditionally recognised areas or sites as well as obtaining consents from descendants, which can often be a lengthy and contentious process. Determining whose owns the land can also trigger much debate. However, this information is essential for submission of the PA for designation under the Act.
- Consents are also for the sharing of locational information as a point or polygon, and consent that this data is the available publicly. A point on a map gives at least some identifying information and can be a more comfortable option for those whose land it is.
- Formalising community needs and aspirations into a structured, written management plan is a challenge and the evolving trial and error process is aiming to make it simpler.
- Rangers are not paid by the governments budget but rely on endowment funds. The PA Act can establish a Trust Fund to assist PA management, but which is still to be established.
- Many exchanges have occurred between Solomon Islands rangers and those from PNG and Australia and all participate in an international ranger's association. Eg; Great Barrier Reef

rangers will travel to pacific countries to assist regardless of whether or not there is any exchange.

- Rangers have undertaken some legal trainings on how to report incidents, technical monitoring, etc however this is a capacity area that requires strengthening.
- Logging is a significant threat and challenge to biodiversity and national PA objectives. The consent process time for a logging request is very short – particularly enhanced due to the need for minimal input from community or landowners. Those responsible for administering the Environment Act are supposed to review the license in the first instance rather than the Forestry Ministry. Development consent for logging does not require an environment impact assessment. The concept of a temporary closure while consent matters are being considered, including biodiversity issues would be a huge advantage to the process and reduce the issue of potential future PAs being degraded. There are mis-matches between Environment (1998) and Forestry (1969) legislation. Logging also occurs illegally.

5. Protected areas management experiences in Kiribati

KEY POINTS FROM PRESENTATION by Ratita Bebe, Environment Officer, Ministry of Environment, Lands & Agriculture Development, ECD, Kiribati

- Kiribati has a network of protected areas which have been progressively established by government initiative across the southern Line Islands, the Phoenix Islands Protected Area PIPA and Nooto Ramsar site. Parts of the Kiribati EEZ were declared as shark sanctuary in 2016. There are protection activities on mangroves and species protected areas in marine sites with a focus on a few target species due to their declining populations. There are also some community-initiated project sites.
- Government collaborates with partners and NGOs in national, regional and international levels. The enabling of protected areas is driven by government through decisions made by cabinet. Government ministries and partners work together to develop the process of establishing protected areas management. Communities then take on implementation roles.
- As reported on the WDPA, Kiribati has achieved the quantitative goals for marine and terrestrial areas for CBD Aichi Target 11.
- Prominent funding sources include GEF, NZAID, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and the PIPA Trust fund.
- Heavy fishing activity has gradually decreased through the establishment and control of the level of fishing activities which were detected by global fishing watch in 2012. Between 2014 and 2015 the effect of the fishing ban in the PIPA meant that fishing was virtually non-existent within 10 months of installing the ban.
- Threats include population growth which places more pressure on resources for subsistence, with unsustainable harvesting, poaching and illegal entry. Budget and resource constraints (enough staff and patrolling equipment) are a problem for monitoring, surveillance and enforcement. Invasive species such as little fire ants, common myna bird, rats and feral cats have established.
- Tourism and biodiversity values can be a fraught alliance. Waste and pollution threatens the protected area and tourism values of Christmas Island which is a wildlife sanctuary. Tourism is an opportunity but also presents challenges when tourists are unaware of the principles and desirable activities associated with a protected area.
- Lessons learned include:
 - Let the public know that they are ultimate owners of the PAs.

