



---

GEF IW R2R/ RSC.5 / WP.15

Date: October 19, 2020

Original: English

**Fifth Regional Steering Committee Meeting (Virtual) for the  
GEF Pacific International Waters Ridge to Reef Project entitled:**

*Ridge to Reef – Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest &  
Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon,  
Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries*

Suva, Fiji, October 22<sup>nd</sup> – 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020

**What's next COVID-19 and Post-R2R? – Panel Recommendations**

The Committee is invited to consider outcomes and recommendations set out in this paper in making your decision related to this meeting theme.

## **Session 6 – Looking ahead COVID-19 and post R2R**

### **Outcomes & Recommendations**

Having considered and deliberated on the papers, participants resolved and agreed on the following decisions: -

1. Participants considered and reflected on key points in the paper relative to progressing project implementation within the current Programme scope and the supporting role of the RSTC in the remaining life of the project ending in September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021.
2. Participants discussed a broader vision and strategic directions and agreed for a follow up streamlined next phase post R2R. Participants recommended that the Committee endorse a next phase of future upscaling R2R investments and ICM planning relative to post-R2R and COVID-19.
3. Participants recommend that the next R2R project focuses only on priority focal areas supporting research & development, capacity building, and replicating innovative technologies and development measures that upscaled and replicated thereby securing ecosystems goods and services following the R2R-climate resilient approach and inclusive green economic pathway.
4. Participants considered and endorsed a further no cost extension of up to 12-months from September 30<sup>th</sup> 2021 subject to UNDP policies to deliver on the project outcomes, and use the opportunity to explore further concept note for phasing in strategy to be considered at the next meetings of the RSTC & RSC in 2021.

## ANNEX 1:

### RECORD OF DISCUSSION – SESSION 6 ON 16<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2020

#### Opening & Prayer

1. The virtual Pre-RSC Panel/Breakout Session 6 was hosted at the EQAP conference (SPC building, Suva) on the 16<sup>th</sup> of October 2020. Twenty-one (21) participants representing the national STAR and IW R2R projects, partners and observers attended the session. The list of participants is appended as **Annex 1**.
2. R2R-RPCU staffs, Mr. George Naboutuiloma offered an opening prayer for the virtual information session and Mr Samasoni Sauni facilitated Session 6:

#### Overview Session 6 – Looking ahead COVID-19 and post R2R

3. The Secretariat introduced the session outlining purpose and expected outcomes particularly in relation to future directions in the current COVID-19 climate and post R2R. The following guiding questions:

Discuss and ask questions for clarifications on **timelines, specific tasks and associated outputs?**

Discuss and **provide inputs into the concept paper**, whether there is interest to support designing a more streamlined R2R project in upscaling future R2R investments and ICM planning? **Endorse** a preferred option.

**Discuss and endorse** a further no-cost extension of up to 12 months from September 30<sup>th</sup> 2021.

#### **Presentation 1: RSTC Chair's Report 2020 – highlights, challenges and opportunities - WP: GEF IW R2R/RSC.5/WP.02**

4. Prof Marcus Sheaves stated that in WP.02 there are issues to deal with when moving forward. He goes over the highlights and stated issues with COVID-19, and that there was a need for innovative technologies. Prof Sheaves further stated that this is not a trivial technical issue because everybody was having to adapt to remote ways of getting things done through development of high level of skills in using such technology within the Pacific Islands. Prof Sheaves also emphasized reviewing sampling designs and from there how to achieve best practices and upscaling of investments. This would be very important for two reasons:
  - a. Doing things in cost effective ways and to understand the central issue to standardise and replicate this in different regions, considering and understanding the contextual differences so that the data collected across regions are indeed comparable.
  - b. To start the conversation of funding support for future R2R investments i.e. outcomes that are real such as scientific peer reviewed publications as this is what underlines the quality of the activities.
5. Prof Sheaves encouraged balancing between pure science, social science, traditional knowledge, community to cabinet dynamics when looking at the R2R system and to understand the people's needs. He also encouraged the acceleration of mainstreaming R2R to understand that needs of the Pacific region considering the natural dispersion of its constituent islands.

