



Fourth Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue

12-13 November 2024

Original: English

Outcomes and Actions Report from the 4th Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue

CBFD4

Outcomes and Actions Report from the 4th Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue

Background

1. In August 2020, the First Regional Fisheries Ministers Meeting (RFMM1) endorsed a regional mechanism aimed at enhancing the engagement of civil society organisations (CSOs) and other non-state actors (para 16, Statement of Outcomes from RFMM1) to give effect to the decision of the Pacific Island Forum Leaders', made in September 2016, concerning coastal fisheries (as stated paragraph 10, 47th Leaders Communique).
2. The new mechanism involves convening a two-day dialogue on Community-Based Fisheries (CBF) within the Regional Technical Meeting on Coastal Fisheries and Aquaculture (RTMCFA). The dialogue, known as the Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue (CBFD), serves a primary objective:
 - a. providing the CSOs and other NSAs actively involved in community-based fisheries in the region, the platform to provide advice on key needs and issues associated coastal fisheries resources across the Pacific Island region. This is done through the RTMCFA to the Heads of Fisheries, to assist with informing regional fisheries ministers and Pacific leaders about priority issues associated with the sustainable access and use of coastal fisheries resources.
 - b. an avenue for CSOs and NSAs actively involved in community-based fisheries in the region to exchange experiences and lessons from community-based initiatives to strengthen efforts to maintain productive and healthy ecosystems, and their associated fisheries resources, which are critical to the wellbeing of over 10,000 coastal communities in the Pacific Island countries and territories.
 - c. fostering a dialogue with government and other partners on the management of coastal fisheries in the region.

Fourth Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue (CBFD4)

3. The Fourth Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue (CBFD4) was held on 12-13 November 2024 at the Holiday Inn in Suva, Fiji.
4. The CBFD4 was chaired by Ms Aydah Akao from Solomon Islands and supported by the Vice Convenor, Mr Niegel Rozet from Hawaii.
5. The CBFD4 focused on reviewing past CBFD activities, hearing the voice of the CSOs and NSAs, local surveillance and enforcement in the community-based fisheries context, traditional knowledge and practices in connection with the sea and resources, how small-grants become an effective mechanism to fund the contribution of CSOs to scaling CBFM, and the future outlook of the CBFD. The session topics were identified and designed based on the needs identified at the CBFD3 and each session was delivered through a mix of presentations, plenary, breakout group discussion, talanoa and panel discussions.

6. This report outlines the outcomes and action points of consensus among Cbfd4 participants highlighting priority issues and needs to be actioned by CSOs and other NSAs, SPC members, provide guidance to SPC's Coastal Fisheries and Aquaculture Programme (CFAP), and identify key recommendations to be taken to the 17th Heads of Fisheries Meeting and the Regional Fisheries Ministers Meeting in 2025.

Opening

7. The Convenor of the Fourth Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue officially opened the Cbfd4, with a prayer by the Tongan CSO representative.
8. The Cbfd4 recognised and emphasised the importance of the Cbfd platform as a means to hear the voice of communities and CSOs, and ensure those are integrated in decision-making by fisheries leaders at meetings like HOF and RFMM. The Cbfd emphasised the considerable progress the Cbfd has achieved to date and how this remains loyal to the original decision and endorsement from 47th PIF Leaders meeting in 2016 and later in the first regional fisheries ministers meeting (RFMM1) in 2020.

Session 1: Updates on Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue Activities

Brief updates on Cbfd3 reporting to HoF16 and RFMM5

9. The Cbfd4 noted and acknowledged the outstanding work carried out by the Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue Advisory Group (Cbfd-AG) in directing SPC, as the secretariat, on:
 - a. The identification and selection of the Cbfd4 participants.
 - b. The identification and selection of the Cbfd4 Convenor and Vice-Convenors and
 - c. The development of the Cbfd4 agenda.
10. The Cbfd4 acknowledged the reporting and endorsement process on the Cbfd3 Outcomes and Actions report to the Sixteenth SPC Heads of Fisheries Meeting (HoF16) and the Fifth Regional Fisheries Ministers Meeting (RFMM5). SPC and the Cbfd3 convenor presented the outcomes and the associated responses from HOF16 and RFMM5. HOF16 considered and endorsed all Cbfd3 (49a-d) recommendations and encouraged the Cbfd3 convenor and Cbfd AG to review these recommendations for clarity with regards to process.
11. Cbfd3 recommendations to HoF16 were presented and the HOF response to these recommendations included: "Considered and endorsed Cbfd3 recommendation to HOF16, 49(a), 49(b), 49(c), and 49 (d), and encouraged the Cbfd3 convenor and Cbfd Advisory Group to review these recommendations for clarity with regards to process"
12. Cbfd4 acknowledged that the Pacific is a global leader in ensuring integration of civil society voices. Cbfd4 also emphasised the continued importance of understanding the meaning of '**considered and endorsed**' and 'noted' in the responses to outcomes by HoF16 and RFMM5

