



DEVFISH Closure & Steering Committee Meeting Summary

Novotel Hotel, Nadi, Fiji

23-24 November 2009



SPC
Secretariat
of the Pacific
Community



Photo: Courtesy of Robert Stone
Taken in the Solomon Islands at the Honiara Fisherman's Village Market 2009

23 – 24 NOVEMBER 2009 DEVFISH CLOSURE & STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS - SUMMARY REPORT

Purpose

This report provides a summary of the 23 – 24 November 2009 DEVFISH Closure and Steering Committee meetings held in Fiji (Appendix 1 for the agenda). It also provides attendee comments on the effectiveness and delivery of DEVFISH and if agreed by the EC suggestions for DEVFISH 2 projects.

Background

As contractually required DEVFISH held a project closure meeting on 23 - 24 November 2009, Nadi, Fiji. This meeting was well attended by a broad range of DEVFISH stakeholders (see Appendix 2) which included prominent private sector representatives. The primary purpose of this meeting was to bring DEVFISH stakeholders together to highlight key projects, seek feedback on the effectiveness and delivery of DEVFISH, inform stakeholders about the status of DEVFISH 2 and, if approved, identify potential DEVFISH 2 projects. The meeting also incorporated the final DEVFISH Steering Committee Meeting which presented its financial position and a progress report on the 2008/2009 work programme. Copies of the presentations will be available on the FFA and SPC websites early in 2010 and on request a CD will be available.

Launching of the DEVFISH Promotion Items

A highlight of this meeting was the launching of the new DEVFISH logo and phrase – a fairer slice for Pacific peoples (see Appendix 3), a promotional video, DEVFISH publication and TV and website advertisements. The promotional items are one component of the overall DEVFISH communications strategy which will be fully implemented if DEVFISH 2 is agreed. The DEVFISH promotional video and advertisements will be played on regional TV and radio stations. They will also be available on the EU, FFA and SPC websites. These items were well received by the attendees.

Industry Attendance

Another highlight of the meeting was the excellent attendance by industry. The industry representation included a broad range of global companies with significant interests in the Pacific (see Attachment 2). A shared remark from the industry representatives was appreciation for the role that DEVFISH played in bridging the gap between governments, regional organisations, donors and themselves. Industry also expressed gratitude for the direct support it received from DEVFISH to enhance their competitive status and for keeping them informed about various regional and international initiatives. This is the first time that a donor and regional organisation have worked directly with the private sector and there was general consensus that this support has produced tangible benefits for the entire region. Industry also saw significant value in the work of

DEVFISH to assist Pacific governments with creating enabling policy environments and opening up new market opportunities.

Day 1 Summary

9.00am	Meeting started with a prayer and welcome by the Chair – Mr. Semisi Fakahau (DEVFISH Consultant).
9.30am	Presentation by Len Rodwell (FFA) on the origins of DEVFISH – no questions from the floor.
10.00am	<p>Presentation by Mike Batty (SPC) giving a DEVFISH overview from 2005 to 2009. The DEVFISH promotional video was also shown.</p> <p>In summary comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How DEVFISH measures its contributions to reducing poverty in the Pacific. An explanation was given that DEVFISH used broad measures such as measuring fisheries contributions to GDP and looking at increases in investment and fisheries related employment. The point was also made that it is hard to measure the contributions of a project like DEVFISH to reducing regional and national poverty levels. However, DEVFISH does have some baseline data which will be useful as comparative data if DEVFISH 2 is approved. The EU representative signaled this measurement is important as are economic indicators and if DEVFISH 2 was approved more work is needed in this area. ▪ Improving DEVFISH private sector interventions – there was some discussion about why and how the DEVFISH private sector interventions could have been improved. There are a number of external factors which impact on the ability of DEVFISH to work directly with the private sector. However, if DEVFISH 2 is approved more effort will be placed on supporting the private sector. ▪ PNG Pump Boats project – there was some discussion about this project and in particular the infrastructure and economic barriers faced by this fishing method in PNG. ▪ Information dissemination – widely circulating DEVFISH reports is very important. Equally important is ensuring that all stakeholders are kept fully informed about sector activities. This will help to improve the transparency and robustness of decision and policy making. ▪ A real strength of DEVFISH, that must be retained and expanded as part of DEVFISH 2, is that it works directly with industry. Direct industry involvement in management and development is critical to the sustainable growth of the fishery. ▪ There was some discussion about how Pacific Island countries can access EU markets. In particular about the EPA process and the establishment of Competent Authorities (CA's). ▪ New EU IUU Regulations - FFA commented it is working on this matter and believes Pacific Island countries should be able to meet the

