



14th SPC Heads of Fisheries Meeting
14–17 June 2022



Pacific
Community
Communauté
du Pacifique

Original: English

Information paper 13

Breakout session feedback on WP6: Regional Aquaculture Assessment, and Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy

FAME Secretariat

Overview

1. This paper provides the results of the of the respective Breakout group (BOG) session on WP6: Regional Aquaculture Assessment, and Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy held during 14th SPC Heads of Fisheries meeting, 14-17 June 2022.

Background information

2. A Regional Aquaculture Assessment has been conducted in response to the stated need of the PICTs to address numerous challenges that continue to deny the Pacific region the long- term benefits that can be derived from the development of sustainable aquaculture. These challenges are limiting the extent of the contribution of the aquaculture sector to employment, food security, livelihoods, environmental protection, and economic growth.
3. The main finding in the Assessment is that the Pacific aquaculture sector has great socio-economic value and economic potential but remains largely under-developed. There are many reasons for this, and they are not limited only to matters of technical capacity.
4. Next step is implementation of HoF13 Decision 13(c) to develop the new regional aquaculture strategy. This requires a process that is as inclusive and consultative as possible (taking into account adaptive measures regarding the on-going COVID-19 pandemic) and which has been endorsed by members.

What we wanted to get out of the Breakout session

5. The breakout session engaged delegates to discuss and get their perspectives on the suggested process identified in WP6 - paragraphs 18 to 19 for the delivery of the Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy, particularly on the inclusiveness and the consultative process undertaken despite the on-going COVID-19 related travel restrictions.
6. The session also sought the delegates view and input on further suggestions and improvements that should be considered to help ensure an inclusive and consultative process

Breakout group arrangement

7. The breakout groups were facilitated by FAME staff and organised as per table below. The outcomes of the discussions captured are consolidated and tabulated from pages 3 onward.

Breakout groups	BOG 1	BOG 2	BOG3	BOG 4	BOG 5
	In-person				
Facilitators	Julia-Anne Kerandel Pauline Bosserelle	Ian Freeman Ariella D’Andrea	Ian Bertram Watisoni Lalavanua	George Shedrawi Andy Halford	Malo Hosken Elena Shishkova
Notetakers	Solene Devez Sebastien Gislard	Carolina Garcia Imhof Valentina Spinedi	Tupeope Samani Richard Veeran	Collette Brown Marino Wichman	Hannah Gilchrist Priya Rachna
Members/ observers	France Nouvelle-Calédonie Polynésie française Wallis et Futuna	Fiji, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Samoa <i>Observers Conservation International & Pacific Islands Forum secretariat</i>	American Samoa, New Zealand, Tokelau, Tuvalu & Vanuatu <i>Observers LMMA Network, SPREP & WPRFMC</i>	Australia, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, United States of America <i>Observers ANCORS, Our Fish Our Future & Pacific Networks</i>	Cook Islands, Niue, Palau. <i>Observers cChange, TNC, WCPFC & NIWA</i>



Vos commentaires sur les sessions de groupes de discussion 1	
Questions guidant la discussion :	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Le processus proposé aux paragraphes 18 et 19 du document de travail 6 concernant l'élaboration de la Stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique est-il inclusif et consultatif, et tient-il compte des restrictions de voyage liées à la COVID-19 encore en vigueur ? 2. Quelles autres suggestions et améliorations doivent être envisagées pour que le processus soit inclusif et consultatif ? 	
Extrait du document de travail 6, paragraphes 18 et 19	Suggestions et améliorations proposées
18. Les conclusions de l'évaluation régionale de l'aquaculture et les orientations, objectifs, priorités et processus futurs qui s'en dégagent contribueront aux consultations avec les membres et les parties prenantes dans le cadre de l'élaboration de la Stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique.	
19. Est présentée ci-dessous une proposition de processus et de calendrier visant à affiner et à parachever une stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture à moyen et à long terme au profit des États et Territoires insulaires océaniques.	
À partir de juin 2022 :	
i. Présentation à la HoF14, par la Division FAME de la CPS, d'une proposition de processus et de calendrier en vue de l'élaboration de la Stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique, pour discussion, modification et approbation par les membres.	
ii. Recherche par la CPS de financements et de soutien de bailleurs sur la base de la décision des directeurs des pêches.	
iii. Lancement du processus par la CPS, au moyen de contacts avec les services des pêches au sein des États et Territoires insulaires océaniques pour les informer des prochaines étapes, à savoir :	
De juin à octobre 2022 (entre la HoF14 et la RTMCFA5)	<i>Point de vigilance sur la faisabilité du calendrier dans le délai très restreint juin-octobre.</i>
iv. Consultations initiales en ligne avec des agents des services et des divisions chargés de l'aquaculture.	