respectively, and the need to review closer what responses and meaningful actions are undertaken. Cbfd4 recognised that the function of the Cbfd platform is to put forward recommendations that lead to action.

13. The Cbfd4 further emphasised the need on the side of Cbfd to formulate implementable meeting outcomes and recommendations, rather than risk accumulating outcomes to HOF and RFMM without meaningful action.
14. The Cbfd4 encouraged the use appropriate wording for outcomes and recommendations to HOF so as to promote action-oriented responses rather than ‘endorsement’ or ‘noting’ of recommendations and supports the Cbfd drafting group to facilitate this.
15. The Cbfd4 noted the need for tracking of recommendations to HOF, and requested the Cbfd-AG to include an annex to the outcomes document of each Cbfd meeting, to document all the recommendations over the last iterations and to report on the actions taken following approach to HOF and RFMM. This can provide monitoring of responses and actions taken to recommendations that have been put forward.

Updates from the Global Small-Scale Fisheries Summit

16. The Cbfd4 noted and acknowledged the outstanding work carried out by the Pacific representatives at the Global Small-scale Fisheries Summit held at the Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome, Italy on 5-7 July 2024:
17. The Cbfd4 acknowledged the importance of the *Pacific Framework for Action on Scaling up Community-based Fisheries Management: 2021–2025* as a regional document that stands in alignment with the global documents like The Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (SSF Guidelines). Pacific representatives reported on widespread challenges faced by countries to implement the SSF Guidelines (in the first 10 years of implementation), particularly in adequately gaining recognition of customary tenure and governance practices. Cbfd noted the critical role the Framework for Action plays in translating global directives into the Pacific context and vice versa alignment, and how the Pacific is one of only a few regions in the world where such alignment is explicit.
18. Cbfd4 encouraged the further consideration and discussion on the idea of
 - a. designating inshore zones to artisanal fishing use (zone out to 50-60 NM or other distance as appropriate to national context); whether this is relevant and implementable to Pacific small-scale fishers. Cbfd4 highlighted the value of learning from experiences from Palau (i.e including the artisanal fishing zone in 30x30 counts) and Cook Islands.
 - b. clarifying the definition of ‘region’ in policy, by separating the Pacific from the broader regional entity of the Asia-Pacific.

Session 2: Hearing the voice of the civil society organisations and the non-state actors

19. The Cbfd4 participants in each subregional breakout group identified the following CBF issues of importance or interest that are common across each sub-region:

Melanesia

- a. Community concerns and issues that are often raised at national level, are not translated to action or response.
- b. Funding and sustainable resourcing of CBF.
- c. Lack of capacity and information to implement management effectively.
- d. Enforcement of rules.
- e. Network of fishers are based on customary systems, and these are very different across countries, islands and the region – there is diversity in traditions, rather than an often assumed single ‘traditional way of doing things.’
- f. Cultivating ownership of management by communities - often it is externally driven, which limits communities feeling confident to make management adjustments.

Micronesia

- a. Lack of enforcement – legal systems do not prioritise conservation violations.
- b. Integrating traditional enforcement and authority.
- c. Losing traditional authority.
- d. There is a disconnect between legal and traditional laws: (i) Marine resource tenure and (ii) Token involvement of communities.
- e. Limited access and representation to remote islands.