	<p>requirements of this regulation. The EU recently produced guidelines and a handbook to assist Pacific Island countries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There were a number of general comments from the floor about the importance of fisheries to the economic, social and cultural wellbeing of Pacific Island peoples. ▪ Questions were asked about how DEVFISH allocates its funds and the process for approving project submissions/requests. The short answer was that projects were mostly demand driven and that some countries made few or no requests to DEVFISH. Some explanation was also given about the criteria for DEVFISH projects and the role of the Steering Committee to identify high level assistance areas for Pacific Island countries. ▪ Feedback on the DEVFISH promotional video was very positive and there was a general consensus that alternative forms of project communication and promotion need to be explored.
10.50am	MORNING TEA
11.20am	<p>Presentation Peter Philipson (FFA) – the Development Opportunities for P-ACP countries.</p> <p>In summary comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The accuracy of industry data and the confusion it can sometimes cause. ▪ Whether FFA has done any work on China being a potential market for Pacific tuna. ▪ Good infrastructure is crucial to the sashimi market and PNG will continue to face barriers to participation in this market until infrastructure (mainly transport and electricity) issues are addressed. ▪ Some discussion about the benefits that have accrued to Pacific nations from their tuna resources and the range of incentives that can be used by Governments to attract investors.
11.50am	<p>Presentation by Jonathan Manieva (SPC) and Naitilima Tupou (Tonga - FIAT) on National Fisheries Associations. In particular DEVFISH assistance to National Fisheries Associations and the work of FIAT in Tonga.</p> <p>In summary comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is easier for Governments to deal with 1 Fisheries Association rather than multiple groups or individuals. ▪ Fisheries Associations assist fishers to better coordinate themselves and provide a good forum for fisher coordination and discussion. ▪ Examples from the PNG experience were provided. PNG is currently looking at how to sustainably grow its Association and is trying to appoint an independent CEO who has the trust of its members. In PNG the role of the Fisheries Association is enshrined in legislation as it has a seat on the NFA Board and therefore receives some support from the Government. ▪ Questions were raised about how the Associations could become self-

	<p>funding especially those that were reliant on support from DEVFISH given the project is closing on 31 December 2009.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Examples were given by FIAT (Tonga) on their work to identify innovative ways to support itself. This included working with the Tongan Chamber of Commerce, accessing donor funding for umbrella organisations, charging a management fee for managing donor projects, accessing Government funds and developing a work programme that is attractive to donors because it adds value to other projects. ▪ Brief overview of the FFA project in Tonga to assist with improved coordination between Government and fisheries stakeholders.
12.20pm	<p>Presentations on the experience of Competent Authorities in the Solomon Islands (Robinson Fugui) and PNG (Aquina Kango).</p> <p>In summary comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The importance of the CA's and the need to ensure that countries retain EU accreditation. ▪ How countries without CA's can begin the process to establish them. ▪ The role of industry, if any, given potential conflicts of interest, to assist/work with the CA's. ▪ The need for long term TA for countries that are just starting the process.
1.00pm	<p>Presentation by Hugh Walton on the Findings of the DEVFISH Mid-Term Review.</p> <p>In summary comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for DEVFISH to continue. ▪ DEVFISH needs to improve its project communications. ▪ The ability of DEVFISH to offer instant assistance enhanced its effectiveness. ▪ Some discussion about the PNG observer programme (although DEVFISH did not have any input into this project) and other DEVFISH projects.
1.30pm	<p>Presentation by Russell Dunham (Fiji Fish) on Industry and DEVFISH.</p> <p>In summary the comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The incentives and concessions Governments can use to attract investment, especially for local businesses. ▪ There is great value in providing for increased private sector participation in regional fisheries forums. ▪ Currently there is a disconnection between support for Governments vs. the private sector from international and regional organisations. ▪ The private sector would greatly benefit from being able to directly access donor and NGO funding aimed at growing local businesses. ▪ Governments and international and regional organisations need to

