

MEETING SUMMARY

1st Regional Consultation meeting on a Permanent Policy Coordination Mechanism (PPCM) and Sustainable Financing Plan (SFP) for Ocean Governance in the CLME+ region

**25-26 September 2018
Cartagena, Colombia**

In Attendance:

- Representatives from CLME+ countries
- Representatives from CLME+ SAP ICM member organizations
- CLME+ Project Coordination Unit (PCU) staff
- CAD consultant team members
- Representatives from UNDP and from ACS-CSC and a member of the PPCM-SFP Technical Task Team (TTT)

The complete list of participants is attached in Annex A.

Detailed documentation of the meeting:

- ❖ All meeting materials can be downloaded here:
<https://www.clmeproject.org/regional-consultation-ocean-governance/> (Password: Cartagena)
- ❖ The meeting was recorded and live streamed to allow remote participation. The entire meeting can be viewed here:
Day 1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zvu5zkQKsiU>
Day 2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tN970f6AVoQ&t=15s>

DAY 1

Agenda Item 1 – Opening

The CLME+ Senior Programme Officer (SPO), acting as facilitator, welcomed all participants to the 1st Regional Consultation meeting.

The CLME+ Regional Project Coordinator (RPC) opened the meeting by giving his welcome remarks to the participants. The RPC stated that he was pleased to welcome participants representing many different countries and a variety of sectors. Consolidation of the regional governance of ocean resources has the ultimate aim to improve well-being in the region, enhance resilience against natural disasters, and move toward a sustainable blue economy. He highlighted the importance of this meeting in moving forward toward an agreement by the end of the CLME+ Project on the future institutional configuration for ocean governance in the region. He thanked the consultant team and all participants for their attendance and wished all a successful meeting.

Further welcome remarks were given by the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor for the Latin America and Caribbean region. He indicated that he was happy to note the attendance of many country representatives from both fisheries and environmental sectors, which reflects the inter-sectoral

nature of the issues. He encouraged the meeting participants to think in terms of scenarios for the region, and to identify a regional agenda for the achievement of sustainable development goals, to support national level implementation. He further went on to state that from a donor perspective, it is recognized that national efforts alone may not be sufficient to solve the challenges of the CLME+ region and that the private sector needs to be engaged much more strongly. Finally, he invited participants to imagine a regional governance model that is not only new to the region, but also new globally in the context of Large Marine Ecosystems (LMEs).

The CAD team coordinator gave a presentation introducing the meeting objectives and agenda. He highlighted that the meeting was not about taking a formal decision on a PPCM, but to guide the consultancy, by discussing and agreeing on a shortlist of options to be further developed during Phase 2.

Participants were then asked to briefly introduce themselves to the meeting. Finally, the CAD team coordinator reviewed the meeting agenda for day 1 and day 2. The Meeting Agenda is attached in Annex B of this Summary.

Agenda Item 2 – Background and Introduction

The CLME+ RPC gave an overview on the CLME+ region and the ocean governance context. Amongst others he presented an overview of the CLME+ Project, the CLME+ Strategic Action Programme (SAP), the CLME+ SAP Interim Coordination Mechanism (ICM), and highlighted the challenges to ocean governance, as well as the risks and opportunities related to advancing the Blue Economy. He conveyed a message of urgency in addressing these challenges and in avoiding major losses and damage.

The CAD team coordinator gave an overview on the PPCM and SFP consultancy, including the consultancy objectives, methodological approach with three phases and a time line spanning 30 months between November 2017 and April 2020. He further went on to summarise the activities undertaken so far, and introduce the consultancy team members. He highlighted the fact that the mandate for the consultancy stems directly from the CLME+ SAP Strategy 3, and that it is being carried out in close coordination with the CLME+ SAP ICM. He also referred to the available documents, including an Inception Report, a Phase 1 report in English and Spanish (Options paper) with background papers, a Brochure and other communication materials in English and Spanish, as well as all presentation material.

Agenda Item 3 – Presentation of Options for a Permanent Policy Coordination Mechanism (PPCM) for the CLME+ region

The CAD team coordinator provided a presentation on the Business-as-Usual (BaU) scenario, on the “benefits at stake” and the ocean governance baseline that had been developed during the Inception Phase and Phase 1 of the consultancy. The BaU scenario is a plausible description of how the future may evolve and affect the goal and objectives of the CLME+ SAP in the absence of a permanent policy coordination mechanism. It analyses the key drivers and trends related to the 3 key transboundary issues in the CLME+ region – unsustainable fishing, marine pollution and ecosystem degradation – in the period 2015 to 2050, looking at existing studies and published data and information. It concludes that, without a permanent policy coordination mechanism for ocean governance, the region is likely to witness negative transboundary impacts and associated political tensions in the future. The CAD team coordinator also provided an overview of the estimated economic value of key selected ecosystems in the CLME+ region, including the benefits at stake. Finally, he provided an overview on the governance baseline at the regional level, specifically the eight IGOs that form part of the CLME+ SAP ICM, their scope of geographic, thematic and policy cycle related mandate.

The CAD ocean governance advisor then presented a review of experiences of regional coordination mechanisms from other LMEs and ocean regions globally. He informed the Meeting that in most regions coordinating mechanisms are only emerging, predominantly based on polycentric, multilevel thinking. More information on existing coordinating mechanisms was provided for the Pacific Islands Region (Pacific Islands Forum; PIF), the East Asian Seas region (Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia; PEMSEA), the Benguela Current LME (Benguela Current Commission; BCC) and the Mediterranean Sea LME (Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development; MCSD).

Specifically on the PEMSEA experience, the Executive Director of PEMSEA, Aimee Gonzales, gave a more detailed presentation through a recorded video message, and a short presentation by the CLME+ RPC, in which the history of PEMSEA, its functions and organizational structure were described. The CLME+ RPC specifically made highlighted potential similarities and lessons for the CLME+ region.