- Align work plan and activities to NBSAPs, regional and international SAPs, etc.
- Understanding the importance of the continuous strengthening of synergies and coordinated efforts between stakeholders and partners in protected areas. Without effective partnerships, enforcement and compliance would not be possible as monitoring and surveillance of such a large marine area is difficult. For example, it is essential to work closely with police to charge offenders of protected areas as it can take a long time if these cases are not prioritised.
- Installing signage that clearly identify PA boundaries as this is important in charging poaching and illegal entry and enforcing rules of protected areas.
- It is important to raise awareness about the threats and challenges in the protected area. A bottom-up approach is preferred to educate children who are the future of Kiribati.
- To maintain positive relationships, regular updates are shared with donors and implementing partners. This ensures a collegial rapport and connection which contributes positively to maintaining funding stream.
- Capacity gaps and needs include:
 - Limited resources to support implementation, management and enforcement - financial, human, tools/equipment.
 - Skills and knowledge required to monitor and manage PAs and natural resources including bird knowledge.
 - There are high also costs associated with remote location and isolation of protected areas and difficulties of accessing and then engaging remote communities.
 - Inadequate legislation to address all the current and emerging issues.
- Future planning includes:
 - Expansion of protected areas to protect against increasing human activities around Christmas Island.
 - Proposed centre to accommodate the PIPA implementing office and PIPA conservation trust office and to serve the promotion of PIPA in Tarawa.
 - Project development to address some of the threats such as invasive species.
 - Development of a specific plan of management for ecotourism activity in the PIPA.
 - Under future planning it is proposed the expansion of protected areas to protect against increasing human activities around Christmas Island.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- Many take-home lessons have been shared during the workshop week. For example, the way that the Solomon Islands rangers deal with poaching has given other countries PA officers food for thought.
- The general issues between boundaries shown by national mapping and the boundaries provided by the WDPA being different was picked up (ie; the PIPA PA management boundary and the PIPA enforcement line boundary). It was thought that this was caused by two sources creating the same data but appearing differently and that essentially the boundaries should be reflected the same area.
- In some cases, in Kiribati, PAs are purely state-owned responsibilities. Where community is involved directly in PA management, community consultations or surveys (i.e.; identifying and monitoring fishing hotspots) then engagement between government and community is strongly practiced as a fundamental approach in PA management.
- Signage based on community naming, and traditional context strengthens national and local pride and ownership in PAs. Signage to also clearly notify about protection status, management rules and level of community ownership and responsibility.

- Unlike many Pacific countries, significant components of the national territory are state controlled (Christmas Islands, Phoenix Islands). However, places like the Gilbert Islands are for communities.
- Negotiation with communities (as across the region) about management plans that could potentially affect livelihood can cause friction and thorough community consultation is required to achieve desirable outcomes.
- GIS officers from all countries represented agreed to convene in their own forums on PA related work.

6. Protected areas management in the Torrecelli ranges of Papua New Guinea

KEY POINTS FROM PRESENTATION by Jim Thomas, Chief Executive Officer, Tenkile Conservation Alliance TCA, Papua New Guinea

- The tree kangaroo conservation project of the Torricelli Ranges demonstrated the value of conservation efforts and PA network establishment that work with and alongside rural communities, which includes 50 villages of 13,000 people covering 880,000 hectares of pristine rain forest.
- The paramount importance of using a bottom up approach and the value of involving and building up the capacity of the community was emphasised.
- While the tree kangaroo work has a conservation focus, most of the work is community development. There are different components of the initiative which includes protecting the Tenkile (a tree kangaroo) which is the most endangered species, research and the growing of crops, as well as other community initiatives such as facilitating water tanks and solar panels. The ancillary, tangible benefits associated with conservation such as access to better power, communications (internet), water (water tanks) and food (alternative protein to bush meat such as managed rabbit and fish) supply, and improved overall health, is integral to overall success in a remote area with limited services, including government assistance.
- Connecting the spiritual elements of the species to the natural environment and with the community has been important for conservation efforts in protecting the Tenkile habitat.
- A critical challenge is sustainable financing to continue the holistic approach to community conservation efforts, which ensures people are actively involved, and have access to resources for their families where they live.
- Initial research activity and results compiled lead to a moratorium on hunting tree kangaroos and many villages working together in this same conservation goal including breeding programs.
- Behavioural change comes with connecting to the spiritual elements of the environment and the community.
- There are challenges in having to work across five local government jurisdictions.
- Continuing threats include logging, extractive industry, sago palm harvesting, rice growing, cash crop cultivation such as cocoa
- The ultimate objective of formally gazetted the Torrecelli Ranges PA is close at hand. The TCA has a research station, satellite internet a meeting area that can house up to 200 people, tree kangaroo enclosures and camera trapping resources. Sustainable funding requires a determined effort.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

- A documentary movie 'Into the Jungle' was shown and received rousing applause from the workshop audience as it represented such a good example of the remote operating context,

challenges and spirit that define community partnership approaches that are so prevalent across the Pacific region. The film has been an opportunity to promote the project and help build awareness about community conservation efforts.