	improve their information dissemination processes to include the private sector.
2.00pm	LUNCH
3.20 pm	<p>Presentation by Peter Philipson (FFA) on the FSM – Offshore Fisheries Development Project.</p> <p>In summary the comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How easily this project could be transferred to other countries.
3.40pm	<p>Presentation by Pete C Celso (RD Canning) on Industry and DEVFISH.</p> <p>In summary the comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The possibility of a breeding programme for tuna. ▪ Questions about how other Pacific Islands countries can better and/or access New Zealand and Australian markets. ▪ How to improve private sector competitiveness. ▪ Discussions about the USA market and its product requirements; the possibility of pursuing duty free market access under the US multilateral treaty was raised. ▪ The importance of Government to negotiate good market access.
4.15pm	<p>Presentation by Joe Hamby (Tri Marine) on Industry and DEVFISH.</p> <p>In summary the comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questions about establishing the PNA and their role. In particular whether the PNA should manage all access arrangements (VDS) so that one organisation has clear oversight for managing access. ▪ The Pacific needs to look at ways to act and think regionally in order to secure sustainable management of their fisheries. Because of fragmented management and unrealistic development expectations opportunities are being lost. ▪ Questions about Tri Marine access to EU markets – Joe Hamby explained that Trimarine no longer exported to EU from Singapore, and that all operations in the Pacific worked under the auspices of the flag states. ▪ The Pacific needs to ensure that real benefits accrue to the domestic economy from investment in the tuna fishery.
4.40pm	<p>Presentation by Puita Etuati (Tuvalu Government representative) on The National Fisheries Master Plan.</p> <p>There were no comments arising from this presentation.</p>
5.00pm	<p>Presentation by Ferral Lasi (Solomon Islands Government representative) on the SI Small Scale Pole and Line Project.</p> <p>There were no comments arising from this presentation.</p>

5.20pm	Presentation by Monte Depaune (Nauru Government representative) on the DEVFISH Project Support to Nauru. There were not comments arising from this presentation.
5.40pm	Closing of Day 1 by the Chair
5.40pm	PITIA Meeting
6.30pm	DEVFISH DINNER

Day 2 Summary

9.00am	Meeting opened by the Chair
9.10am	<p>Presentation by Len Rodwell on the future of DEVFISH.</p> <p>In summary the comments were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potentially 8.2 million euro is not enough funding for DEVFISH 2 because there is a lot of need in the Pacific. ▪ Direct assistance for the private sector must continue under DEVFISH 2 particularly support to the fishing associations. ▪ The EU representative gave an overview of EC funding streams available for Pacific Island projects and the process to access EC funding. ▪ The need for DEVFISH 2 to include a clear set of financial indicators. ▪ The need for fisheries development capabilities within FFA to be strengthened. FFA is currently in discussions with both NZAID and AUSAID about this.
9.40am	Panel Discussion
Question 1	<p>Industry Evaluations: Some project reviews have commented that the DEVFISH project is perhaps one of the best initiatives in regional fisheries for many years. Further, it is potentially the only project that has made an effort to address the needs and interests of the commercial tuna sector.</p> <p>What is your opinion of this observation? Please explain.</p> <p>In summary the responses were about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is important to accurately identify industry needs with industry. DEVFISH does this where other projects fail because they rely on Government analysis of industry needs which are often incorrect. ▪ There was a general consensus that DEVFISH is one of the only projects that works directly with industry and its interventions have been very successful as a result. ▪ DEVFISH is very useful in the way that it facilitates improved relationships between industry and Governments. ▪ Because of DEVFISH there is greater recognition by Governments of the value industry participation brings to decision and policy making