6. Prof Sheaves noted the challenges of science and research in the region. These issues could be addressed by having in-country panel of experts who can do the first level of peer reviewed research and can contribute knowledge and high quality of data for twinning future R2R investments.

7. Prof Sheaves gave the recent example in the Caribbean where, to protect their “ridge-to-reef” environment, non-local people built up the local capacity with the purpose that the major production of outputs would be from local capacity in the future. Prof Sheaves further stated that there is a need for monitoring and evaluation of research and science to identify indicators for streamlining to easily, transferrable replication. He also noted that there would be limitations when extrapolating one watershed to the rest of the watershed scenarios in the entire island.

8. Prof Sheaves further mentioned that to inform the next phase, R2R needs emphasis on lessons learned to understand the successes and learn from those especially the multi-cultural and widely distributed nature of the region. Prof Sheaves noted that it was important to see support for the program, post R2R. He noted that this may be fundable by some organizations and that it was not expected that there would be big outcomes in one round and a timescale of 10 – 15 years would be expected to get things working.

9. Prof Sheaves noted that in a post COVID-19 world, that the reduction of travel costs and remote communication are lessons to learn from about ways of tackling these types of restrictions.

## **Discussion**

10. Mr Samasoni Sauni acknowledged the highlights, opportunities and suggested way forward would lead nicely into the next paper. He also encouraged the use of the chat box or to raise one’s hand (virtual).

11. Dr. Joe Padilla reminded Participants of the previous IWRM project from 2009, stating that most of the downsides covered in R2R were also covered in IWRM. It has been more than 10 years passed while running projects in the same area. While he agreed with Prof Sheaves, Dr Padilla stated that some stress reduction target impacts could only be realized in a much longer period and stated that it would have been useful to monitor progress that was covered in IWRM. He further added that 11 years is a reasonable time to see some progress in the stress reduction targets and made mention of the weak baselining activity in IWRM and that it would be difficult in measuring any impacts at this time and also due to some weak implementation as well.

12. Prof Sheaves reiterated that in recognition of the fast-changing world on the ground, instituting one assessment in place, say 5-10 years’ time, may not be practical. He also stated that it is a very complex issue and to focus on carrying out activities in a standardized way as much as possible.

13. Mr Sauni acknowledged the interaction between Prof Sheaves and Dr Padilla, which is useful to guide strategic thinking in future directions of R2R in this region.

14. Ms Rhonda acknowledged the country representatives in the virtual meeting. She addressed the points from the previous speakers with regards to R2R not picking up all the sites from IWRM

but a lot of important lessons to learn. Ms Rhonda further noted the Pacific Community for Ocean Science (PCCOS) which was established to have less duplication of scientific activities in the region through partnerships with other national and international bodies.

15. Ms Maria from Cook Islands STAR R2R project believed that the project was doomed failure from the start because of its poor design. The programmatic approach was never really observed and implemented and there is disconnection between STAR and IW R2R projects. She supports technological and scientific advances to inform policy in ecosystem goods and services from ridge to reef and beyond to EEZ and high seas.

16. Mr Jose Antonio supported the intervention of Dr Padilla in terms of monitoring the previous IWRM sites and mentioned that monitoring requires financial resources. If this was included in the current project design and that resources are available, he would be keen to perform monitoring to determine the impacts of the IWRM project (ex-post) after 11 years of implementing the projects. The fact of the matter is that most demonstration sites of the Regional IW R2R project are not the same as that of IWRM.

17. Dr Padilla stated that in the IWRM R2R project, the monitoring is part and parcel of the project. He also wondered whether there were baselines from IWRM and the status of this information in 2020 which would show whether interventions have an impact where baselines exist.