<p>v. Recherche (et obtention) d'un accord en vue d'une analyse des besoins et des orientations internes à l'échelle des pays en vue de la Stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique, et nomination d'un point de contact au sein de chaque pays membre pour les consultations avec les parties prenantes.</p>	
<p>vi. Recensement des parties prenantes clés, primaires et secondaires, mené à bien par les points de contact en collaboration avec la CPS (séances de réflexion).</p>	<p><i>Pour la traduction française, remplacer les terminologies « primaires » et « secondaires » par « directes » et « indirectes » (jugé moins dépréciatif). Les territoires soulignent l'importance de la définition des parties prenantes directes (privés, organisations professionnelles, communautés, autorités coutumières...) et indirectes (chambres consulaires, autorités compétentes, autorités locales, organismes scientifiques, organismes de formation, ONG etc.).</i></p> <p>Polynésie française: Mieux définir les parties prenantes pour éviter "d'oublier" certains acteurs.</p> <p>Wallis et Futuna: S'assurer que les points focaux puissent bien définir les parties prenantes au sein de chaque territoire, avec l'assistance de la CPS.</p> <p>Polynésie française: privés et organisation professionnelles doivent être recensés en premier puis les parties prenantes secondaires.</p> <p>PS : Sera présente en visioconférence lors des consultations.</p>
<p>vii. Consultations avec les parties prenantes. Les points de contact des membres peuvent entamer des consultations si celles-ci se limitent à une série d'entretiens individuels. Dans les grands États et Territoires insulaires océaniques dans lesquels les activités aquacoles sont plus complexes, les points de contact organisent des ateliers d'une journée, si besoin, avec l'aide de facilitateurs recrutés par la CPS. Les parties prenantes secondaires implantées dans les pays participent aux consultations.</p>	<p><i>Organisation d'une première consultation avec les parties prenantes directes puis d'une autre consultation avec les différents groupes des parties prenantes indirectes.</i></p> <p><i>La CPS et/ou les consultants engagés par la CPS doivent être présents en visioconférence pour appuyer ces consultations.</i></p> <p><i>Un point de vigilance est souligné sur la capacité des territoires à mobiliser les parties prenantes locales sur une courte période. En effet, il est nécessaire de prévenir les parties prenantes locales en amont pour donner la possibilité à tous de participer.</i></p>