Annex B. List of participants

| Name | Country | Designation | Organisation |
|-----------------------|------------------|---|--|
| Agnetha Vave Karamui | Solomon Islands | Chief Conservation Officer, Protected Areas | Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management & Meteorology |
| Ainsof Soo | Samoa | Systems Developer and Analyst | SPREP |
| Ajay Arudere | Vanuatu | Senior Fisheries Management & Policy Officer | Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Forestry, Fisheries & Biosecurity - Fisheries Department |
| Akiko Hamada-Ano | Samoa | Coastal and Marine Management Specialist | SPREP |
| Aleixo Leonito Amaral | Timor-Leste | Lecturer - Department of Fisheries and Marine Science, Faculty of Agriculture | Universidade Nacional Timor Lorosa'e (UNTL) |
| Alfred Ralifo | Fiji | Coordinator - Policy & Great Sea Reef Programme | WWF Pacific |
| Alifereti Tawake | Fiji | Council Chair/Technical Advisor | LMMA Network International/Fiji FLMMA Network |
| Amanda Wheatley | Samoa | Ecosystem and Biodiversity Officer | SPREP |
| Ana Tiraa | Samoa | Oceania Representative - IUCN Council | c/- FAO Sub-Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific |
| Anama Solofa | Samoa | Volunteer | SPREP |
| Andrew Cottam | Italy | Biodiversity and Information Specialist | European Commission-Joint Research Center |
| Andrew Foran | Fiji | Regional Programme Coordinator | IUCN Oceania Regional Office |
| Andrew Hedin | Samoa | Legal Intern | SPREP |
| Arpana Pratap | Fiji | Team Leader - Capacity Building | Pacific Islands Development Forum |
| Audrey Brown Pereira | Samoa | Lead rapporteur | SPREP |
| Auiluma Lotoala | Tuvalu | Traditional Knowledge & Cultural Biodiversity Officer | Tuvalu Association of Non-Governmental Organisation |
| Beatrix Oni | Papua New Guinea | Senior Officer - Conservation | Bougainville Bureau for the Environment |
| Ben Namakin | Kiribati | Executive Director | Kiribati Islands Conservation Society |
| Benedict Yamamura | Marshall Islands | Coastal Fisheries Information Officer | Ministry of Natural Resources & Commerce, RMI Marine Resources Authority |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| Bradley O. Kumangai | Palau | Chief Enforcement Specialist | Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment & Tourism - Protected Areas Network Office |
| Bridget Kennedy | Fiji | Pacific Regional Development Manager | Conservation International Fiji |
| Carlos Kusto | FSM | Marine Protected Area Network Coordinator | Conservation Society of Pohnpei |
| Cathlehra Denitage | Nauru | Environmental Policy Officer | Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment |
| Christine Tuioti | Samoa | Technical Officer | Samoa Conservation Society |
| Czarina Iese Stowers | Samoa | Principal Terrestrial Conservation Officer | Division of Environment and Conservation, MNRE |
| Dave Mathias | FSM | Marine Conservation Management Specialist | Department of Resources & Development |
| David Moverley | Samoa | Invasive Species Adviser | SPREP |
| Easter Galuvao | Samoa | Director for Environmental Monitoring and Governance (EMG) | SPREP |
| Edmund Jackson | Brussels | Programme Officer, Environment & Climate Change Department | ACP Secretariat |
| Elizabeth Munro | Cook Islands | Senior Biodiversity Officer | National Environment Service |
| Emma Arasi | Samoa | Records and Archives Assistant | SPREP |
| Eveli Nakautoga | Fiji | Communications Officer | IUCN Oceania Regional Office |
| Etika Qica | Fiji | Regional Project Officer | IUCN Oceania Regional Office |
| Faamatuainu Einstein Simanu | Samoa | Senior Forestry Research Officer | Forestry Division, MNRE |
| Faasulu Fepuleai | Samoa | Fisheries Officer | Fisheries Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries |
| Filifilia Iosefa | Samoa | Sub-regional coordinator | UNDP Samoa Multi-Country Office |
| Fiona Leverington | Australia | Director | Protected Area Solutions Ltd. |
| Fipe Tuitubou | Fiji | Programme Support Officer | IUCN Oceania Regional Office |
| Haseldon Buraman | Nauru | Executive Director | Econauru |
| Heather Bingham | United Kingdom | Programme Officer, Protected Areas Programme | UN Environment World Conservation Monitoring Center (UNEP-WCMC) |
| Huggard Tongatule | Niue | Biodiversity and Conservation Officer | Ministry of Natural Resources, Department of Environment |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| Isabell Rasch | Samoa | Rapporteur | SPREP |
| Iva Josivini | Fiji | Environment Officer | Ministry of Environment |
| James Thomas | Papua New Guinea | Chief Executive Officer | Tenkile Conservation Alliance |
| Jennifer McGowan | Australia | Spatial Planning Technical Coordinator | The Nature Conservancy/University of Queensland |
| Josefa Moceiwasa Ravuso | Fiji | Executive Officer | National Trust of Fiji |
| Joyce K. Beouch | Palau | Conservation Planner | Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment & Tourism - Protected Areas Network Office |
| Juney Ward | Samoa | Sharks & Rays Conservation Officer | SPREP |
| Karen Stone | Tonga | Director | Vava'u Environmental Protection Association |
| Kate Davey | Fiji | Project Officer | IUCN Oceania Regional Office |
| Kathleen Taituave | Samoa | Principal Legal Officer | Legal Division, MNRE |
| Kevin Iro | Cook Islands | Ambassador - Marae Moana | Marae Moana |
| Kiji Vukikomoala | Fiji | Co-ordinator | Environmental Law Association |
| Kosi Latu | Samoa | Director General | SPREP |
| Liam Kokaua | Cook Islands | Project Officer | Te Ipukarea Society |
| Lina Dorovolomo | Solomon Islands | Project Coordinator - Choiseul | Ecological Solutions Solomon Islands |
| Lolita Gibbons-Decherong | Palau | Program Manager - Conservation and Protected Areas Program | Palau Conservation Society |
| Mafa Wilson | Fiji | Program Manager | Change Pacific |
| Makerita Atiga | Samoa | IOE Programme Assistant | SPREP |
| Maria Sapatu | Samoa | Programme Associate - Marine | Conservation International |
| Marika Tuiwawa | Fiji | Curator | USP Institute of Applied Science |
| Mark O'Brien | Fiji | Pacific Regional Co-ordinator | BirdLife International Pacific Partnership Secretariat |
| Martin Romain | Marshall Islands | Executive Director | Marshall Islands Conservation Society |
| Mason Smith | Fiji | Regional Director | IUCN Oceania Regional Office |