18. Mr Antonio made known the MTR recommendation number 2 indicating the need to review the impact of previous IWRM investments with the objective of deriving further lessons learned.

### **Presentation 2: What's next post R2r and COVID-19 - WP: GEF IW R2R/RSC.5/WP.15**

19. The Secretariat introduced RSC.5/WP.15 and referred participants to the key recommendations. The paper is particularly seeking consideration for the next phase post R2R and COVID-19, and a proposal for no cost extension.

### **Discussion**

20. Dr Mangisi-Mafileo encouraged inputs from the national projects at this stage. She opened the floor to Prof Sheaves.

21. Prof Sheaves believed that the issues are to do with capacity and the different levels of engagement from the people involved. Prof Sheaves emphasized that it was very clear in general that the more willing people in the countries had more outcomes. It was important to encourage people to engage with the issues for the future of the countries and, though it may not be easy, it was important to be honest about this situation.

22. Ms Maria asked whether if there had been a second no cost extension of this sort. She also supported Prof Sheaves' points on technological science and fully support the notion put forward by Prof Sheaves in using more technology (relating to virtual communication). Ms Maria also welcomed the points regarding mainstreaming R2R and using experts in-country. On Dr Padilla's point regarding IWRM and R2R, Ms Maria believed that the R2R originally a set up to fail. The Cook Islands would most likely be supportive of a no cost extension but would like to work on the disconnect

between R2R STAR and IW and find ways to “shrink the net”. It is important to work with other regional programs and made mention of SPREP and IUCN and stated that the best way forward was to strengthen communications. Ms Maria also mentioned due to the political changes in the Cook Islands (new Prime Minister), that the transition progress and the priorities surrounding R2R were slowly picking up now.

23. Dr Joe Padilla of UNDP Bangkok thanked for the presentation and provided several observations as set out below: -

- a. IWRM was quite successful and achieved lots more if compare to current R2R which is ambitious and realistically difficult and challenging to implement and achieve targets. He had to temper the aspirations of those that were leading the design of R2R at the time and these aspirations were carried by the successes of IWRM.
- b. Key to the implementation issues and problems we understand now is the COVID-19 and high turnover of staffs amongst other possible challenges.
- c. Lessons learned and aspirations to ascertain what worked and not are important in assessing the overall impacts. Recall the intention of the R2R project is to test methodologies and the aspiration is drawing from lessons learned from R2R where what works and what does not work will be identified and what works in the Pacific in terms of upscaling and addressing of environmental issues.
- d. There is inclination to finish quickly the project and tap GEF-7 cycle not good idea because of progress of implementation and state of achieving project objects and outcomes
- e. GEF-7 running out and UNDP currently supporting two projects for the cycle – FFA tuna project and new follow up Island to Island (I2I) project. The latter is currently being processed in collaboration between UNDP, UNE and ADB
- f. The GEF funding earmarked for 2021 under international waters is over US\$20million and I2I proposal is targeting US\$10-15million. The PIF on this project will be soon completed and send to GEF Secretariat for processing.
- g. To qualify for a GEF funding under a next phase project, the current R2R project must complete all the requirements first which includes terminal evaluation completed to support a next phase project. With the current proposal for a no-cost extension the actual dates may move from current commencement date of February to possibly later in the year.
- h. Consequently, a next phase project or program could target GEF-8 cycle if the RSC approves and supports a next phase. Concerning the constraints raised, it was his recommendation to focus on implementing the current project and making use of current available funds.
- i. UNDP policies provides for only a one-off extension for a max 18-months (only 15mths granted), and that has been done already last December.
- j. With COVID-19 the UNDP policies can allow 6-months extension but agree to a 12-months extension as proposed.
- k. Ideas moving forward – where countries are unable to fully utilise their country allocations then consider giving it up and transfer to countries showing commitments and need for more resources; in the presentation we don’t know exactly how much is the regional fund, we need to know so we can transfer to country projects to support project work and COVID-19 responses.