<p>viii. Organisation, dans des lieux centralisés, de trois ateliers sous-régionaux (dans un format hybride, en personne et en ligne, de sorte à garantir le caractère inclusif), le but étant de consolider les résultats des consultations menées à l'échelle nationale et d'impliquer les parties prenantes secondaires implantées à l'échelle sous-régionale.</p>	<p>Nouvelle-Calédonie : Il serait utile que la CPS transmette une compilation des résultats des consultations par sous-région aux pays avant les ateliers.</p> <p><i>Points de vigilance :</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Un atelier aquaculture organisé par PROTEGE est en discussion pour le mois d'octobre 2022 et il mobilisera les 3 territoires (PF, NC, WF).</i> - <i>L'atelier PROTEGE doit être réalisé avant l'atelier sous-régional FAME.</i> <p><i>Pour l'atelier aquaculture PROTEGE, il est primordial de mobiliser les acteurs PROTEGE ainsi que le personnel de FAME spécialisé en aquaculture pour permettre une transversalité entre les divisions/ projets travaillant sur des thématiques similaires.</i></p>
<p>ix. Compilation par la CPS des conclusions de ces trois ateliers dans une version préliminaire de la Stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique, distribuée à tous les États et Territoires insulaires océaniques pour commentaires.</p>	
<p>x. Intégration d'une séance d'examen et de validation de la version préliminaire de la stratégie dans le cadre de la 5e Conférence technique régionale sur les pêches côtières et l'aquaculture (RTMCFA5), à la suite de laquelle des modifications sont apportées au document en tant que de besoin.</p>	
<p>D'octobre 2022 à mars 2023 (entre la RTMCFA5 et la HoF15)</p>	
<p>xi. Distribution à tous les membres de la CPS de la version préliminaire de la Stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique ainsi que d'une note d'orientation y afférente aux fins de redistribution en interne à toutes les parties prenantes, qui formulent au besoin des commentaires, ces derniers étant inclus dans les documents finaux de l'avant-projet.</p>	
<p>xii. Présentation à la HoF15 de la version préliminaire de la Stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique ainsi que d'une version provisoire de la note d'orientation de la CPS sur l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique pour dernier examen et approbation.</p>	
<p>De mars à juillet 2023 (entre la HoF15 et la 4^e Conférence régionale des ministres des Pêches)</p>	



<p>xiii. Présentation de la Stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique et de la note d'orientation de la CPS y afférente approuvées par la HoF15 à la 4e Conférence régionale des ministres des Pêches pour approbation.</p>	
<p>xiv. Lancement de la Stratégie régionale pour l'aquaculture dans le Pacifique dans toute la région, assorti d'une couverture médiatique et de publicité.</p>	<p><i>S'assurer de l'envoi de la stratégie à tous les partenaires régionaux directs et indirects pour information (FAO, NACA, OIE, PROE etc.).</i></p>
<p>xv. Mise en œuvre de la Stratégie par les membres, avec l'aide des institutions et partenaires régionaux.</p>	

<p>Feedbacks from the Breakout groups 2, 3, 4, 5 Discussion-guiding questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the suggested process identified in WP6, paragraphs 18 to 19 for the delivery of the Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy represent an inclusive and consultative process, taking into account the on-going COVID-19 related travel restrictions? 2. What further suggestions and improvements should be considered to help ensure an inclusive and consultative process? 	
<p>Text excerpt from WP6, paragraphs 18-19</p>	<p>Proposed suggestions and improvements</p>
<p>18. The output from the Regional Aquaculture Assessment and its suggested future directions, objectives, priorities, and processes, will inform the consultations with members and stakeholders towards the development of a Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy.</p>	<p>Australia: Plenary made it clear, assessment is one step in the process. Add a word/line to say that this report is not the sole source (output of the assessment).</p> <p>United States: When discussion raised at Reg. Tech. Meeting. Feedback from member countries, there may be priorities that conflict or present challenges, (e.g. focussing on protein). Strategy part makes sense but there needs to be both a short-term and long-term approach, taking sustainability into consideration. Key to having effective infrastructure and capacity is making support available to them.</p> <p>Kiribati: The development of the Regional Aquaculture Strategy, it should be complementary with existing aquaculture strategies in place, e.g. FAO Strategy. It should be collaborative.</p> <p><i>In terms of consultative process, taking into account travel restrictions: suggest consultants seem to target only the Gov. Authorities. Proposes a</i></p>