| | | | |
|------------------------|-----------|--|---|
| Michael Dyer | Samoa | GIS Specialist | Green Climate Fund - UNDP |
| Miraneta Williams | Samoa | Knowledge Manager | SPREP |
| Moeumu Uili | Samoa | Principal Parks & Reserves Officer | Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment |
| Mohammed Azad | Fiji | Acting Senior Environment Officer, North | Ministry of Environment |
| Nanette Woonton | Samoa | Media & Public Relations Officer | SPREP |
| Nate Peterson | Australia | GIS and Conservation Information Manager, Pacific Division | The Nature Conservancy |
| Nunia Thomas | Fiji | Director | Nature Fiji-Mareqeti Viti |
| Paul Anderson | Samoa | Inform Project Manager | SPREP |
| Penny Figgis | Australia | Vice Chair, Ocean | IUCN Regional Vice Chair WCPA |
| Phoebe Rollin | Samoa | Rapporteur | SPREP |
| Ratita Bebe | Kiribati | Environment Officer | Ministry of Environment, Lands & Agriculture Development, ECD |
| Remik Scotty | Nauru | Project Officer | Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment |
| Rolenas Tavue Baereleo | Vanuatu | Senior Conservation Officer | Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation |
| Ron Vave | Fiji | PHD Student, University of Hawaii | CEESP Oceania |
| Roxana Bucioaca | Belgium | Manager Communications & External Relations | BIOPAMA II |
| Samantha Kwan | Samoa | Senior Marine Officer (DEC) | Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment |
| Sarah Tawaka | Fiji | Executive Officer/Member Focal Point | IUCN Oceania Regional Office |
| Sarat Gidda | Canada | Head of the Conservation & Sustainable Use Unit | Secretariat, Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) |
| Semisi Tawake | Fiji | Regional Head of Finance and Administration | IUCN Oceania Regional Office |
| Serena Heckler | Samoa | Programme Specialist Natural Sciences | UNESCO Office, Apia |
| Siniva Tuuau-Enosa | Samoa | SPREP Finance | SPREP |
| Siosua Latu | Tonga | Principal Environment Officer, Nukualofa | Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change & Communications |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| Stacy Jupiter | Fiji | Director, Melanesia Regional Program | Wildlife Conservation Society |
| Stamatios Christopoulos | Samoa | GEF Task Manager/ Programme Management Officer | UN Environment |
| Stephen Peedell | Italy | Senior Scientific Officer | European Commission-Joint Research Center |
| Stuart Chape | Samoa | Acting Deputy Director General – Strategic Policy & Technical Programmes/Director - Island and Ocean Ecosystems | SPREP |
| Susana Waqainabete | Fiji | Director | Conservation International Fiji |
| Tahirih Hokafonu | Tonga | Principal Assistant Secretary/ Principal Biodiversity Officer & Head of Biodiversity Division | Ministry of Environment & Information, Department of Environment, Biodiversity Division |
| Taouea T. Reiher | Kiribati | Deputy Director | Ministry of Environment, Lands & Agriculture Development, ECD |
| Tony O'Keeffe | Australia | BIOPAMA II Consultant | IUCN Oceania Regional Office |
| Trevor Maeda | Solomon Islands | Principal Conservation officer | Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management & Meteorology |
| Ulu Bismarck Crawley | Samoa | Chief Executive Officer | Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment |
| Vainuupo Jungblut | Samoa | Protected Areas Officer | SPREP |
| Vanessa Fread | FSM | Technical Coordinator, FSM Ridge to Reef Project | Department of Resources & Development |
| Warren Lee Long | Samoa | Coastal and Marine Adviser | SPREP |
| Warwick Harris | Marshall Islands | Deputy Director | Office Environmental Planning & Policy Coordination |
| Yvette Kerslake | Samoa | Assistant Resident Representative - Environment, Energy & Climate Change | UNDP |