In the following plenary discussion, participants commented that the presented BaU scenario painted a gloomy picture of the future, which may not reflect some positive developments that are underway. It was also indicated that the implementation of the SDGs are the responsibilities of the countries. The Consultants were also cautioned regarding the PPCM as a mechanism that could fix all problems in the region. It was also mentioned that the composition of the ICM/PPCM may need to be re-thought.

Further, participants stated that it would be useful to learn more about success stories/factors from other LMEs. It was highlighted that PEMSEA did not set any new obligations for countries, but was built on existing commitment, and it would be useful to get information on the tangible results obtained thus far.

The CAD Team leader then presented the four generic options for a PPCM. He highlighted that the presented options were not a prescription, but were instead thoughts to stimulate discussion among countries, and get feedback in order to move ahead in the next phase of the consultancy. He recognized the CLME+ SAP as the origin for the PPCM development, but that the PPCM itself would go beyond the issues identified in the SAP. He also highlighted the existence of the ICM as an important success in the region and as a starting point for the suggested options as well as the engagement of IGOs in building on the options. The PPCM options presented are

- Option 1: The 'Base Model' – continuing with the existing MoU/ICM arrangement with a simple secretariat to replicate functions currently provide by the CLME+ PCU
- Option 2: The 'Enhanced Base Model' – providing the PPCM/secretariat with enhanced capabilities
- Option 3: 'PPCM within an existing IGO model' – the function of the PPCM is integrated into an existing IGO/regional agreement, with different possible sub-options or 'end-points'
- Option 4: The 'WCR Commission model' – a model based on a regional convention and binding decision making by member states

The presentation also included a cost estimate for the different options. The presentation further identified potential criteria for selection of a PPCM option. The CAD team leader referred the Meeting to the Phase 1 report for further details.

Following was a short presentation by the CAD financing task leader who provided an initial overview of Sustainable Financing Plans (SFP) for the PPCM. The SFP structures the financing model for the PPCM into core and complementary financing, with different potential sources. He also proposed that PPCM financing would need to be developed in two phases; the first the establishment phase; and

the second the long term operation. In the long term, the financing of the PPCM should be embedded into a wider plan for sustainable financing of the governance framework. The CAD financing task leader highlighted that the discussion on those issues would take place on the following day, and that more details on the options can be found in the Phase 1 report.

Participants asked whether the capacities of IGOs were assessed in order to establish if their potential roles and contributions to the PPCM are feasible; and if such an assessment was based on their current mandates. The consultant team explained that a governance and financing baseline assessment was carried out in the inception phase, considering, among other, the IGOs' current mandates (geographical and thematic scope and policy cycle completeness) and status of financial sustainability. The development of options took the results from the baseline assessment into account, and a close engagement with the ICM took place to reflect the IGOs' perspectives.

Participants agreed with the proposed iterative/step-wide approach for the development of PPCM options. It was stated that further work was required regarding how the proposed PPCM would function. The meeting suggested that emphasis should be placed on how the process would work and what is it that the region wants to achieve, rather than what structure it will have. It was also indicated that it would be important to determine how the PPCM relates to actions being undertaken at the national level, and what the scope of the project is in this regard. Also, it would be necessary to determine what policy coordination actually means.

The representative from Jamaica shared CRFM's position on the WECAFC reform process, reaffirmed by the CFRM Ministerial Council, i.e. that the RFMO should only focus on areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ). This would need to be respected in the report.

Agenda Item 4 – Working group discussion of PPCM options suitable for CLME+ region

The CAD team gave a presentation on the organization of working group discussions. As background information, the CAD team coordinator shared the results of the pre-meeting survey, showing that there were no clear preferences so far among countries regarding the preferred PPCM options.

The CAD team leader introduced the questions to be discussed in groups:

- What do the countries want the PPCM to achieve?
- Which option/structures are best suited to meeting the expectation of the PPCM?
- How should the countries be represented in the PPCM?

For the discussions, participants were placed into three groups, each one facilitated by a consultant team member. Each group was assigned a note taker and a rapporteur. The group rapporteurs gave short presentations summarizing the discussions points. The summaries of the group discussions can be found in Annex D.

The group presentations were followed by a discussion in plenary. Participants comments and discussion points included:

- The idea of the progressive development of the coordination mechanism is an important approach, based on learning and examples;
- It will be important to have a monitoring and evaluation framework for the PPCM;
- The proposed Option 1 may be less than what exists currently with the ICM, and therefore not desirable (this was not very clear in the report but was understood during out in the meeting)
- The four proposed PPCM options should not be considered as phases that need to be implemented consecutively, but as a menu of options that countries can chose from;

- The coordination mechanism of the PPCM should be mapped including the relations between the different elements;
- The region should leverage support from the global initiative to build advance with a Blue Economy agenda;
- There is a need to reach out to stakeholders through the Project to better explain the PPCM; there is also a need for an innovative approach to communicate the concept and functionality of the PPCM to governments (mindful that governments may have changed from when the SAP was endorsed); and that the PPCM is related to the Blue Economy.
- The Meeting raised a number of points for further clarification including a number related to the sustainable financing proposal.

The Meeting also discussed if the PPCM should focus only on programmatic coordination or on policy coordination, or both (policy and programmatic coordination), with different opinions raised by participants. It was further stated that the issue may have been discussed at different levels within the three working groups and it was recommended that this issue be discussed further in the plenary.

In response to a question regarding the next steps, it was mentioned by the CAD team coordinator that a meeting report would be developed together with an outline on next steps. Representatives from the IGOs were also asked to inform their own constituents on the outcome of the meeting.