	<p><i>national consultant to undertake the assignment, they should be responsible for collecting missing feedback from communities.</i></p> <p>United States: In event of continued COVID travel restrictions, it will be important to identify specific needs of each country, to carry out and plan, workshops and F2F meetings, working closely with local stakeholders. If outside consultants cannot travel, we need to work with local leaders/officials to deliver in-country activities.</p> <p>SPC: Point well taken on planning for in-country delivery if travel restrictions continue.</p> <p>Marshall Islands: agrees with Kiribati's comments regarding having a means to include non-government stakeholders during assessments to get their feedback as well. Also, as it was mentioned earlier in plenary about full participation in subregional networks, and it would be of interest from RMI's side if a study could be done with regards to the membership investments into the network if it is enough to carry out the work that is required and expected of from the members (country capacity)</p> <p><i>Look at national plans/strategies and support updating them. Have the regional strategy and then start consultations at national levels with all relevant stakeholders (associations, people affected by aquaculture).</i></p> <p><i>Take into consideration timelines of national processes.</i></p> <p><i>Need for funding? Other support (e.g. in-country support for consultations)?</i></p>
<p>19. Below is a suggested process and timeline to further develop and finalise a mid- to long-term Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy for the PICTs:</p>	<p>SPC partnering with non-state actors to provide capacity and support to countries to see the activity to completion</p> <p>Vanuatu – endorse the steps – agreed by the group</p> <p>Cook Islands: need for viability and feasibility assessment to ensure we chose activities that can be sustained in long-term, particularly touching on markets and trade. Not all aqua activities have commercial value, some have livelihoods and food security importance, they also need to remain sustainable. Important to consider in any strategy or plans.</p>



<p>From June 2022 onwards:</p>	
<p>i. SPC FAME presents to HoF14 a suggested process and timeline for development of the Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy, for discussion, amendment, and confirmation by members.</p>	<p>Sharing initially the consultation plan and look for endorsement from countries before moving on</p> <p>Vanuatu finds the steps to be quite very clear and endorses the steps.</p> <p>Cook Islands: note comments need more time to review. 2-week timeframe might be too short.</p> <p>United States: 5,6&7 may need more detail on specific issues, don't want open ended agendas and results in conflicting need and requests that a difficult to incorporate into a regional strategy. Outline some general areas that need to be addressed in a regional strategy.</p> <p>SPC: two strategies, put pathways in place for commercial practice and its SPC views to support commercial considering the attractiveness in the region.</p>
<p>ii. Funding and the support of donor partners is sought by SPC based on the HoF decision.</p>	<p>Cook Islands: SPC has a few partners and knows who the right partners are. Any partners should support member driven activities and needs, and they remain mindful of this. Be aware of history of donor-driven activities.</p> <p>Tuvalu: budget would a concern noting the geographical spread of islands within member countries. Would require a lot of resources and time.</p> <p><i>Timeline is ambitious and national agencies already have their own work plans to fulfil.</i></p> <p>American Samoa: agrees with TV. Would require funding. Very limited aquaculture development in country but need expertise to expand on this opportunity. Geographical spread of islands which will a critical factor affecting the timeline and resources required.</p> <p><i>Need funding support from donors, need expertise from SPC, other developed countries</i></p>
<p>iii. SPC to initiate the process by contacting fisheries departments in PICT governments and administrations, to advise as to the next steps which are:</p>	



<p>June to October 2022 (HoF14 to RTMCFA5)</p>	<p><i>Timeline might be a bit tight</i></p> <p>WPRFMC – developing regulating and monitoring system, still in process towards implementation. Long-standing work since 2009. Successes/lessons include – engaging with communities, virtual forum doesn't work everywhere.</p> <p>Consider modalities of consultation to ensure that we can get input from all relevant stakeholders effectively. A one-size-fits-all approach would not work. Consider online surveys, paper surveys, using existing apps. Make assessment links publicly available.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How to conduct assessment 2. The lead time and general time needed to undertake the work - be pragmatic and realistic.
<p>iv. Initial virtual consultations with individuals in aquaculture departments and divisions;</p>	<p>Cook Islands: There is an opportunity to identify parties to consult in next step – SPC has address book to use. Could do an initial survey, a lot of work done in initial assessment could be put forward to primary stakeholders, during this could identify other stakeholders who might be open to follow up calls.</p> <p><i>Identify focal points – bear in mind time limitations at the national level (fisheries/aquaculture departments)</i></p> <p>Guam: agree with comments on engaging with more stakeholders during process. Virtual consultation was not sufficient, need to find other avenues to get wider input – across the region and Guam particularly. Consider in-person consultation (could be a challenge). 2-3months (sometimes over a month) lead time needed for planning with other stakeholders. For government within a month should be fine.</p> <p>Tuvalu: SPC to collaborate with non-state actors to deliver on this activity</p> <p>New Zealand: Consultation with stakeholders and focal points needs to be meaningful and effective, giving it enough time to ensure consultation is valuable and not done too quickly</p>



American Samoa: meaningful capacity enhancement training with measured outcomes.