24. Dr Padilla responded to Ms Maria stating the one time extension of 18 months which had already been applied to this project and for COVID-19, there is a UNDP policy of a maximum of 6 months therefore he was not sure whether they would allow for an extension longer than 6 months.

Dr Padilla also reminded the participants that any unutilized funds after extension must be returned to GEF and he would like to make some suggestions to go about spending these funds instead. He further stated if there is something that could be tabled to the RSC where reallocation of funds from one country to another could be a possibility. Dr Padilla also mentioned the possibility of regional RPCU controlled funds to be reallocated to the national IW R2R projects. He stated that these are two ways to accelerate the use of funds from now till the possible 6 months extension period.

25. Dr Padilla also addressed the possibility of finding ways to address COVID-19 in their respective countries which could be aligned with the project. Referring to the theory of change, something could be translated into country level and interventions could be identified and COVID-19 could be aligned to certain outcomes and outputs.

26. Ms Rhonda thanked Dr Padilla for the comments. She mentioned that she recognized that GEF 7 is not possible and that SPC was aware of this. She also reassured country counterparts and partners that SPC would like a broader funding portfolio (could be GEF 8). Ms Rhonda stated that it was important to note that the work that was being done now would generate lessons to better understand and inform the design process for priorities moving forward. She emphasized that the no cost extension is not to draw out additional funding but to use up the current funding.

27. Participants also noted that as an organisation and executing agency of the R2R the SPC Secretariat consulted widely and bouncing off ideas moving forward in this space of international waters focal area. Unfortunately, the SPC has no knowledge of the I2I until we sought details from UNDP Suva Office in our last internal meetings. As a secretariat for all SPC countries and territories we are also mandated to engage strategically with our own plus GEF focal points explore future directions in the space of further follow up in future R2R investments and development planning for our countries and this region.

28. Moreover, the SPC is quite happy, if there is positive signal from RSC this week, to explore preferred option further and start the conversation engaging with partners particularly targeting GEF-8, EU, Aust/NZ, Green Climate Fund, and other traditional donors. We intend to commence this soon a decision is made to mobilise resources and get to work the designs.

29. Mr Antonio thanked Dr Padilla in informing everybody on using the unused funds from COVID-19 due to COVID-19 travel restrictions. Mr Antonio informed Dr Padilla on the MYCWP working paper and to be mindful that the countries mentioned in Mr Sauni's presentation slides that some of the countries such as Palau are now closed. Mr Antonio stated that despite Palau being the best performed IW R2R project, there were still savings there and emphasized that the 200K is more than enough to produce outputs. Mr Antonio further stated that the RPCU is currently planning and will look at how far it would be possible to assist countries and as Mr Sauni had already mentioned, had it not been due to COVID-19, the regional activities and consultancies would have been carried out and delivered. Mr Antonio emphasized that what mattered the most was delivering outputs and achieving outcomes. Mr Antonio stated the to be mindful of the absorptive capacity of countries and the flexibility of allocating resources needed most to create a humongous effect in terms of producing results. Mr Antonio also encouraged to produce outputs cohesively and feasibly in a coherent manner in order to illustrate what best practices were tested and achieved in the best way to govern national resources.

30. Mr Sauni stated that the project was not being redesigned but trying to complete the project as is and stated that the remaining funds in the project had already been committed. WP.08 of RSC 5 focused on putting money in national capacity for technical resources and assessment in science to policy deliverables. Mr Sauni also stated that GEF 8 is another donor but always opportunity to approach other donors. He stated that this discussion can be put together for plenary to investigate strategic directions for this Working Paper.

31. Dr Padilla stated that the only reason for the reallocation of funds is the context of adaptive management due to COVID-19. This was raised in the tuna management project where countries mentioned that most activities in country required international travel by consultants. He further stated that his level of “competence” is in the area of GEF but acknowledged the possibility of other donors and countries themselves which is part of the exit strategy that could be sustained beyond the life of this project. He also noted that there were more than 15 projects on his portfolio so apologized that he could not read all the documents regarding the relevant paper in this program.