Agenda Item 5 – Preliminary prioritization and closing

At the end of day 1, participants were asked by the CAD team coordinator to fill out and submit a short questionnaire to indicate their preliminary preferences regarding the proposed PPCM options, for the consultant team to get a first understanding of country opinions after the first day of the Meeting.

The CAD team coordinator thanked all participants for their attendance and contributions, and closed day 1 of the Meeting.

DAY 2

Agenda Item 6 – Opening

Day 2 commenced with a brief presentation by the CAD team coordinator on the results of the preliminary questionnaire of day 1, with the results alluding to a preference of options 2 and 3 of the 4 PPCM options presented the previous day. The CAD team coordinator also reviewed the agenda for day 2.

Agenda Item 7 – Options for Sustainable Financing of the PPCM

The CAD financing task leader gave a presentation on the Sustainable Financing Plan (SFPs) for the PPCM options that were developed by the consultant team during Phase 1 of the Consultancy. He highlighted that what was presented at this stage were options and ideas for countries to consider and take forward as they see adequate, and that these financing options were not prescriptions. He stressed that further details on the SFPs could be found in the consultancy report, specifically in background report no. 2.

The UNDP Regional Advisor gave a presentation on the potential of the GEF 7 to support the establishment and operation of the PPCM. He indicated that opportunities potentially lay in partially financing some of the proposed functions (activities) the PPCM could undertake such as: SOME reporting; identifying emerging threats and opportunities that require priority actions; and establishing public-private partnerships. Providing support to the implementation of investment plans

related to the three priority issues in the region was also a possibility (this may also include national level actions that are in line with the financing criteria of GEF IW focal area).

Agenda Item 8 – Q&A from participants on SFP options

Generally, participants appreciated the phased approach and the overall strategy for financing. The participants also appreciated that there is a potential for the GEF, through GEF 7 to partially support the PPCM.

It was also highlighted that countries need to decide what they want to achieve with the PPCM, and what type of coordination is required. It was highlighted that the full cost of improved coordination in the region is more than the establishment of a unit with staff, and that the real costs to countries entail an entire process that starts at the national level.

Participants also highlighted that one needs to be cautious, and not separate IGO and country contributions, as they are basically the same, coming from countries' national budgets, and that IGOs are already having problems in receiving their contributions from countries.

Countries also raised concerns about potential committed contributions by countries to finance the PPCM, which may not be a feasible option. The Meeting noted that it was too early to have a detailed discussion regarding the financing of the PPCM as its functions first needed to be clearly defined. They went on to state that the financial capacity of the countries are already very complex and as such, it cannot be assumed that they will make further commitments, so contributions by countries should be voluntary.

Regarding financing, it was further mentioned that Member States contributions are unlikely to change, and that many IGOs could function more efficiently if all committed funds were paid. A PPCM could lever funds between IGOs from future projects resulting from better co-ordination. It was considered very important to maintain and improve co-ordination and interconnectivity between IGOs.

Participants also commented that the private sector should contribute resources to the financing of ocean governance, being among the main beneficiaries from marine resources and ecosystem services.

It was further mentioned that a lot of work in the region has already been done as a result of improved co-ordination, with clear benefits, e.g. the adoption of an ecosystem-based approach to fisheries management. The PPCM will allow the region to address problems more effectively in marine/ocean governance.

Agenda Item 9 – Discussion on PPCM functions (originally: Working Group discussion on the associated SFP options suitable for CLME+ region)

Based on agreement among participants, this agenda item was changed in order to allow for a discussion on the proposed functions of the PPCM.

The meeting reviewed the functions of the current CLME+ SAP ICM as described in the MoU, and participants shared perspectives on which functions the future PPCM should entail. These statements were collected to draft a set of meeting recommendations, which were presented later in the day for validation and review by participants (see Agenda item 11).

Agenda Item 10 – Presentation and discussion of Options for a Sustainable Financing Plan for the Regional Governance Framework

The CLME+ RPC gave a brief overview on the existing Regional Governance Framework (RGF). He explained that the governance framework is *multi-level* – meaning that it encompasses governance arrangements and bodies at the national, sub-regional and regional level (with linkages to global processes); and it is *nested* – meaning that different countries are members of different regional integration mechanisms and organizations in the region. He highlighted that the PPCM is considered to be a missing piece of the RGF, in order to strengthen coordination among regional and sub-regional organizations.

The consultant team commented that it was not the intention to create a new IGO in the region, but a mechanism for coordinating the work of existing IGOs, and that the PPCM would not be a programme implementation body. An IGO representative argued that policy development may not be the right focus for the proposed coordination mechanism. It was further noted that there is a need to identify what type of coordination is required, specifically in the context of the Blue Economy.

The CAD financing task leader then presented the two complementary options for sustainable financing of the Regional Governance Framework (RGF), namely a donor-centred approach and a beneficiary-centred approach to financing. He explained that the SFP options provided suggestions on how to strengthen financial sustainability (in terms of sufficiency, reliability and resilience of financing), and that they focused on the 8 member IGOs of the ICM as key constituents of the RGF. The SFPs are being developed in the context of the consultancy to ensure that the PPCM governance and financing options are embedded in an overall financially sustainable regional governance framework. Also, the future PPCM can play a crucial role for the financial sustainability of the RGF.

There was no discussion on the details of the presentation, and participants were of the view that the meeting should continue with reviewing the recommendations on the PPCM functions as a necessary first step before detailed discussions on financing take place.

Agenda Item 11 – Drafting meeting recommendations and Way forward (originally: Way forward)

The meeting reviewed and revised draft recommendations of the Meeting to inform Phase II of the PPCM and SFP Consultancy. The agreed Meeting Recommendations can be viewed in Annex C of the Meeting Summary below.