Have stakeholder consultations to be adaptable or flexible as it would differ with each country.

Suggest the Country FP's start raising these regional strategy matters when they have specific national aquaculture meetings to link it up.

LMMA: Consultations to consider also private sectors, community-based farmers, cooperatives and government partners already involved with aquaculture. Some may already have organized meetings & workshops

FAO: include aquaculture-related research institutions where available in country

Vanuatu: PPP engagement

Look at possibilities to include financial/lending institutions in these sectoral development discussions.

Consider business training for new entrants

SPC: Points taken, we will continue to work through member requests.

United States: 5,6&7: Could be a little bit more specific on issues that can be addressed in a regional strategy could be noted. Open ended agendas can present conflicting needs, making it difficult to turn into regional strategy/statements.

SPC: 2 different strategies, commercial aquaculture. Does have a role but SPC supports the former (Jamie....)

Kiribati: in agreement with process but timeline may be too short.



	<p>Niwa: agreement with Kiribati. Timeframe seems too ambitious/too short. Is funding needed to implement strategies? If funding needed, timeline needs to be extended.</p>
<p>v. Agreement sought (and obtained) for in-country needs and direction analysis for the Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy and appointment of a government focal point for stakeholder consultations in each member.</p>	<p><i>Focal point to identify the needs</i></p> <p>Guam: don't see obstacles in accepting regional strategy</p> <p>Marshall Islands: is in agreement with Kiribati's comments regarding having a means to include non-government stakeholders during assessments to get their feedback as well. Also, as it was mentioned earlier in plenary about full participation in subregional networks, and it would be of interest from RMI's side if a study could be done with regards to the membership investments into the network if it is enough to carry out the work that is required and expected of from the members</p>
<p>vi. Identification of key stakeholders, both primary and secondary, carried out by focal point/s with SPC (brainstorming sessions).</p>	<p><i>People affected by aquaculture, associations, extension officers, local governments, partners, village communities. Provide the opportunity to all interested in having a say.</i></p> <p>United States: Ensuring primary stakeholders are prioritised during consultations and not being as prescriptive with methods.</p> <p>NIWA: identification of key stakeholders could be more fleshed out</p> <p>Cook Islands: Aside from SPC address book, there are other people who could help put together stakeholders for this consultation process</p>
<p>vii. Consultations with stakeholders. The member focal point/s can undertake consultations if limited to a series of individual interviews. In larger PICTs with more complex aquaculture activities, the focal points conduct one day workshops assisted, if necessary, by facilitators recruited by SPC. Country based secondary stakeholders are included in the consultations.</p>	<p><i>How to conduct consultations with small stakeholders, like families conducting small aquaculture projects.</i></p> <p><i>National consultations will be different in different countries.</i></p> <p><i>Working in partnerships with associations (when appropriate/if existent/if active and supported by individual farmers) - supporting associations/clusters if not strong enough?</i></p> <p><i>Individual interviews only? Not group discussions.</i></p>



Country Focal point may need assistance for consultation of meetings

Budget

(Do we have local consultants in country to assist??)

Focal points to have meaningful capacity enhancement training at sub-regional level to do this work consultation with stakeholders and focal points needs to be meaningful and effective, giving it enough time to ensure consultation is valuable and not done too quickly

Be flexible with stakeholder consultations, different amongst countries and national focal points will advise on best way to do this

Suggest that country focal points start raising these regional strategy matters when they have specific national aquaculture meetings

Consultations to consider also private sectors (including markets, processing), community-based farmers, cooperatives, public and private partnerships, and government partners already involved with aquaculture

How to consider or involve financing industries e.g. banks – part of consultations etc

Consider business training for new entrants

Australia: Building on US and Kiribati comments, Perhaps too prescriptive with methods, could replace with statement with what we want to get out of consultations to suit specific contexts of each country, drawing on lessons from COVID.