32. Dr Cenon, Technical Advisor to Fiji STAR project made a point emphasizing the need and support for both IW/STAR R2R projects, which appears to be a bottleneck impact progress of implementation. For instance, in Nauru both IW and STAR R2R projects appear to working in different directions and in their own groupings. The Secretariat referred Participants to numerous efforts of the RPCU-SPC to distil the programmatic approach driving implementation of the entire R2R program. This includes joint boards or steering committees, sharing and exchange of information and data, etc. Unfortunately, there are numerous ‘talks’ on this subject but lack of action is disappointing. For instance, a guidance document prepared for Nauru IW R2R seeking review and endorsement from STAR project did not materialised.

33. Regarding the programmatic approach, Mr Antonio emphasized that it is about time that we must “walk the talk” and stated that since November 2017 until the present day, it had always been about “talking” and not “walking”. Mr Antonio recalled in trying, to the best of their ability, in advocating setting up a joint steering committee and encourage national projects to pursue a programmatic approach, working harmoniously with the national government in mainstreaming R2R in planning and/or policy. Mr. Antonio was referring to the discussions with Dr. Cenon as CTA for both Nauru and Fiji STAR projects. In Fiji for example, the MOA that was signed by SPC and the Ministry of Waterways and Environment serve as basis for interacting with STAR project. In that MOA, a provision indicated for the need to establish a joint steering committee for both STAR and IW.

34. Moreover, Mr Antonio explained that due to the MOA, in the early stage of STAR project implementation, the technical staff of RPCU were supporting the Fiji STAR project (i.e. monitoring and communications). Later, the joint steering committee did not function anymore but instead urged to have a separate PSC for each project - STAR and IW. The advocacy of RPCU has been well recorded in the minutes of meeting of the Fiji STAR project steering committee. He stated that it was time that things were done together through the lessons learned and as a program (and not just IW). Mr Antonio emphasized that time and again, RPCU have offered their services to all STAR projects and expressed that he was not sure of the reason from the perspective of STAR as to why this offer had not been taken up as SPC had always been open to helping.



35. Dr Mangisi-Mafileo stated that there will be a presentation on the MYCWP coming through as agreed in RSC last year. She also stated that the lack of collaboration and reasons behind it is also lessons learned. She further encouraged everyone to look at the guiding questions.

36. Mr Senson acknowledged the RPCU and the challenges for different countries. Stated that UNDP cannot deny the challenges. He also stated that he would send the documents and lessons learned. Mr Senson stated that he supported the extension.

37. Dr Mangisi-Mafileo acknowledged Senson's intervention and excited about receiving lessons learned from PNG and encouraged everyone to send summaries in to be included and opens floor again for guiding questions and any inputs for the concept paper.

38. Sammy of Solo IW project made an excellent point that any extension requested must only link to the remaining activities and not necessary for anything else. The Secretariat supported this and encouraged everyone not to seek extension for anything else other than to complete project work, and leaving at least one month before termination date for project closure work.

39. Silia of Tonga IW project refer to outstanding regional activities yet to be implemented in Tonga which may be a problem given the project terminates in March 2021. The Secretariat explained that given the current circumstances most national demonstrations are feeling practical challenges. A formal request is needed from host agency seeking more time and extension of termination date just to finish off outstanding project activities.

40. Evayne from Nauru IW clarified that unlike what is be shared, Nauru IW and STAR continues working and sharing work together, and many times she approved STAR project for help regularly. There have been some delays with IW project due to contractor's availability but progressing well overall.

41. Silia asked what are they COVID type activities following interventions from Dr Joe Padilla to transfer funds from regional to national projects for COVID – would these be additional activities and therefore use of saving from COVID in the regional budget to be used this way?