Annex C. Workshop Programme (concise version)

Regional Workshop on Improving Information and Capacity for More Effective Protected Area Management and Governance in the Pacific

11-15 June 2018, Tanoa Tusitala Hotel, Apia, Samoa

| Sunday 10 th June 2018, Tanoa Hotel | |
|--|---|
| Time | Session |
| 2:00pm – 4:00pm | Registration opportunity for workshop participants |
| DAY ONE Monday 11 th June, 2018, Tanoa Hotel | |
| Time | Session |
| 8:00am – 8:30am | Registration |
| 8:30am – 9:15am | <p>Official Opening Blessing for successful workshop – Susuga Rev. Taumafai Komiti, Methodist Church, Apia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Address by Stuart Chape, Acting Director General, SPREP ▪ Address by Mason Smith, Regional Director, IUCN Oceania Regional Office ▪ Address by Stephen Peedell, European Commission – Joint Research Centre ▪ Address by Edmund Jackson, Programme Officer Environment and Climate Change, ACP Secretariat ▪ Opening welcome address by Afiogi Taefu Lemi Taefu, Hon. Associate Minister, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, Government of Samoa |
| 9:15am – 9:30am | Introduction to the workshop participant profile and workshop housekeeping |
| 9:30am – 10:00am | Session 1 Introduction to the Biodiversity and Protected Area Management Programme 2017 – 2023 |
| 10:00am – 10:15am | Group photo |
| 10:15am – 10:45am | MORNING TEA |
| 10:45am – 11:10am | Session 2: Workshop objectives, programme outline, expectations |
| 11:10am – 11:30am | Session 3: Protected Areas in the Pacific – setting the scene |
| 11:30am – 12:30pm | Session 4: A conversation with the BIOPAMA regional implementing partners |
| 12:30pm – 1:30pm | LUNCH |