Polynesia

- a. Government awareness raising of size limits – people do not have (or take note of) these rules.
 - b. Destructive fishing techniques still pervasive (and equipment).
 - c. No enforcement or surveillance of MPA.
 - d. Runoff and land-based development impact fisheries.
 - e. Lack of focal points for CBF issues – platform to communicate with the government.
 - f. Fishing tensions among communities.
 - g. Enforcement of bye laws and support by government to see enforcement through.
 - h. Insufficient alternative livelihood options for communities.
20. From the listed issues of importance, the Cbfd4 participants in each subregion identified two common CBF issues across their respective subregion, and had in-depth discussion on the two common CBF issues to identify and share the following (national and/or regional) actions/solutions:

Melanesia: two priority issues – (i) Funding and sustainable resourcing of CBF and (ii) Enforcement of rules.

- a. Actions thus far have focused on strengthening co-management and associated constitutional capacity.
- b. Recommended national actions – (i) simplify existing enforcement processes between government and communities, including reporting, processing claims, and enforcement. (ii) protect and empower community rights; (iii) map out who is doing what (i.e. clarify who to go to for what support).

Recommended regional actions – assist in better coordination among service delivery. Tailor information awareness relevant to local contexts, so as to make sure the information material is appropriate to context.

Micronesia: two priority issues – (i) There is a disconnect between legal and traditional laws, and (ii) Limited access and representation to remote islands

- a. Actions thus far have focused on (i) documenting traditional fisheries management practices, (ii) ways to share information to broad stakeholder groups, (iii) reviving traditional authorities, and (iv) ensuring that law reflects traditional practices (and vice versa).
- b. Recommended regional actions – (i) clear communication on all the above, (ii) provide resources to support activities and do so by learning with (and from) Polynesia and Melanesia.

Polynesia: two priority issues – (i) Lack of understanding at community level on fisheries regulations (size limits); (ii) Lack of MCS through dialogue.

- a. Actions thus far have focused on (i) providing training outreach, (ii) information and awareness through provision of existing information on what to do and what not to do, and (iii) development of management plans.
- b. Recommended regional actions – (i) provide funding for awareness raising, (ii) provide technical advice, (iii) digital platform for communities to exchange information and an in-person platform like this for in person exchange.

21. The Cbfd4 reflected on progress from the first iteration of Cbfd to now and raised the question on how change and impact in the issues can be ensured, and how the Cbfd is best able to fulfill its mandate. Tools that have been developed (e.g. Echoes of Oceania) have not been sufficiently mentioned so maybe efforts need to connect these platforms/action with practice.
22. Palau representative noted large investments in establishing a national MPA network and there are lessons in the experiences of this development, particularly how communities can

be left behind. Cbfd4 encouraged to learn from those lessons, and to think on how to make sure community participation is true and deep.

23. Cbfd4 noted that the Cbfd's primary mission is to hear the community voice. Global calls for climate change and biodiversity protection responses can override community calls over the importance of fisheries (e.g. as a main livelihood to people). Coastal fisheries as a priority, needs to be reflected in national budgets and actions by government on the ground.
24. **OUTCOME:** Cbfd4 recognises that its function is to put forward recommendations that lead to action. Cbfd4 emphasised their concern that there has been no meaningful action taken from recommendations to HOF and RFMM. Cbfd4 emphasises the importance of reviewing what responses and actions have been undertaken following recommendations.
25. **OUTCOME:** Cbfd4 acknowledges the considerable number of technical tools and amount of support material that has been developed in the region, however Cbfd4 emphasises the need for better and more widespread application of these.

Session 3: Local surveillance and enforcement

26. Cbfd4 recognised the persisting priority of improving MCS&E in CBF and, with that, the increasing focus on strengthening enforcement and compliance in CBF. Speaking of experiences in MCS&E for CBFM in a Talanoa session, common outcomes included:
 - a. Traditional rules are strongly connected to people's connections to land and sea, which in turn are determined by customary tenure systems. Rules and processes are in place that address poaching, which are enforced based on tenure boundaries.
 - b. In Melanesia 'tabu' is central (and a well-known concept among people) to customary governance and a basis to establishing access rules.
 - c. Many national laws are enforced through communities (by traditional meetings and authorities, e.g. fishing by underwater breathing apparatus or fishing without licence). Communities and their way of enforcing rules form a first point by which rules and regulations are implemented and how.
 - d. Traditionally and by state law, people may only fish for certain kinds of fish at certain times of the year, however compliance remains a challenge.
 - e. Over time and generations, ideas about prohibiting dynamite fishing or using traditional poison fishing techniques (i.e. cyanide fishing) have become integrated in traditional rules and norms, and therefore more difficult to discourage if much of the rest of the management tends to strengthen traditional practices.
 - f. The government is the most legitimate law holder, and while communities have agency on the ground often there remains a disparity between abilities to enforce laws/rules.
27. Cbfd4 noted the challenges, risks and opportunities in communities taking a more active role in MCS&E, including:

