



**National Capacity Self-Assessment Sub-Regional Workshop
Joint UNDP/UNEP Global Support Programme
Tanoa International Hotel, Nadi, Fiji
16 – 18 November 2009**

Workshop Report

Introduction

Approved in November 2003, the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) programme was the first pathway of the Global Environment Facility's (GEF) *Strategic Approach to Enhance Capacity Building*, which provided a framework to develop countries' capacities for environmental management. Implemented as projects, they were/are an opportunity for countries to assess their management capacities and formulate a national capacity development strategy to achieve national and global environmental priorities, to be undertaken in a systematic manner. The NCSAs complement the other capacity development pathways identified in the *Strategic Approach* document, namely strengthening capacity building elements in GEF projects; targeted capacity building projects, and country specific programmes that address critical capacity needs in Least Developed Countries.

When completed, a total of 145 countries will have performed an assessment of their national capacities through the NCSA process with support from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

Workshop Objectives

By mid-2009, a number of countries had yet to complete their NCSAs, most having experienced delays for a number of reasons. These include problematic governance structures, unclear institutional roles, and weak technical know-how and capacity to undertake comprehensive assessments. This workshop was largely organized to provide support to the remaining NCSAs in the Asia and Pacific region, but also to facilitate networking among NCSA project teams by sharing lessons learned and best practices.

Workshop Programme

The workshop was conducted in English over three days. The workshop was organized in three parts: an opening session of speakers from the host government of Fiji, UNDP Multi-Country Office, and UNEP, followed by thematic presentations from UNEP and UNDP representatives and the GSP Technical Advisor. The remainder of the workshop focused on presentations by the NCSA project coordinators, followed by discussions. The workshop was originally structured to spend more time on discussing the emerging lessons from the 2006 analysis of NCSAs, such as engaging stakeholders and synthesizing cross-cutting capacity development needs. However, based on the needs of the participants, the GSP Technical Advisor modified the workshop agenda to give priority to having a detailed discussion of each NCSAs implementation challenges and opportunities for their adaptive management.

Workshop Proceedings¹

Opening Session

The Workshop began with a presentation of SaluSalu to the three dignitaries who formally opened the workshop, followed by a prayer by Pastor Vacca. Mr. Epeli Nasome, Head of the Department of Environment, Fiji then outlined how the NCSA process had been a major part of Fiji's ability to meet their commitments under the three Rio Conventions. The NCSA was a unique process that had brought stakeholders together to understand their shared responsibility for environmental management and stewardship. The Government of Fiji is making an effort to bring its NCSA to a successful close in the coming months. Mr. Toily Kurbanov, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative outlined UNDP's four areas of support to the Pacific member countries, which includes mainstreaming environmental management. The upcoming negotiations in Copenhagen on climate change are critical for the Pacific, given the impact on tourism. The Pacific countries suffer from other challenges, such as political instability and achieving effective community development. Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, Communications and Outreach Director of UNEP/GEF followed, calling the NCSAs as an opportunity for countries to strengthen their capabilities to implement the multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). UNEP and UNDP recently submitted a joint concept paper to the GEF Secretariat for a global programme for the implementation of priority capacity development needs for Small Island Developing States, including Least Developed Countries.



Mr. Gabor Vereczi, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor for Climate Change Adaptation explained that the NCSAs are about changing the mindset about the environment, and is much like any other sectoral planning process. The NCSA is a comprehensive approach to assess the in-country foundational capacities to achieve environmentally sound and sustainable development, with global benefits. The NCSA is also an important means to mobilize resources for a wider source of donors. Ms. Emma Mario, Environmental Programme Officer for UNDP Fiji Multi-Country Office (MCO) outlined the targeted support provided to the ten NCSAs managed by the Fiji MCO. She cited feedback from the project coordinators about how the Resource Kit and other reports available on the NCSA website have served as useful guides for the NCSAs in the Pacific. Many countries found Kyrgyzstan's NCSA reports as especially useful. The website contains the final NCSA reports from all countries.