The CAD team coordinator presented the major milestones associated with Phase II of the consultancy, which included a 2nd Regional Coordination meeting to select a PPCM option in mid of 2019, and the final Project Steering Committee meeting to endorse the selected option for a PPCM.

Regarding the next steps, the following were discussed:

- IGOs will include the PPCM and SFP as part of their respective Intergovernmental Meetings.
- Countries may need further regional consultations (besides their national level consultations) before taking a final decision on the coordination mechanism. It was also stated that sufficient time to allow for consultation by countries was important in coming to an agreement. The PCU highlighted that therefore the next consultation meeting will be critical and provides an opportunity for further consultation, and all parties (PCU, consultants, ICM and countries) will have to be very well prepared in order for it to be successful.
- Regarding national consultations, it was requested to have an abbreviated version of the Phase II Report, together with a set of slides for the countries to use for their internal consultations.

- Printable leaflets or brochures outlining the benefits of the PPCM, to countries, the gaps that the PPCM filling (also in terms of Blue Economy), the clear targets of the PPCM would also be helpful.
- The National Intersectoral Committees (NICs) would be the right avenue to hold consultations ta the national level.
- More communication to target users of marine resources is needed. As such, it was suggested that the region make use of already existing communications material produced by ICM members.

Agenda Item 12 – Closing

The CLME+ RPC thanked all participants for their valuable contributions and noted that the results of the meeting will be very useful for the work ahead under Phase II of the consultancy. He also thanked all involved in the organization of the meeting and wished safe travels to all participants.

Annex A: List of participants

List of Delegates

<u>ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA</u> Ms. Tricia Lovell Senior Fisheries Officer Fisheries Division Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Fisheries and Barbuda Affairs Point Wharf Fisheries Complex Lower North Street St. John's Tel: 268-462-1372 or 268-720-5910 Email: trilov@hotmail.com ; Tricia.lovell@ab.gov.ag	<u>ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA</u> Dr. Linroy Christian Director of Analytical Services/ LBS Focal Point Friars Hill, St. John, Antigua Tel : 1 268 764 8338 Email: Linroy.christian@ab.gov.ag
<u>BAHAMAS</u> Mrs. Indira Brown Fisheries Officer 19 Guadeloupe Street; P. O. Box CB-12905; Nassau, Bahamas Tel: 242-393-1777 242-424-0232 Email: protectorofthesea@gmail.com	<u>BAHAMAS</u> Ms. Sydnei Cartwright Environmental officer BEST COMMISSION Charlotte House (1st Floor) Charlotte St. Nassau, N.P., The Bahamas Tel: 242-397-9353 Email: scartwright@best.gov.bs
<u>BARBADOS</u> Dr. Fozlo Leo Stanley Brewster Director Coastal Zone Management Unit, 8th Floor Warrens Tower II, Warrens, St. Michael, Barbados Tel: 246 535 5740/5700 Email: lbrewster@coastal.gov.bb	<u>BARBADOS</u> Mr. Travis A. Sinckler Senior Environmental Officer #103b Warrens Terrace East, Apt #1, St. Thomas. Bb22026 Tel : +1246-535-4383 Email: travis.sinckler@barbados.gov.bb
<u>BELIZE</u> Mrs. Vivian Belisle-Ramnarace Fisheries Officer Princess Margaret Drive, Belize City Tel: 501 623 6092/ 2244552 Email: vivian.ramnarace@fisheries.gov.bz	<u>BELIZE</u> Mr. Anthony Mai Environmental Officer Market Square, Belmopan, Belize Tel: (501) 822-2819/2548 Email: enforcement@environment.gov.bz
<u>COLOMBIA</u> Ms. Kelly Moreno Profesional Especializado Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo	<u>COLOMBIA</u> Ms. Sonia Angelica Jurado Asesora Cancillería

Calle 37 N° 8-40 Bogotá Tel: 3323400 Ext:2477 E-mail: kimoreno@minambiente.gov.co	Calle 10 # 5-51 Tel: +571 3814000 ext 4292 E-mail: Sonia.jurado@cancilleria.gov.co
<u>COSTA RICA</u> Ms. Maylin de los Ángeles Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía, Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, Área de Conservación la Amistad Caribe Costa Rica Tel: 8331-5425 Email: maylin_mora_arias@hotmail.com	<u>COSTA RICA</u> Mr. Mario Cerdas Gomez Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía, Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, Área de Conservación la Amistad Caribe Costa Rica Tel: 8686-1397 Email: Macego2003@hotmail.com
<u>CUBA</u> Mr. Ernesto Daniel Plasencia Especialista de la Dirección de Relaciones Internacionales del Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente de la República de Cuba Calle 18 A # 4118 e/ 41 y 47, Playa, La Habana 11300, CUBA Tel: (537) 2144257 Email: edaniel@citma.gob.cu	<u>CUBA</u> Mr. Eugenio Manuel Basterrechea Director de la Oficina de inspección, que controlan las regulaciones establecidas a la pesca en el Ministerio de la Industria Alimenticia Ave. 41 # 4455 e/ 48 y 50 Municipio Playa, La Habana, Cuba Tel: 72123900 al 08 y 72036801 al 06 Email: eugenio.basterrechea@cnica.cu
<u>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</u> Ms. Jeanette Mateo Directora de Recursos Pesqueros C/Camila Henriquez Ureña Esquina Jesus Maestro. Edificio Nicole Antoinette. Apto. C-3. Mirador Norte. Santo Domingo Tel: 8498176826 Email: jeannettemateo@gmail.com	<u>GRENADA</u> Mr. Francis Calliste Fisheries Officer Mt. St. Ervans St. Andrew Grenada Tel: 1-473-417-2908 / 449-2173 Email: tobex00@hotmail.com