- a. Total bans on protected species harvests (like turtle) can conflict with traditional practices. Preventing customary ceremonies stands to create opposition to fisheries management more broadly.
 - b. People need income and food, and do so through marine resource use. Non-compliance to restrictive rules is often linked to these driving forces. Considerations for alternative livelihoods offer ways to address this.
 - c. Sole focus on information provision does not guarantee compliance. Many cases exist of high non-compliance even though people are aware of rules. Non-compliance in such cases are reflective of little sense of ownership over rules and responsibilities.
- a. Community based surveillance should be in harmony with law enforcement authorities. The importance of building on community-based monitoring to support effective MCS&E. Government has mandate to pass law, however, to enable effective MCS&E in communities, communities should play meaningful roles in providing evidence for those laws to be actioned.
 - b. Bottom-up approaches are true to the objective of participation: focus on community-based driven fisheries as a key pathway towards sustainability nationally, and so too effective MCS&E.
28. The Cbfd4 recognised the importance of human rights perspectives. While these principles form a strong basis for bottom up MCS&E, there is also recognition that human rights claims by individuals or specific groups can at times also compromise communal/collective shared stewardship sustainability objectives in a community communal setting. This poses challenges in balancing individual versus collective interests and rights.
29. The Cbfd4 emphasised foundation principles for community based MCS&E, to include: (i) collective wellbeing is a shared goal but also a shared responsibility (through MCS&E), (ii) “take only what you need while considering future generations’ needs”, (iii) always maintain consideration for others in harvesting marine resources, (iv) maintain respect for each other and our living environment, and (v) communities’ ways of dealing with conflicts and compliance are a critical first line of enforcement and/or resolution (allowing appreciation of local cultural sensitivities).
30. **OUTCOME:** Cbfd4 recognises the persisting priority of MCS&E in CBF and identified foundational principles for community based MCS&E to improve implementation, including:
- a. collective wellbeing is a shared goal but also a shared responsibility,
 - b. ‘take only what you need’ while considering future generations’ needs,
 - c. always consider others in harvesting marine resources,
 - d. maintain respect for each other and our living environment, and
 - e. communities’ ways of dealing with conflicts and compliance are a critical first line of enforcement

Session 4: Honouring our elders through listening, learning and knowing their story of place

31. The Cbfd4 recognised the loss of traditional knowledge and practices in the Pacific, and the importance of transfer of knowledge to younger generations. It emphasised the urgency in addressing this challenge given the passing of last knowledge holders among our elders.
32. The Cbfd4 emphasised the role of traditional knowledge holders and the need to value them and compensate them for any transfer of knowledge they are enabling. The Cbfd4 recognised the value that traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) holds locally and the many rules and norms determining how transfer of knowledge across groups may occur. Considering this, appreciation is critical to balancing the risks of monetising/commodifying TEK with the need to fairly and appropriately compensate custodians of knowledge (economically or otherwise).
33. **OUTCOME:** Cbfd4 recognises the value of traditional knowledge, skills and practices in the Pacific, and the importance of transfer of knowledge to younger generations. It emphasises the urgency of addressing this challenge given the loss of traditional knowledge among our elders.

Session 5: How could small-grants become effective mechanisms to fund the contributions of civil society organisations to scaling CBFM?

34. The Cbfd4 urged community small grants programmes to be further developed and to recognise the challenges (i) communities face in developing proposals, implementation planning, and reporting, and (ii) for grant managing agencies in ensuring appropriate coordination. Co-design of small grants programmes is critical and should consider mentoring and training mechanisms for grantees to ensure lasting capacity in communities to be able to engage in small grant programmes into the future. Similarly mentoring and training mechanisms are needed for grantors to understand the Pacific reality on the ground and how programmes need to tailor to that.
 - a. Examples of capacity development for grantees:
 - i. Financial management
 - ii. Implementation planning and project management
 - iii. Reporting
 - b. Examples of capacity development for grantors:
 - i. Cultural Pacific framing, and understanding Pacific realities on the ground (communication and infrastructure, literacy etc).