Mr. Frank Wickham of the South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme (SPREP) outlined this organization's support to the Pacific countries. SPREP has played a particularly important role in strengthening partnerships in the Pacific, which includes providing direct support to a number of NCSAs, including convening several regional workshops on assessment methodologies and tools. In working with the NCSAs, SPREP has learned the informal arrangements to support the NCSAs were not effective as there was no accountability. Also, the Resource Kit was too cumbersome to be as effective as it was perhaps intended; and countries do in fact see and understand the linkages among the set of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). While the NCSAs brought parties together and raised the profile of the MEAs, a number of project coordinators cited the challenges of "assessment fatigue" among stakeholders. Many of the coordinators were young and faced the challenge of grappling with an assessment methodology that was perhaps too flexible, allowing coordinators to pick and choose how they wanted to implement the NCSA.

¹ Most of the presentations were made using MS Power Point presentations, which are available online at <http://ncsa.undp.org>.

Focal Area Presentations

Mr. Greg Sherley, Task Manager for UNEP/GEF in Samoa, participating via Skype™, outlined UNEP's support to address biodiversity conservation in the Pacific, including the Pacific Action Strategy (PAS) and Pacific Round Table for Nature Conservation. The PAS, with support from the GEF, is largely about developing partnerships, collaboration, and leadership, devoting efforts towards strengthening community rights, financial stability, good governance, and accountability. Mr. Sherley made a few recommendations on what he sees as key capacity development priorities/needs in the Pacific, i.e., setting up trust funds that would provide long-term, stable sources of funding, strengthening cooperation and collaboration so as to avoid duplication and create economies of scale, and using regional service providers such as SPREP, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) and the South Pacific Applied Geoscience Commission (SOPAC).



© Thomas Jensen, 2009

Ms. Emma Mario of UNDP Fiji Multi-Country Office, outlined the work countries are undertaking to support Sustainable Land Management. Key outputs from these interventions are the preparation of a medium-term national investment plan to mobilize necessary resources. An important lesson learned was the need to strengthen partnerships with regional development organizations. SPREP and SPC have been providing important support in these areas.

Mr. Thomas Jensen, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor for Climate Change Mitigation, outlined how climate change mitigation projects in the region are developing capacities to achieve environmental sustainability. He explained that capacity development should be at the heart of these interventions. The current debate on climate change is largely about reducing greenhouse gas emissions and not enough on the opportunities of action. The challenge in the Pacific is that there are often too few people in government working on energy as it relates to climate change mitigation, indicating a relative low political priority.

Mr. Gabor Vereczi, UNDP/GEF Regional Technical Advisor for Climate Change Adaptation, outlined the work undertaken in the region to support countries in climate change adaptation. There are a number of projects underway to plan and implement priority climate change adaptation strategies. These projects have helped identify and address some of the data gaps and needs in the region, leading to the strengthening of a knowledge network on vulnerability and adaptation to the impacts of climate change, which is a core function of the Adaptation Learning Mechanism jointly managed by the World Bank, UNDP and UNEP. For the Pacific, it is less about the financing as it is about coordination.

Mr. Kevin Hill, Technical Advisor of the Global Support Programme, gave an overview of the conceptual framing (definitions, principles, and criteria) of capacity development for environmental sustainability. One of the challenges of capacity development for environmental sustainability is the ability to effectively communicate the concept to local communities. Often, these stakeholders do not view the environment in the same way that stakeholders in developed countries or western societies do, given their different histories and relationships with nature. This even applies to some key governmental decision-makers. Multilateral environment agreements are therefore difficult to implement without the ability to effectively translate in a way that resonates with stakeholders' particular culture and language. As a result, there can be insufficient political commitment to the concept and the allocation of resources necessary to address and fulfill MEA obligations.

With an understanding or agreement on the principles and criteria of capacity development, the challenge is to operationalize them. Whereas capacities are about the assets for development, capabilities are about

transforming those assets into desired outcomes. Environmental mainstreaming is perhaps the most common approach to strengthening countries' capabilities. Therefore, many of follow-on NCSA projects focus on integrating environmental considerations into national and sectoral policies and actions, as well as within their associated governance structures and mechanisms. Participants agreed that leadership and performance management are key to reforming the necessary public administration structures for environmental sustainability.