Include regional institutions and partners in stakeholders.

Australia: Roman Number: 7/8 too prescriptive about the methods, replace with a statement about what we want to get out of the consultation. And let that process have a natural development depending on the circumstance.



	<p>Remove specific reference on the consultation process and rather country specific approach.</p> <p>Vanuatu: identify who these stakeholders are, spell them out.</p> <p>Cook Islands: accessing stakeholders on atolls is challenging as don't have access to transport. Also have low bandwidth so communications and encouraging their participation is difficult. Need to think more about how to approach this, one option could be a paper based or SPC developing a survey to transfer to tablets for fisheries officers to conduct. Unlikely they will read the assessment, so need to present this carefully to get good inputs. Elections also coming up through to August, therefore working with reduced capacity. Flying is not an option. Ensure language is accessible, reducing technical language where possible.</p> <p>WPFRMC: virtual planforms not very successful for rural communities.</p> <p>Cook Islands: Consider modalities for consultation, a common approach may not work for everyone.</p>
<p>viii. Three sub-regional workshops (hybrid in-person/virtual format to ensure inclusiveness) convened in geographically central locations to consolidate the results of the in-country consultations, and to involve sub-regionally based secondary stakeholders.</p>	<p><i>Agree on some level of standardisation into the consultation process?</i></p> <p>Kiribati: How will the regional workshops be determined? E.g., will they be organised by ethnicity? Micronesian, Melanesian, Polynesian?</p> <p>NIWA: workshops should work closely with the CBFM workshops and key stakeholders of CBFM</p> <p>Cook Islands: Workshops might be useful but timeframe between Jun and Oct may be too ambitious. Calendar is busy.</p> <p>Cook Islands: Economic analysis – need for viability and feasibility assessment. Choosing activities that can be sustainable in the long term.</p>
<p>ix. The results of the 3 sub-regional workshops are consolidated by SPC into a Draft Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy which is distributed to all PICTs for further comment.</p>	<p>Cook Islands: important to have this validation.</p>
<p>x. A review and validation session for the draft Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy is incorporated into the 5th Regional Technical Meeting on Coastal Fisheries and</p>	



<p>Aquaculture (RTMCFA5) and further adjustments made to the Draft Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy document as necessary.</p>	
<p>October 2022 to March 2023 (RTMCFA5 to HoF15)</p>	<p>Vanuatu: Accept as is</p>
<p>xi. Draft Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy and a supportive Draft SPC Pacific Regional Aquaculture Policy Brief are distributed to all SPC members for them to further distribute internally to all stakeholders, who make further comments as appropriate, which are incorporated in the final draft documents.</p>	
<p>xii. Draft Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy and a supportive Draft SPC Pacific Regional Aquaculture Policy Brief are presented to HoF15 meeting for final review and approval.</p>	
<p>March to July 2023 (HoF15 to RFMM4)</p>	
<p>xiii. The Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy and the supportive SPC Pacific Regional Aquaculture Policy Brief approved by HoF15 are presented to the 5th Regional Fisheries Ministers Meeting for endorsement.</p>	
<p>xiv. The Pacific Regional Aquaculture Policy is launched throughout the region with media coverage and publicity.</p>	
<p>xv. Members proceed to implement the Pacific Regional Aquaculture Strategy, assisted by regional institutions and partners.</p>	<p>United States: Might be worth including the language around regional partners and institutions earlier on (this is first time its mentioned).</p> <p>United States: regional partners and institutions, may need to spell this out a bit more. To identifying network, so mention regional intuitions earlier.</p> <p>SPC: George: this may refer to earlier consultations with stakeholders which needs to be fleshed out a bit more, who they are.</p>