- ii. Building on experience from existing small grant programmes regarding what works in the Pacific context to improve processes of co-design.
35. **OUTCOME:** CBF4 notes that community small grants programmes need to be further developed and to recognise (i) the challenges communities face in developing proposals, implementation planning, and reporting; (ii) the challenges for grant managing agencies to ensure appropriate coordination and compliance to donor requirements.

Session 6: Future outlook of community-based fisheries dialogue

36. The CBF4 discussed and agreed on clarifying/updating what the CBF4's function is moving forward, particularly considering the experience of CBF4 functioning over the last four years and understanding that resourcing uncertainty exists into the future.
- a. Functions of CBF4 in service of communities (inward function)
 - i. To allow for cross exchange and sharing of knowledge – having country focal points in place is critical to this, but also considering use of technology.
 - ii. To serve as a mechanism for accountability, ensuring commitments are achieved.
 - iii. To help align civil society actions and national strategies/policy directives, and make sure those align with regional strategies/directives.
 - iv. To help gain consensus around an agreed voice from Pacific communities on certain matters.
 - b. Functions of CBF4 in representing Pacific community voice (outward function)
 - i. To bring the Pacific innovations and achievements to global platforms.
 - ii. To provide advice and guidance to government programmes through communicating outcomes of CBF4 meetings.
 - iii. To advocate to our governments the importance of building on community capacities in management.
 - iv. To bring forward issues that are beyond communities' ability to solve – to advocate for efforts to address these.
37. The CBF4 discussed and agreed on clarifying/updating how the CBF4 should function moving forward, to make sure it is able to function as intended into the future, particularly considering the experience of CBF4 functioning over the last four years and understanding that resourcing uncertainty exists into the future. For this the CBF4 considered actions across three main areas, organisational, resourcing, and human capital considerations:
- a. Organisational considerations to make sure CBF4 functions well into the future:

- i. There is a need to have better visibility of CBF4 in national levels; to improve awareness of the CBF4's function and to show the added value for national government programmes in engaging with the CBF4.
 - ii. Make sure the in-country preparation processes are adequate to ensure CBF4 representatives at meetings are prepared with issues defined by broader stakeholder groups in their subregion.
 - iii. Encourage presentations by CBF4 representatives to present on status per subregion at the beginning of CBF4 meetings.
 - iv. Clear articulation of roles of observers and partners in the meeting as part of the terms of reference.
 - v. Selection criteria for CBF4 participants reflective of who we want CBF4 participants to be.
- b. Resourcing considerations to make sure CBF4 functions well into the future:
- i. Considerations for frequency of face-to-face meetings to make it cost effective, given funding and resourcing (consider combinations of face-to-face and virtual meetings).
 - ii. Consideration for funding or in-kind contributions by government agencies.
 - iii. Considerations for cost sharing of meetings by relevant country projects.
- c. Maintaining human relations considerations to make sure CBF4 functions well into the future:
- i. Establish a CBF4 FB page and WhatsApp group.
 - ii. Consider hosting the meeting across the region with a rotating hosting responsibility across subregions.
 - iii. Utilise internet-based platforms for sharing experiences and information to improve practices in the country.
38. The CBF4 noted the value of holding the meeting prior to RTMCFA and in a separate format to RTMCFA, with frequency and venue considerations as noted above.
39. The CBF4 acknowledged the positive outcomes from selection processes in-country for CBF4 representatives. Experience from selection of the Polynesia representative contributed to processes in Samoa that resulted in a memorandum of understanding (MoU) between CSOs and government being established.
40. **OUTCOME:** CBF4 emphasises the function of CBF4 moving forward as being to:

- a. enable support and information sharing that strengthens communities' roles in coastal fisheries management (regional platform to increase knowledge, learning, and awareness);
- b. provide an avenue for Pacific CSOs' and communities' voices to be represented and to call for action on global learning platforms and regional policy platforms.