Follow-up to the NCSAs

A special session of the workshop was devoted to the discussing the implementation of NCSA recommendations. This began with a presentation by Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, UNEP Senior Communications and Outreach Director on the European Commission-UNEP Multilateral Environmental



Agreement Programme for Africa, Caribbean and Pacific regions. This €21.5 million, four-year programme consists of two inter-related components, structured as three regional hubs to provide capacity development services to countries to implement MEA provisions. This programme envisages a number of the key capacity development needs, such as the strengthening of client countries' negotiating capacities in the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee dealing with mercury; the development of legal instruments on biosafety and persistent organic pollutants; improved compliance with and enforcement of MEAs; improved knowledge management systems and public awareness; improved policy coordination at the national and regional levels; and mainstreaming MEAs into national sustainable development strategies.

More information on this programme can be found in the PowerPoint presentation and at the following website: <http://www.unep.org/AfricanCaribbeanPacific/MEAs/Doc/JulyNewsletter.pdf>.

Mr. Frank Wickham of SPREP followed up with a summary of the recent conference on the EC/UNEP ACP MEA programme that took place the prior week (9-12 November 2009). As a partner to the programme, and informed by the NCSAs, SPREP's role is to continue supporting countries on a range of cross-cutting issues and mainstreaming environmental priorities, as well as with coordination and resource mobilization. To this end, SPREP will act as the regional hub for the Pacific. Some of the key recommendations made at the recent MEA conference include:

- Strengthening nationally driven information management systems;
- Promoting inter-ministerial sharing of information;
- Developing a regional MEA clearinghouse;
- Developing a registry of regional experts for Pacific;
- Implementing an education and communication programme;
- Strengthening the role of government decision-makers in mechanisms such as the the Nature Conservation Round Table; and
- Recognizing and supporting Pacific territories that are not beneficiaries of the MEAs.

The SPREP Governing Council had recently decided that their role is to support countries to achieve environmental sustainability by facilitating coordination and cooperation, and not to undertake actual implementation work. The Pacific countries feel that they have completed all the necessary assessments and must now move devote full attention to implementing projects and building capacities and capabilities. Institutional capacity development must also extend to local and regional government levels.

Mr. Prakash Bista, UNEP Task Manager, outlined the recently submitted concept paper (Project Implementation Form – PIF) for the Global Programme for Capacity Development (CB2) for Small

Island Developing States and Least Developed Countries. The aim of this US\$ 24 million programme (US\$ 15 million from GEF, US\$ 9 million in co-financing) is to overcome the capacity development challenges to implementing the three Rio Conventions. The programme consists of five strategies, one of which countries will choose to implement as a priority pilot project:

- Strengthening policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks
- Mainstreaming global environmental priorities into national policies and programs
- Improving convention institutions structure
- Strengthen financial and economic measures
- Improving knowledge systems

The CB2 programme would be implemented with support from regional implementing partners, such as SPREP, and will include a support facility similar in function to the Global Support Programme. Countries seeking access to the CB2 programme will be made on a first come first served basis, must already have completed their NCSAs, and demonstrate that they have the necessary absorptive capacities. The CB2 programme is presently under the early stages of development, details of which will be worked out during the planning process expected to begin in early 2010 once the programme has been approved by the GEF. One of the details under discussion is how to effectively coordinate the CB2 programme with the MEA project, which is in the early stages of implementation. The CB2 programme should also look at other initiatives that have capacity building components in order to better capitalize on opportunities. Individual CB2 projects will be approximately US\$ 400,000. However, there are no



guarantees that the CB2 programme will be approved at the request level. The project preparation phase is expected to take approximately six months, with the full project not ready until late 2010. In the meantime, countries are encouraged to develop concept papers based on their top priority capacity development recommendations that emerged from their NCSAs, and outline the supportive role of relevant regional development organizations.