<u>DOMINICA</u> Mr. Riviere D Sebastien Chief Fisheries Officer Fisheries Division Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries 7506 Colihaut Village Colihaut COMMONWEALTH OF DOMINICA Tel: 767 276 1702 Email: sebastien65@ufl.edu	<u>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</u> Ms. Nina Lysenko Coordinadora Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales Avenida Cayetano Germosén esq. Avenida Gregorio Luperón Ensanche El Pedregal, Código Postal 11107 Santo Domingo Tel: 809-399-5593 cel: 809-567-4300/ext. 7140 Email: ninalysenko@gmail.com Nina.Lysenko@ambiente.gob.do
<u>GUATEMALA</u> Mr. Juan Carlos Diaz Coordinador de la Unidad de Cooperación Internacional Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales Guatemala , Guatemala 7ª. Avenida 03-67 Zona 13 Tel: (502) 2423-0500 Ext. 1045 (502) 3037-4485 Email: jcdiaz@marn.gob.gt / juancarlosdiaz.marn@gmail.com	<u>GUATEMALA</u> Mr. Oscar Alfredo Zaparolli Ministerio de Ambiente y Recursos Naturales Guatemala , Guatemala 7ª. Avenida 03-67 Zona 13 Tel: 55149407 Email: zaparollisipex@hotmail.com
<u>GUYANA</u> Mr. Denzil Bertram Roberts Chief Fisheries Officer Fisheries Department Ministry of Agriculture Regent & Shiv Chanderpaul Drive Georgetown, Guyana Tel: 592 2259559 / 592 641 9331 Email: fisheriesguyana@gmail.com	<u>GUYANA</u> Mr. Rayner McAndrew Environmental Officer II Environmental Protection Agency Ministry of Agriculture 35 Nelson Street, Mocha Village, East Bank Demerara Tel: 592-629-8185 Email: Epa.brm@gmail.com
<u>JAMAICA</u> Mr. Rudolph Carroll Environmental Officer 1 Central Avenue, Kingston 8, Jamaica Tel: 18768188880 E-mail : rudolph.carroll18@gmail.com/ rudolph.carroll@nepa.gov.jm	<u>JAMAICA</u> Mr. G. Andre Kong Director of Fisheries Ministry of Industry, Commerce, Agriculture and Fisheries Fisheries Division; 2c Newport East; Kingston 15; Jamaica Tel: 876-967-1601; 948-9014; 924-9182 (Fax); 416-6743 (cell) E-mail: gakong@micaf.gov.jm

<u>MEXICO</u> <i>(Remote participation via live streaming)</i>	<u>NICARAGUA</u> Mr. Renaldy Barnuty Director Dirección de Investigaciones Pesqueras DIP – INPESCA Nicaragua, Frente a emergencia del Hospital San Jose. Ciudad de Diriamba, Carazo. Tel. 505- 22-4424-01 Ext. 140 Celular INPESCA: 505-842-041-10 Email personal: rbarnutti@yahoo.com
<u>PANAMA</u> Ms. Zedna Ibis Guerra Lima Directora Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá Edificio La Riviera Avenida Justo Arosemena y calle 45 Bella Vista, Rep. De Panama Tel: 511-6000 Office Cell: 65327174 Email: zguerra@arap.gob.pa	<u>PANAMA</u> Ms. Liz Montilla Dirección General de Ordenación y Manejo Integral Autoridad de los Recursos Acuáticos de Panamá Edificio La Riviera Avenida Justo Arosemena y calle 45 Bella Vista, Rep. De Panamá Email: liz.montilla@arap.gob.pa
<u>ST. KITTS and NEVIS</u> Ms. Nikkita Browne OCEANOGRAPHY & GIS OFFICER Department of Marine Resources Ministry of Agriculture, Marine Resources C. A Paul Southwell Industrial Park, Basseterre, St. Kitts Tel: 1 – 869- 465 -8045 Email: Nikkita.browne@dmrskn.com	<u>ST. KITTS and NEVIS</u> Mr. Thomas Marc Xavier Williams Director of Marine Resources Bay Road, Basseterre, St. Kitts Tel: 8694658045 / 8696681188 Email: marcwill3@aol.com / dmrskn@gmail.com
<u>ST. LUCIA</u> Mr. Thomas Nelson Deputy Chief Fisheries Officer Department of Fisheries Pointe Seraphine Castries, Saint Lucia Tel: (758) 468-4136 or (758) 716-0836 Email: thomas.nelson@govt.lc	<u>ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES</u> Ms. Deborah Daniel Williams Agricultural Planning Officer Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Rural Transformation, Industry and Labour Richmond Hill, Kingstown Tel: 1-784-4319118 Email: debbidaniel@gmail.com

<u>ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES</u>	<u>SURINAME</u>
--	------------------------

Mr. Kris Isaacs Senior Fisheries Officer Fisheries Division Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Transformation, Forestry, Fisheries and Industry St. Vincent and the Grenadines Tel: 784 456 2738 (work) 784 430 4810 (cell) Email: kris.isaacs@yahoo.com	Ms. Marjory Danoe Alimoenadi Field Officer, Environmental and Social Assessment Office Nationaal Instituut voor Milieu & Ontwikkeling in Suriname (NIMOS) Mr. Jagernath Lachmonstraat 100/Hoek Bersabalaan Tel.: (597)490044/490046/490047 Email: mdanoe@nimos.org
<u>SURINAME</u> Ms. Shannon Murg Junior Legal Officer Nationaal Instituut voor Milieu & Ontwikkeling in Suriname (NIMOS) Bersabalaan #100 Tel.: 597490044 Email: smurg@nimos.org	<u>TRINIDAD & TOBAGO</u> Ms. Lara Andrea Ferreira Senior Fisheries Officer (Acting) Fisheries Division Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Fisheries #35 Cipriani Blvd. Port of Spain, Trinidad Tel: 1-868-625-9358; 1-868-623-8542; 1-868-623-8525 Email: lferreira@gov.tt
<u>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</u> Ms. Erica Nuñez International Affairs Specialist US Dept. of Commerce/NOAA, 1401 14th & Constitution Ave NW, Suite 68029, Washington, DC 20230 Tel: 202-482-3122 Email: Erica.Nunez@noaa.gov	<u>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</u> Ms. Iris Lowery Attorney-Advisor, NOAA Office of the General Counsel 263 13th Avenue South St. Petersburg, FL 33701 Tel: 1-727-551-5731 Email: iris.lowery@noaa.gov