Session 7: Fifth Community-Based Fisheries Dialogue (CBFD5) Agenda

41. The CBFD agreed on the following topics to be discussed at the Fifth Community-Based Fisheries dialogue (CBFD5)

- a. Enforcement at the community-level
 - Processes for enforcing laws (e.g. collecting evidence, identifying support channels, and understanding relevant legislations).
 - Balancing individual versus collective interests and rights in community-based fisheries, particularly within communal settings.
 - Addressing challenges related to the lack of prioritisation of conservation violations within the legal system.
 - Addressing the loss of traditional authority and the disconnect between legal systems and customary laws.
 - Sharing compliance and enforcement initiatives implemented in the region (e.g., community justice systems).
- b. Information and awareness:
 - Techniques for achieving effective behavioural change.
 - Addressing gaps in community understanding of government rules and regulations (e.g., reasons for size limits).
 - Promoting and socialising *Echoes of Oceania* and other available management tools and materials.
 - Presenting case studies on the application and impact of these tools in various contexts.
- c. Updates and tracking of CBFD actioned outcomes (CBFD1–CBFD4)
 - Sharing country and subregional updates where available.
 - Highlighting actioned outcomes and their alignment with the *Pacific Framework for Action on Scaling up Community-Based Fisheries Management: 2021–2025*.

CBFD4 Actions:

42. The CBFD4 agreed on the following actions:

- a. **Tracking of recommendations to HOF and RFMM:** The CBFD requested CBFD-AG to include an annex to the outcomes document of each CBFD meeting, to document all the recommendations to HOF and RFMM over the last iterations and to report on the actions taken.
- b. **Increase connection between regional CBFM support and local practice:** CBFD meetings to be used to update on what tools information are available, thereby ensuring technical tools are used in practice. CBFD representatives to increase awareness and visibility of CBFD at national scale.
- c. **Integration of foundational principles for MCS&E in CBF contexts:** The CBFD4 urges initiatives to make explicit reference to building on these principles in any community MCS&E initiative.
- d. **Strengthening MCS&E in communities:** The CBFD4 encourages national agencies to further invest in information and awareness on legislation to ensure people are adequately informed on why rules and regulations exist
- e. **Learning platforms:** The CBFD4 emphasises the critical importance of continued learning through platforms like CBFD to bring lessons from elsewhere to country.
- f. **Preserving traditional ecological knowledge (TEK):** CBFD4 urges fisheries leaders to (i) add to existing national efforts in preserving TEK related to CF (including bridging TEK with science), (ii) integrate both youth and elders together into fisheries work to ensure transfer of TEK, and (iii) coordinate with education and environment departments around sharing information.
- g. **Intergenerational knowledge transfer:** CBFD4 identifies the need to value and appropriately compensate traditional knowledge holders for their role in transferring knowledge. It is critical here to balance the risks of monetising TEK with the need to fairly compensate custodians of knowledge.
- h. **Small grant programmes for CBF:** CBFD4 urges the need to further develop these opportunities and within those for mentoring and training mechanisms for:
 - i. grantees (to ensure lasting capacity in communities to be able to engage in small grant programmes into the future);
 - ii. grantors (to understand the Pacific reality on the ground and how programmes need to tailor to that while aligning to development targets).
- i. **Continued CBFD functioning:** CBFD4 proposes actions and measures to be taken by CSOs and community representatives to strengthen (i) organisational, (ii) resourcing,

and (iii) social capital aspects that are critical to Cbfd continuing its function into the future.

The 17th SPC Heads of Fisheries Meeting:

43. The Cbfd4 agreed the following recommendations for the Seventeenth SPC Heads of Fisheries meeting:
 - a. The Cbfd4 notes that community small grants programmes need to be further developed and to recognise (i) the challenges communities face in developing proposals, implementation planning, and reporting; (ii) the challenges for grant managing agencies to ensure appropriate coordination and compliance to donor requirements
 - b. The Cbfd4 recognises that its function is to put forward recommendations that lead to action. Cbfd4 emphasised their concern that there has been no meaningful action taken from recommendations to HOF and RFMM. Cbfd4 emphasises the importance of reviewing what responses and actions have been undertaken following recommendations.
 - c. The Cbfd4 acknowledges the considerable number of technical tools and amount of support material that has been developed in the region, however emphasises the need for better and more widespread application of these.

Session 9: Closing

44. The Convenor, Ms Aydah Akao, warmly thanked all the participants of the Cbfd4, the Cbfd-AG and SPC FAME for a successful completion of Cbfd4 and closed the dialogue.