42. Ms Rhonda stated that she thought Dr Padilla was speaking to the nature of delivery and content of work that must be done. Given travel restrictions, what had the project team done for delivery of action on the ground considering this. E.g. work planning, zoom training as opposed to face to face training. Has the team considered the model given the situation of the travel restrictions and nationally, regionally and in relation to the revised MYCWP.

43. The Secretariat also responded that the working paper on MYCWP provide details of the COVID strategy response reprioritising of project outputs/activities and using alternative modalities to deliver on targets. We are not redesigning the project at this phasing out period rather we are re-allocating resources appropriately in accordance to the same project goals and objectives and outcomes.

44. Participants further noted that the no cost extension proposal is part of the COVID strategy that would provide more time for the project to complete implementation and allow refocus of regionally driven activities of the science-policy theory of change focusing only on committed and active 6 countries to deliver on IDA/SoC/SAP/SAF process. As reflected in the MYCWP resources

have been reallocated already for to support the renewed focus COVID strategy with funds supporting local consultants to deliver to carry technical assessments and complete the IDA/SoC/SAP/SAF process.

45. Moreover, the Secretariat explained that we are all too familiar with the process of the R2R project planning and budgeting such that we follow a multi-year costed workplan with annual approval on revisions particularly based on the status of the previous 12-months implementation and associated impacts on budgeting and forecasting. For example: -

- (i) Current funds remaining with SPC of the regional IW R2R includes both unpaid tranches of participating countries, unpaid invoices of JCU for R2R course, unpaid invoices of international/ national consultants, etc., which are on hold the requirements for the delivery and reporting against the work set out in contractual agreements including supporting documentations (and stamped signed invoices etc) etc are being completed satisfactorily, products delivered satisfactorily . To date the level of compliance has been relatively poor with RPCU continually left chasing after these late submissions and supporting documentations to satisfies requirements of the UNDP as implementing agency and SPC as the executing agency.
- (ii) That said, if all played out appropriately with timely delivery of workplans and products, and no COVID or operational challenges such as procurements etc., and as mentioned by some, high turnover of staffs, project objectives and outcomes would have been delivered and project closed as originally intended. With current paper on MYCWP all funds are committed with the renewed strategy and understandably SPC is aware of funds remaining will need to return to UNDP and that is already factored into current planning and budgeting.
- (iii) So if there is push to transfer funds to countries beyond their \$200K beyond what set out in the project document, then we seek decision of the RSC, at the current late phasing out period of the project to tell us exactly based on what you see the proposed MYCWP what project outputs/activities you want to see removed or zeroed fund allocations and transfer that to remaining tranches of country allocations. Also want to see what these funds going to use for in relation to achieving stress reduction targets already agreed and approved by RSC. And what guarantee is there that COVID-19 and restriction of movements people and cargoes would not bear any influence on additional activities that use these additional funds.
- (iv) From past experiences, SPC has been in the receiving end picking up the pieces as a result of similar advice as mooted in this discussion without consideration of the implications and realistic impact if unable to report on the appropriate use of resources that strictly govern by approved logframes and MYCWPs – i.e. deliver on intended project objectives, outcomes and targets.
- (v) On the suggestion to take funds from poorly performed countries and give to advanced committed countries has been attempted before. As reported last year at the RSC, the RPCU-SPC priority is to continue supporting all 14 countries in their demonstration projects recognising operational challenges – no one will be left behind. If not for COVID we would have delivered and helped countries speed up implementation. Our rating of implementation progress at ‘moderately satisfactorily’ speaks to these efforts. However, if insisted, then better proponent of the question put the same question directly to countries.