	<p>processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More questions about how DEVFISH can identify its contributions towards reducing poverty and stimulating economic development. ▪ It is important that DEVFISH continues to work as a vehicle for sustainable development because sometimes industry and Government relationships are poor. ▪ Questions about how industry can access DEVFISH assistance even when they do not have the support of their Government. ▪ In order be effective project staff must have good relationships with both Government and private sector staff. They must also know Government processes to help industry navigate through it. ▪ General approval of DEVFISH project request process and its support for industry. ▪ There needs to be more assistance to Pacific Island countries to help them identify the value of their tuna resources and how to optimize returns. ▪ The ability of DEVFISH to respond quickly to project request is a great benefit. ▪ Often more assistance is required to implement the recommendations in DEVFISH reports and without implementation the report can be useless. ▪ FFA commented that the RAO and EC Fijian Delegation have both been very helpful. Especially in terms of accurately conveying the conditions in the Pacific to EU headquarters. ▪ Governments need to improve their commercial understanding of the tuna industry which will improve their responsiveness to industry.
Question 2	<p>Fisheries Development Reviews (longline, purse seine, trolling, etc): The work of DEVFISH to analysis the benefits derived from longline and purse seine fishing operations was intended as guide for both government policy makers and commercial operators looking at ways to optimise future returns from the tuna industry.</p> <p>Was this work helpful and did it assist you when considering your development strategies and options?</p> <p>In summary the responses were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This study was probably more useful for policy makers but it did have some relevance for industry. ▪ A point was made that if industry requires this kind of information it will buy it. Often these studies are not completed fast enough to be of real commercial assistance. ▪ Fishing Association representative commented these reports were very useful for them in terms of decisions relating to policy initiative and strategies.

<p>Question 3</p>	<p>Competent Authorities: DEVFISH, in conjunction with others, worked with Competent Authorities to improve their inspection and certification regimes and the training of their officers.</p> <p>Was this assistance useful? If so please explain.</p> <p>In summary the responses were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There was a general consensus that DEVFISH assistance to CA's was extremely useful and must continue under DEVFISH 2. ▪ DEVFISH assistance was particular helpful because it was fast and didn't involve lots of red tape and extended waiting times which is common with requests to Government for support. ▪ Concern was expressed at the ability of the CA's to retain certification from the EU. It was agreed that DEVFISH had an ongoing role to prevent loss of EU accreditation. ▪ Through the CA's the EU is actually assisting the Pacific to improve its product quality through improved fish standards. The CA's are also upskilling Pacific labour market. ▪ DEVFISH worked specifically with the Fiji, SI and PNG CA's but FFA has been working with other Pacific Island countries to assist with exporting into Europe. ▪ Countries without a CA are not optimising the returns from their tuna. The EU market is one of the most lucrative and industry has considered ways to assist Governments to establish CA's but industry assistance could be viewed as corruption and it isn't the role of industry. DEVFISH is 'magic' because it can work with both industry and Governments to establish CA's.
<p>Question 4</p>	<p>FSM - Offshore Fisheries Development Project: This project aims to attract fisheries investors to FSM and simplify the government approval process that fisheries investors must navigate in order establish fisheries businesses in FSM. The primary way it does this is to assist the government to develop an 'investment friendly' environment through better coordination of all fisheries stakeholders in FSM.</p> <p>What are your views on this approach? Please explain.</p> <p>In summary the responses were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The industry representatives did not believe that onshore processing in FSM would be commercially viable, and expressed concern about the impact of such projects on increasing capacity in the purse seine fishery. Primarily because FSM is competing against Bangkok who is able to process tuna a lot cheaper, has better market access and infrastructure. They did see some value in the policy approach and believed DEVFISH contributions to that were very useful. ▪ There was some discussion about the benefits of Pacific Island