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| 1:30pm – 2:00pm | Session 5: Country case study Large marine protected areas – the Cook Islands’ experience |
| 2:00pm – 3:30pm | Session 6: Panel Discussion – protected area types, circumstances and needs in the Pacific. |
| 3.30pm – 3:50pm | AFTERNOON TEA |
| 3:50pm – 4:50pm | Session 7: International support initiatives for protected areas – CBD, WCPA, UNEP WCMC |
| 4:50pm – 5:00pm | Conclusion to Day One |
| 5:15pm – 6:15pm | Side Events |
| 6:30pm | Evening Cocktail Event |

| DAY TWO Tuesday 12 th June, 2018, Tanoa Hotel | |
|--|--|
| Time | Session |
| 8:30 am – 8:45am | Plenary: Recap of Day One and overview of sessions for Day Two |
| 8:45am – 9:15am | Session 1: Country case study Palau’s Protected Area Network. |
| 9:15am – 10:30am | Session 2: Interactive session – needs, priorities and aspirations for enhancing protected area governance and management. |
| 10:30am – 11:00am | MORNING TEA |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | Report back from session 2 |
| 11:15am – 12:30pm | Session 3: Pacific Islands Protected Area Portal – overview, demonstrations and case study. |
| 12.30pm – 1.30pm | LUNCH |
| 1:30am – 2.30pm | Session 3: continued Pacific Islands Protected Area Portal – demonstrations and practical applications |
| 2:30am – 3.30pm | Session 4: BIOPAMA Action Component |
| 3.30pm – 3:50pm | AFTERNOON TEA |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| 3:50pm – 4:30pm | Session 4: continued BIOPAMA Action Component |
| 4:30pm – 4:50pm | Plenary Summary of Day Two - Sessions 3 and 4 |
| 4:50pm – 5:00pm | Instructions concerning the field trip on Wednesday |
| 5:15pm – 6:15pm | Side Events |

| DAY THREE Wednesday 13th June, 2018, Tanoa Hotel and Upolu Island | |
|---|--|
| Time | Session |
| 8.30am – 9:00am | Session 1: Country case study <i>Samoa's experiences with protected area management</i> |
| 9.00am – 5.00pm | FIELD TRIP Hosted by Samoa Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MNRE) and SPREP |

| DAY FOUR Thursday 14th June, 2018, Tanoa Hotel | |
|--|---|
| Time | Session |
| 9:00am – 9:45am | Session 1: Field trip observations – interactive session |
| 9:45am – 10:15am | Session 2: Country Case Study – the Solomon Islands' experience with managing protected areas |
| 10:15am – 10:30am | Session 3: Recap of Day Two and introduction to sessions for Day Four |
| 10.30am – 11:00am | MORNING TEA |
| 11:00am – 12:30pm | Session 4: Information systems for protected and conserved areas |
| 12:30pm – 1:30pm | LUNCH |
| 1:30pm – 3:00pm | Session 5: The World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA): Supporting Pacific countries in reporting on protected and conserved areas |
| 3.00pm – 3:20pm | AFTERNOON TEA |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| 3:20pm – 5:00pm | Session 6: Tools for assessing Protected Area Management Effectiveness and Governance, including country case study from Papua New Guinea |
| 5:15 – 6:30 | Pacific Islands Roundtable for Nature Conservation MaC BIO reports launch International Year of Coral reefs |

| DAY FIVE Friday 15 th June, 2018, Tanoa Hotel | |
|--|---|
| Time | Session |
| 9:00am – 9.15am | Plenary: Recap of Day Four and introduction to sessions for Day Five |
| 9:15am – 10.15am | Session 1: Country Case Study – the Kiribati experience with managing protected areas |
| 9:15am – 10.30am | Session 2: Protected areas information data bases - final observations, questions, discussions and actions confirmed |
| 10:30am – 11:00am | MORNING TEA |
| 11:00am – 12:15pm | Session 3: BIOPAMA Action Component - final observations, questions and discussions |
| 12:15pm – 12:30pm | Session 4: Summary of Day Five - Sessions 2 and 3 |
| 12:30pm – 1:30pm | LUNCH |
| 1:30pm – 2:30pm | Plenary: Workshop conclusion – next steps and timelines, final remarks, other issues Votes of thanks Workshop closure |
| 2:30pm onwards | Informal end-of-workshop Talanoa invitation to all participants to be provided at Tanoa Tusitala Hotel |