INSTITUTIONS	
<u>ACS</u> Mr. Alexnder Girvan Programme Coordinator Caribbean Sea Commission 5-7 Sweet Briar Road St Clair Trinidad and Tobago Tel: 1868-482734 (cell) 1868-6229575 Email: algirvan@acs-aec.org	<u>CARICOM SECRETARIAT</u> Ms. Amrikha Singh Programme Manager, Sustainable Development CARICOM Secretariat, Turkeyen, Greater Georgetown Guyana Tel: 592 222 0001ext 2627 Email: Amrikha.Singh@Caricom.org
<u>CCAD</u> Mr. Salvador Nieto Secretario Ejecutivo Boulevard Cancillería Edificio SICA 3er nivel, Antiguo Cuscatlán, El Salvador.	<u>CRFM</u> Ms. Susan Singh-Renton Deputy Executive Director CRFM Secretariat Top Floor, Corea's Building

Tel: 503 2248-8843 Email: snieto@sica.int; salvador.ernesto@gmail.com	Halifax Street, Kingstown St. Vincent and the Grenadines Tel: 784-457-3474 Email: susan.singhrenton@crfm.net
<u>FAO</u> Mr. Terrence Phillips Regional Project Coordinator StewardFish Email: Terrence.Phillips@fao.org	<u>OECS COMMISSION</u> Mr. David Vincent Robin Programme Coordinator Ocean Governance and Fisheries OECS Commission, Morne Fortune, Castries, Saint Lucia Tel: 17584556344 / +17582855459 Email: david.robin@oecs.int
<u>OSPESCA</u> Mr. Reinaldo Morales Director Regional Dirección Regional de Pesca y Acuicultura SICA/OSPESCA Tel: 503 2248 8840 Email: rmorales@sica.int	<u>UNDP</u> Mr. Jose Vicente Troya Regional Technical Advisor. Water And Oceans. Undp Un House, Building 129, City Of Knowledge, Clayton, Panama City, Panama Tel: 507 302 4636 Email: jose.troya@undp.org
<u>UNEP CEP</u> Ms. Lorna Inniss Coordinator 14-20 Port Royal Street, Kingston, Jamaica W.I. Tel: 876-922-9267 Ext. 6223 Email: Lorna.inniss@un.org	<u>UNESCO – IOC</u> Mr. Cesar Toro Head UNESCO IOC Regional Office for IOCARIBE Torices, Edificio Chambacu, Oficina 405, Cra 3B # 26-78, Cartagena Tel: 6640955 Email: c.toro@unesco.org

OTHERS

<u>CAD</u> Mr. Steffen Schwörer CAD Team coordinator Tel: +34 633 28 96 95 Email: sschwoerer@globalcad.org	<u>CAD</u> Mr. Peter Whalley CAD Team leader Email: pdwhalley@btinternet.com
<u>CAD</u> Mr. Edward Interwies CAD Financing task leader Email: Interwies@intersus.eu	<u>CAD</u> Prof. Emeritus Robin Mahon CAD Ocean Governance Advisor Email: prof.mahon@gmail.com

Technical Task Team Mr. Michael Witter Jamaica Email: mikeywitter@gmail.com	
--	--

CLME+ PCU

Mr. Patrick Debels Regional Project Coordinator PatrickD@unops.org	Ms. Laverne Walker Senior Project Officer LaverneW@unops.org
Mr. Ivan Pavletich Meza Operations and Finances Manager IvanP@unops.org	Ms. Silvia Del Castillo Operations and Finances Associate SilviaDCP@unops.org

Annex B: Meeting Agenda

Meeting Agenda Day 1 – Tuesday, 25 September

Time	Activities	Facilitation
09.00 – 09.30	1. Opening a. Welcome by facilitator b. Welcoming remarks c. Introduction to the meeting agenda and objectives	PCU/Consultants
09.30 – 10.30	2. Background and Introduction a. History of Ocean Governance in the Region b. Introduction to the Consultancy c. Clarification questions by participants	PCU/Consultants
10.30 – 10.45	Coffee Break	PCU
10.45 – 12.45	3. Presentation of Options for a Permanent Policy Coordination Mechanism (PPCM) for the CLME+ region a. Business-as-Usual Scenario, Benefits at Stake, Governance Baseline, Global Experiences <i>Clarification questions</i> b. Presentation of four PPCM Options, including the associated Costs and Benefits <i>Clarification questions</i> c. Initial overview of Sustainable Financing Plans (SFP) <i>Clarification questions (Plenary)</i> d. Q&A from participants on the PPCM options	Consultants
12.45 – 13.00	4. Working group discussion of PPCM options suitable for CLME+ region a. Introduction to working groups on PPCM options	Consultants
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch break	PCU
14.00 – 15.30	b. Working Group Discussion on PPCM options	Consultants/PCU
15.30 – 15.45	Coffee Break	PCU
15.45 – 16.30	a. Reporting back to the plenary <i>Clarification questions</i>	Consultants
16.30 – 17.00	5. Preliminary prioritization and closing a. Preliminary prioritization of PPCM options b. Closing	Consultants/PCU