	<p>fisheries being managed regionally (similar to the EU) with national authority being delegated to a regional organisation, such as the PNA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FFA comment on the role of the PNA and its origins. Previously there weren't as many drivers for regionally cooperation as there is now. ▪ The Pacific is struggling with how to best manage and develop its tuna fishery and DEVFISH is well placed to assist Pacific Island countries with these issues. ▪ Regionalism is the best way to manage and develop the fishery but clear economic benefits must still accrue to individual countries
Questions 5 & 6	<p>Lessons Learnt and Other Observations: Do you have any suggestions for DEVFISH lessons learnt, how to better disseminate information, how the delivery of DEVFISH could have been better or Green Themes for DEVFISH 2?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The project needs to be clear about what types of assistance it provides and the criteria. It shouldn't spread itself too thinly. ▪ Further work on DEVFISH communications is required. ▪ The DEVFISH newsletter should continue and be more frequent. ▪ Work on 'Green Themes' is very useful and should be included in DEVFISH 2. Especially alternative fuel and energy sources. ▪ FFA's tuna development role needs to be strengthened. ▪ Both Governments and the private sector are looking for development assistance which is not adequately provided. ▪ As part of DEVFISH 2 more work must be done to identify appropriate economic indicators which will measure the contributions the project is making to both and national and regionally economies.
12pm	Chair closed the meeting.
	LUNCH

DEVFISH STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

1.15pm	Meeting opened by the Chair
1.20pm	<p>Presentation by Len Rodwell on the work programme and its status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments or questions
1.35pm	<p>Presentation by Leonard Paia on the financial report and expenditure to date</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some clarification sought about plans for remaining budget. ▪ FFA advised by the EU and RAO to spend the remaining budget.
1.50pm	<p>Presentation by Jonathan Manieva on the support to Fisheries Associations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No comments or questions
2.05pm	<p>Presentation by Len Rodwell on the matters arising from closing DEVFISH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DEVFISH will be closed by 31 December 2009. ▪ A final activity report will be written and provided to the RAO and EC during the first quarter of 2010. ▪ On suggestion from the RAO DEVFISH is requesting that the auditors

	<p>begin work in December 2009 while staff are available rather than in January 2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The RAO and EU will undertake an independent evaluation of the project beginning 1 January 2010 as part of the closure phase. ▪ Small organisations, such as the Fisheries Associations, have great difficulty funding themselves so hopefully the time delay between DEVFISH and DEVFISH 2 will be minimal.
2.20pm	<p>Presentation by Anouk Ride (FFA) on DEVFISH and DEVFISH 2 Communications. The DEVFISH 2 advertisement was also played.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The DEVFISH 2 TV advertisement was well received. ▪ There was a question about whether DEVFISH could fund other types of newsletters related to tuna and if DEVFISH would pay for space in other organisations newsletters. ▪ There was general agreement to the DEVFISH 2 communications strategy.
2.40pm	Meeting closed by the Chair
4.30pm	DEVFISH Drinks, Nibbles and Farewells

Potential DEVFISH 2 Projects

Based on comments during both meetings the suggestions for potential DEVFISH 2 projects included:

- A study on the options to improve industry participation in Government decision and policy making processes.
- A paper on the various funding sources available for tuna management and development and how the private sector can access it.
- A study on the feasibility of a marine school in the Solomon Islands. Similar to the one in PNG.
- Palau would like a study on the viability of the Government purchasing foreign owned fishing businesses in Palau.
- Continued support for Fishing Associations including a study on the options for the Fishing Associations to become self-funding.
- Study on how Governments can confirm the profits and losses being made by the private sector which will assist them to set appropriate taxes, duties etc.
- Further studies on alternative tuna markets, such as China.
- Further assistance with HCCAP and other processing and hygiene standards training.
- Ongoing support to CA's is critical. The suggested types of support included; ongoing technical assistance, funding for specialised equipment, upgrading laboratory equipment, testing kits, funding for TA positions etc.
- Solomon Islands wants to get its health laboratory accredited by an external organisation and would like DEVFISH assistance with this.