46. Dr Mangisi-Mafileo reflected in Point 2 for the floor. Stated the highlight by Dr Padilla and Mr Sauni on the FFA management project I2I UNEP, UNDP, ADB. Perhaps take a poll whether you endorse number 1 or 2 or specific outline in any paper. (5 minutes)

47. Dr Mangisi-Mafileo stated it would be good to have some indication to express which option to lean towards and in context within national development plans. She further acknowledged that supervisors need to be prompted and invited to put in the chat box and invited for questions. She would be happy to elaborate on any further questions.

48. Mr Sauni recalled that in the discussions earlier in the week when presenting the regional guidelines, there were some good interventions from the floor and some recommendations that led to possible next phase. Stated that RMI supported tools being developed and looked into tools in-country to train and support to get the model outputs approved by policy makers. The training and use of tools by technical people on the ground to depict hotspots and where areas can be selected for conservation actions were all part of interventions from Ms Debrum.

49. Moreover, the discussions earlier in the week especially intervention from Mr Pene Conway on what to do with the tools on making them available to non-experts and to be packaged to be used and commercialized by interested entrepreneurs. In the same vein, Dr Guiang spoke on reinvesting back to R2R by business houses following successful R2R policy interventions. The WP.08 set out specific areas in streamlining the next phase – e.g. paragraph 14 (formal and informal qualifications could be elevated to Masters or PhD). Mr Sauni stated that USP strongly supported that those with relevant qualifications to develop standards for piggeries and instead of using standards from the US and Europe to address contextual key questions. He stated that the promise of monitoring and evaluation and current R2R and predecessor IWRM is part and parcel for next phase for R2R and IW interventions and hoped that his current elaboration on the matter would help with their interventions.

50. Participants noted the following results on the preferred choice of options noting clear majority support for option 2:

- a. Ms Leger supported Option 1 and 2 with conditions (not specified)
- b. Mr Senson opted for Option 2
- c. Mr Airahui opted for Option 2
- d. Mr Padolina suggested Option 2 as a way forward
- e. Ms Siba personally supported Option 2

51. Mr Sauni closed the meeting and stated that discussions were extremely encouraging and noted UNDP for the inputs and food for thought. He stated that in terms of recommendations there will be a draft outcome and recommendations to be framed appropriately for those in the chat box and by Saturday to review outcomes by 11.59 PM. Encouraged everybody to also attend RSTC.

52. Dr Isoa stated that in the second phase it was important to have these projects without getting people on the ground. He further emphasized in having institutional memory and R2R is complex so, just like in the government, they have reps that look after some of these sites.

53. Ms Rhonda closed the meeting by thanking everybody for their time and discussions and acknowledged these pre briefing sessions helped focus and formed what to take to the proper RSC meetings next week and looked forward to seeing everybody face to face in the near future.

#### Annex 1: List of Participants

Country	Affiliation	Name
PNG	IW R2R Project	Mark Senson
Solomon Is	IW R2R Project	Sammy Airahui
Fiji	GEM-SPC	Carrol Chan
FSM	IW R2R Project	Faith Siba
UNDP	Regional Technical Advisor	Dr Joe Padilla
Australia	JCU	Prof Marcus Sheaves
Philippines	Consultant	Dr. Ernie Guiang
Fiji	CTA STAR R2R Project	Dr. Cenon Padolina
Vanuatu	IW R2R Project	Ericksen Packett
RMI	STAR R2R Project	Jennifer Debrum
Fiji	UNDP	Josua Turaganivalu
RMI	UNDP	Francis Wele
Cook Islands	Marae Moana	Maria Tuora
Nauru	IW R2R Project	Ms Silia Leger
Fiji	SPC-RPCU	Mr Samasoni Sauni
Fiji	SPC-RPCU	Dr Fononga Vainga Mangisi-Mafileo
Fiji	SPC-RPCU	Mr Jose Antonio
Fiji	SPC-RPCU	Ms Vere Bakani
Fiji	SPC-RPCU	Ms Swastika Devi
Fiji	SPC-RPCU	Mr John Carreon
Fiji	SPC-RPCU	Ratu George Naboutuiloma