Day 2 – Wednesday, 26 September

Time	Activities	Facilitation
09.00 – 09.15	6. Opening Welcome, recap from day 1 and agenda for day 2	PCU/Consultants
09.15 – 10.00	7. Options for Sustainable Financing of the PPCM Presentation of the SFPs associated to the PPCM options in the CLME+ region	Consultants
10.00 – 10.30	8. Q&A from participants on SFP options	Consultants
10.30 – 10.40	9. Working Group discussion on the associated SFP options suitable for CLME+ region a. Introduction to working groups on SFP options	Consultants
10.40 – 10.55	Coffee Break	PCU
10.55 – 12.00	b. Working Group discussion on SFP options	Consultants

12.00 – 12.45	c. Reporting back to the plenary <i>Clarification questions</i>	Consultants
12.45 – 13.45	Lunch Break	PCU
13.45 – 15.15	10. Presentation and discussion of Options for a Sustainable Financing Plan for the Regional Governance Framework a. Presentation of SFP Options for the RGF b. Q&A by participants and discussion	Consultants
15.15 – 15.30	11. Way forward a. Prioritization of PPCM options with associated SFPs	Consultants
15.30 – 15.45	Coffee Break	PCU
15.45 – 16.15	b. PPCM and SFP shortlist and way of forward of the consultancy	Consultants
16.15 – 17.15	c. Conclusions and discussion on the way forward on selecting and endorsing PPCM and SFP options	PCU/ICM
17.15 – 17.30	12. Closing	PCU

Annex C: Recommendations

Recommendations from the 1st Consultation Meeting on PPCM and SFP

25 – 26 September 2018

Cartagena, Colombia

1. Four preliminary, generic options for a possible PPCM were presented at the meeting to inspire discussions on the desirable formats and functionality of such PPCM. The consultancy will move forward with the development of 2 more detailed proposals for further discussion and consensus by countries based on the recommended functions and considerations articulated below
2. Incorporated in these new proposals should be elements of options 2 and 3, as well as the recommendations proposed by States and participants during the 2-day regional consultation. It should be noted that of the four options presented, Option 1 is considered to have too low an ambition (not even maintaining what exists now) and Option 4 is not considered feasible at this point (legally binding decision making and resources needed).
3. The participants request that during phase II of the Consultancy, the consultants incorporate, at the minimum, the following functionality in the development of the proposals for the PPCM:
 - a. **Functions from the SAP ICM MOU**
 - i. Monitoring & Evaluation of the CLME+ SAP and other critical ocean sustainability goals and commitments
 - ii. Communication, outreach and dissemination of information
 - iii. Data and information sharing
 - iv. Stakeholder engagement via the CLME+ Partnership
 - v. Identifying and addressing emerging issues
 - vi. Reporting back to their constituents
 - b. **Functions Proposed During the PPCM Consultation**
 - i. Joint programme development
 - ii. Resource mobilization
 - iii. Reach out to/support national ocean governance, including national level coordination for oceans
 - c. Any additional functions identified during Phase II of the consultancy deemed necessary to the successful functioning of a PPCM
4. The points detailed in the annex brought forward by the working groups are important considerations in formulating the revised proposals. These considerations include:
 - a. That a major focus of the PPCM could either be on programmatic coordination or on facilitating policy harmonization for integrated ocean governance / policy advice, or a mixture of both and clarified through the specification of the functions outlined above. The consultancy team will explore the formats that such coordination could take, as well as possible new names for the PPCM which will reflect these roles and mandates.
 - b. The PPCM must include active participation and engagement of CLME+ countries, with IGOs in a programme development role.

- c. Recommendations on how the PPCM should function/work
 - d. The understanding that the PPCM would undergo a progression towards enhanced functionality through a phased approach.
 - e. Proposed options should be adaptable
 - f. Propose an approach for implementing the PPCM
 - g. Learn from existing ICM experiences and successes
5. The PPCM should have a broad thematic scope from the onset, but should initially prioritize its thematic scope to the three key transboundary issues (pollution, habitat degradation and unsustainable fisheries), and the cross cutting issue of climate change¹.
 6. The PPCM should support the pursuit of a Blue Economy and DRR in the context of sustainable development.
 7. The PPCM should support countries to meet their international commitments (SDGs, Samoa Pathway, etc.)
 8. It is critical that the PPCM appropriately package and communicate its added value relative to the existing arrangements and to better articulate the costs and benefits to all stakeholders.
 9. The consultancy should present an overview and comparison of the existing functions of the ICM and the proposed functions of the PPCM

¹ Solutions to deal with the issues of pollution, habitat degradation and the unsustainability of fisheries should be robust and contribute to enhancing the resilience of the socio-ecological system in the face of climatic variability and change

Annex D: Summary of Working Group Discussions

Group A.

What do the countries want the PPCM to achieve?

1. Social, environmental, and economic sustainability of the CLME+ region

The formation of a PPCM should focus on guiding the work of countries and IGOs towards the goal of achieving social, environmental and economic sustainability consistent with the concept of the 'Blue Economy'. (Involving the concept of the Blue Economy would interest both high-level national engagement and the potential opportunities of attracting financing from expanding the scope beyond fisheries/environment to other sectors).

2. To balance the health and wealth of the ocean

Recognising the importance of the Blue Economy to the CLME+ region and the need to balance the health and wealth potential of the marine environment, the PPCM should take a key role in co-ordinating the plans, programmes and policies of the relevant sectors (to potentially include fisheries, environment, tourism, transport, oil, etc.). Linked with the expectations of the SDGs

3. To extend the policy-making capabilities of member countries

To assist the counties and regional/sub-regional IGOs develop, update and review policies to improve co-ordination and harmonisation, achieved by sharing and highlighting practice and experience from the region and beyond.