- Studies into alternative sources of funding and assistance for CA's.
- Support for the Marshall Islands to establish a CA.
- Study on how to provide accurate industry fisheries information directly to policy and decision makers in order to improve policy outcomes.
- Solomon Islands would like assistance to implement recommendations from a report on its Rural Fishing Centers.
- Providing Pacific Island countries with assistance to undertake feasibility studies on the economic viability of joint ventures or other commercial projects.
- Further assistance directly to Pacific Island Governments to develop robust and transparent fisheries policies.
- Technical advice on the viable types of fisheries investment individual Pacific Island countries should be pursuing.
- Support to hold neutral forums aimed at bringing Governments and industry together to discuss regional and national fisheries issues.
- Studies on alternative fuel and energy sources for the sector.
- Studies on the benefits of increased regional management of Pacific Island fisheries, especially tuna.
- Report on the viability of a regional policy statement to facilitate greater regional integration and cooperation.
- DEVFISH could provide soft-loans and grants for Pacific Island fishing businesses.
- Continue the DEVFISH newsletter.
- Further studies into the economic opportunities for domestic employment through crewing, observer programmes etc.
- Assistance to implement the EU IUU regulations.
- Improved access to fisheries data.

APPENDIX 1

DEVFISH Project Closure Meeting

23 - 24 November 2009
Novotel Namaka Road, Nadi, Fiji

AGENDA

Day 1: 23 November 2009

TIME	ITEM	PRESENTER
8.30 – 9.00am	REGISTRATION	DEVFISH Staff
9.00 – 9.30am	Opening of the Meeting by the Chairperson	Mr. Semisi Fakahau
9.30 – 10.00am	The Origins of DEVFISH: The Case for Intervention	Mr. Len Rodwell (FFA)
10.00– 10.40am	DEVFISH Summary: An overview of the last 4 years of DEVFISH <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ World Premiere – the DEVFISH DvD 	Mr. Mike Batty (SPC)
10.40 – 11.00am	MORNING TEA	
11.00 – 12.30pm	DEVFISH Projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development Opportunities in the Fisheries Sector for P-ACP Countries ▪ National Fisheries Associations: Case Study - the Tongan Experience ▪ Competent Authorities: Case Study – the Papua New Guinea and Solomon Islands Experiences 	Mr. Peter Philipson (FFA) Mr. Jonathan Manieva (DEVFISH) & Ms. Naitilima Tupou Ms. Aquina Kango and Mr. Robinson Fugui
12.30 – 1.00pm	Findings of the March 2008 Mid-Term DEVFISH Review	Mr. Hugh Walton (DEVFISH Consultant)
1.00 – 2.00pm	DEVFISH and Industry <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fiji Fish ▪ FSM - Offshore Fisheries Development Project 	Mr. Russell Dunham Mr. Peter Philipson (FFA)
2.00 – 3.00pm	LUNCH	
3.00 – 4.00pm	DEVFISH and Industry <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ RD Canning ▪ TriMarine 	Mr. Pete Celso Mr. Joe Hamby
4.00 – 4.45pm	DEVFISH and Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tuvalu Ministry of Natural Resources – Department of Fisheries ▪ Solomon Islands Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources ▪ Nauru Fisheries and Marine Resources Authority 	Mrs. Puaita Etuati Mr. Ferral Lasi Mr. Monte Depaune

4.45 – 5.00pm	Closing of Day 1	Mr. Semisi Fakahau
5.00 – 6.30pm	Free time	
6.30 – 8.30pm	DEVFISH DINNER and DRINKS	

**Please note PITIA is holding an open invitation meeting from 5.15 – 6.15pm
in the DEVFISH conference room and if interested you are welcome to
attend**

Day 2: 24 November 2009

TIME	ITEM	PRESENTER
9.00 – 9.15am	Opening of the Meeting	Mr. Semisi Fakahu
9.15 – 9.35am	The Future of DEVFISH	Mr. Len Rodwell
9.35 – 11.00am	DEVFISH Panel Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Panel discussion to review progress, assess results and discuss future needs ▪ Question and Answer session 	Mr. Len Rodwell and Panel Members
11.00 – 11.30	Close of Day 2	Mr. Semisi Fakahau
11.30 – 12.30pm	LUNCH	