4. Scope should be broadened beyond fisheries and environment

The scope should be broadened to include all sectors that use, or impact on, the ocean space. The PPCM would need to co-ordinate with NICs at the national level to ensure engagement of the relevant sectors

5. PPCM to have the flexibility to respond to the priorities of the region.

The PPCM must have the flexibility to respond to the evolving needs/ priorities of the region and to recommend changes to scope (geographical, thematically) to the PPCM steering committee and countries as required.

6. Future pilot projects to test/demonstrate the PPCM in action resolving issues of competing interests/sectors

For consideration in a follow-on regional project to establish the PPCM. Specific countries with interests in sectors beyond the initial focus (fisheries/environment) could be identified to practically explore the impacts of expanding the scope of the PPCM (e.g. to include tourism, oil and gas sectors, etc.) and to test/demonstrate how the PPCM can contribute to the resolution of the issues between/among competing interests/sectors.

7. PPCM as an advisory body to high-level summits

The PPCM could be an advisory body to summits of the high level decision-makers (CARICOM, OECS, SICA), and/ or to bodies that attend such summits.

8. Analysis of roles/functions of existing IGOs

Determination of the exact role/ function of the PPCM and the most appropriate option (structure) would benefit from a full analysis of the roles of all the existing IGOs in order to identify gaps and redundancies, and to identify where (for example) additional IGOs should be invited to be part of the PPCM (to respond to future ambitions of expanding sector engagement).

Group B.What do the countries want the PPCM to achieve?

- The coordination mechanism builds on the objectives of the SAP and should review/advance the SAP.
- The coordination mechanism should effectively coordinate programmes, projects, activities within the framework of CLME+, relating to the geographical scope and the three thematic issues of the SAP.
- A transversal axis of the coordination mechanism should be the management and exchange of information.
- The coordination mechanism could facilitate coordination/cooperation at the sub-regional level and between neighbouring countries.
- The coordination mechanism should support coordination at the inter-institutional level at the national level (Government and private sector).
- The coordination mechanism should involve other sectors such as tourism - both public sector and operators (private sector), or marine transit, such as COCATRAM
- Policy coordination is required in the region - at the administrative/governmental level, and in relation to the 3 thematic areas of the SAP. The coordination mechanism could provide support to the countries towards a harmonization of policies.

Which option/structures are best suited to meeting the expectation of the PPCM?

- A structure according to regional and national realities is required.
- Seeing the global experiences will help in analyzing the options for the CLME+ region.
- The structure should be based on the functions, mission and indicators of the coordination mechanism.
- The coordination mechanism would be established in phases, initially with a technical mandate
- Political will is necessary, it is necessary to raise awareness among decision-makers
- The possible legal basis for the establishment of the coordinating mechanism should be investigated. Countries would not accept a completely new mechanism unrelated to the existing legal framework.
- Experiences from actions undertaken (programmes, projects) and bilateral or multilateral agreements between the countries on which they are based should be examined, e.g. at the Ministerial level (e.g. the Caribbean Biological Corridor).

How should the countries be represented in the PPCM?

- Country representation is required at the decision-making/strategic level.
- Direct representation of governments is required, as representatives of technical groups from each country, according to the issues addressed, and a steering committee composed of political actors from each country.
- The capacities of existing IGOs, their resources and financial capacity should be reviewed in relation to their roles related to the coordination mechanism.
- The representation of countries is different in different IGOs, so countries should be represented directly in the coordination mechanism, and not only through IGOs.
- Process, functions and objectives of the mechanism should be defined
- No new organization should be created.

Group C.

What do the countries want the PPCM to achieve?

- Discussion on what *coordination mechanism* means and decides that it would not be a policy making body, but a mechanism to bring blue economy initiatives and identify commonalities (analysis and discussion).
- The need for a PPCM was reconfirmed and emphasized in the discussion: appeal to political aspect; many IGOs exist in the region, the SAP was approved some years ago. Political circumstance change, but common governance issues remain change,
- Some options were not considered practicable, particularly Option 4.
- It was discussed that more clarity is needed on the policy spectrum that the PPCM's mandate would cover; institutional coordination vs. policy coordination
- The PPCM should be inclusive and involve stakeholders and users in its process, including civil society and sectors such as oil & gas, the private sector
- Joint programme development should be one function of the PPCM
- PPCM to assist IGOs in their programmes
- PPCM to do "Marketing for the CLME+ SAP"
- PPCM should build on national governance
- The PPCM's actions and communication should reach all stakeholder groups

Which option/structures are best suited to meeting the expectation of the PPCM?

- Option 4 is regarded difficult to implement (legally binding, no compliance mechanism), but some elements could be built into other options
- Communication expert/function (from option 4) is important for any PPCM structure/option
- Different governance agreements already exist in the region; discussion whether the PPCM to build on memorandum vs. political agreement
- Form follows functions – need to define the core functions
- Programme coordination influences policy
- More integrating options are needed
- Efficiency and coordination is key for the PPCM structure
- It was suggested that the PPCM would be a permanent programmatic coordination mechanism
- A need was identified for:
 - Mapping of all processes/pathways is needed to intensify gaps to be addressed by PPCM
 - Role of the PPCM to be seen in the context of the entire RGF
 - Establish what value added the coordination would bring, related to the blue economy
 - Define what type of coordination is needed, mindful that IGOs have their own agendas
 - Review the core functions of the organizations in order to harmonize them

Option 1 was considered to be below the existing interim coordination mechanism, option 2 and 3 were preferred but with a stronger role of countries.

How should the countries be represented in the PPCM?

- Role of countries is key and has to be assured in the final option, countries steering the PPCM
- Roles of the PPCM elements need to be clear – secretariat, committees etc.
- Create synergies among countries to endorse activities and act as final authority of the PPCM, countries need to be involved in the decision making, countries determine the IGO agendas