DEVFISH Steering Committee Meeting

AGENDA

Day 2: 24 November 2009

TIME	ITEM	PRESENTER
12.30 - 12.40pm	Opening of the Meeting	Mr. Semisi Fakahau
12.40 - 12.50pm	Work Programme Progress	Mr. Len Rodwell
12.50 - 1.00pm	Financial Reports of Expenditure to Date	Mr. Leonard Paia
1.00 - 1.10pm	Summary of Major Project Outcomes	Mrs. Louisa Hodge-Kopa and
1.10 – 1.20pm	Summary of Fisheries Associations Support	Mr. Jonathan Manieva
1.20 – 1.30pm	Matters arising from Closing DEVFISH	Mr. Len Rodwell
1.30 – 2.00pm	Summary of DEVFISH Communications	Ms. Anouk Ride
2.00 – 2.20pm	AFTERNOON TEA	
2.20 – 3.00pm	The Future of DEVFISH	Mr. Len Rodwell
3.00 – 3.15pm	Any General Discussion	Mr. Semisi Fakahau
3.15 - 3.30pm	Closing of the Meeting	Mr. Semisi Fakahau
4.30 – 6.30pm	DRINKS, NIBBLES and FAREWELLS	

Document List

DEVFISH Booklet - available at the meeting
2008 - 2009 DEVFISH Financial Report
DEVFISH Project Activities Summary Note

DEVFISH Fisheries Associations Support Summary Note
DEVFISH Communications Summary Note
Closure of DEVFISH Summary Note

APPENDIX 2 - ATTENDEE LIST*

NAME	COUNTRY	ORGANISATION
1. Hugh Walton	PNG	Fisheries Consultant/NFA
2. Naitilima Tupou	Tonga	FIAT
3. Aquina Kango	PNG	NFA
4. Russell Dunham	Fiji	Fiji Fish
5. Puaita Etuati	Tuvalu	Tuvalu High Commission representing - Ministry of Natural Resources: Fisheries Division
6. Bootii Nauan	Kiribati	MFMRD
7. Ferral Lasi	Solomon Islands	MFMR
8. Jitendra Mohan	Fiji	Hangton Pacific
9. Fa'au E Teli	Tuvalu	TNFA
10. Victorio Uherbelau	Palau	JTF/DTID
11. Pete C Celso	PNG	FIA
12. Semisi Fakahau	Tonga	Fisheries Consultant
13. Vina Ram-Bidesi	Fiji	USP
14. Dave Lucas	Fiji	Solander Pacific
15. Terence Debao	Nauru	Nauru Fishers Association
16. Mike Batty	New Caledonia	SPC
17. Len Rodwell	Solomon Islands	FFA
18. Louisa Hodge-Kopa	Solomon Islands	FFA
19. Peter Philipson	Solomon Islands	FFA
20. Anouk Ride	Solomon Islands	FFA
21. Jonathan Manieva	New Caledonia	SPC
22. Leonard Paia	Solomon Islands	FFA
23. Teriba Tabe	Fiji	RAO
24. Bernard Blazkiewicz	Fiji EC	European Union Delegation
25. Joe Hamby	Singapore	Tri Marine
26. Robinson Fugui	Solomon Islands	Ministry of Health
27. Monte Depaune	Nauru	NFMRA
28. Tricia Emberson	Tonga	Alatini Fisheries
29. Bill Holden	Tonga	MSC
30. Charles Hufflet	New Zealand	Solander
31. Tuikolongahau Halafihi	Tonga	Tongan Fisheries Division

*Please note five confirmed attendees from Samoa, Cook Islands, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands and Fiji we unable to attend due to last minute unforeseen circumstances.

APPENDIX 3 – NEW DEVFISH LOGO and PHRASE



DEVFISH

A Fairer Slice for Pacific Peoples

DRAFT