Political Commitment and Ownership

NCSAs can be supported by political commitment, but this has to be managed in a way that facilitates agreement among key decision-makers, rather than have strong leaders take over the NCSA process. The NCSA can be overtaken by strong personalities of key decision-makers, resulting in the NCSA being taken in a direction that runs counter to the assessment methodology and NCSA objectives. The key is having the right people involved as champions to the NCSA to mobilize other key decision-makers and stakeholders. In some cases, the NCSA helped get key stakeholders to communicate. However, each NCSA is unique in its ability to get high ranking officials involved. Using powerful champions appears to be the best practice to securing high level involvement. Another best practice is to provide regular briefings and awareness sessions to key stakeholders and decision-makers to cement a full understanding of the importance of the NCSA to their work.

The other challenge countries faced in implementing their NCSA lay with securing active and constructive participation from stakeholders. In addition to their insufficient understanding of the NCSA and absence of accountability incentives, a number of NCSAs experienced constant change in stakeholder representation in meetings. One effective strategy to improve consistent attendance and active participation by stakeholders is to provide participation incentives, such as meal allowance, a 'sitting' allowance, or a speaking allowance.

In some cases, the NCSA has facilitated high-level political commitment by using existing structures and mechanisms, such as holding awareness workshops for Members of Parliament and other senior officials on the Rio Conventions. This is an activity that is already part of the GEF-funded Country Support Programme.

Expertise and Experience



The NCSA process involves significant and on-going stakeholder engagement. Finding consultants and experts in the Pacific is a real challenge, as there is a relatively high turnover of experienced individuals. This resulted in delays for a number of the Pacific NCSAs when the Project Coordinator left prior to the end of their original contract. For these reasons, the Pacific countries often have to resort to using high-priced international consultants. The other

misconception about the consultants is that they need to be top experts. This contributed to the challenges for the Thailand NCSA. In this case, some of the consultants felt that since they were the experts, the view expressed by non-expert stakeholders were not valid.

Participants agreed that having very detailed Terms of Reference, with the necessary checks and balances, including the clear statement of intellectual property rights, are very important to minimize the conflicts with contracted consultants. The consultants to be recruited in the NCSA should be experts in assessment methodology, i.e., on participatory research methodologies. They should understand the NCSA process and the concepts underlying capacity development, as well as demonstrate strong leadership and facilitation skills.

SPREP has trained a number of local consultants and provided services to countries undertaking a range of environmental planning exercises. The challenge lies in finding consultants with a range of experience and appropriate expertise. In the case of Papua New Guinea, due to limited remaining project funds, SPREP is supporting their NCSA at a cost of airfare travel and daily subsistence allowance. In another case, a contracted consultant who did not perform was released from their contract. In their stead, four graduate students were brought on board to fill in the gaps in the NCSA Thematic Assessments. Using graduate students as volunteers is a contribution to developing in-country capacities by creating a larger baseline of trained individuals on capacity development for environmental sustainability.

Organizational Capacity

A significant challenge for the Pacific island nations is staff turnover and loss of institutional memory. Staff that had been involved in the previous national assessment projects is often no longer working in the same institution at the time of the subsequent assessment projects, such as the national communications. The turnover of staff in key ministries and agencies also has implications for the countries' absorptive capacity to implement development priorities. For this reason, regional networks play a crucial role in providing countries with the necessary technical support. The root causes for the loss of institutional memory are difficult to overcome, as they are the result of countries' weak public administration infrastructure, which include poorly defined institutional linkages, low salaries, and lack of a career path.



The impact of the relatively high turnover of staff in the region is minimized to some degree as many of these same individuals remain available as consultants. However, due to the unpredictability of project

funding, these individuals do not remain as consultants for any significant length of time, having developed their expertise to a level that allows them to find jobs outside of the islands. While the need for consultants is necessary, countries should endeavour to institutionalize the core functions normally undertaken by consultants into the work functions of core staff. This was a lessons learned from the UNEP Biosafety Programme. The GSP has been developing a roster of experts since June 2009.

In a number of cases, the NCSA was constrained by the low numbers of government staff working on environmental management. Consequently, the GEF Focal Points are often over-worked, with the NCSAs becoming additional work to their already stretched capacities. This is further compounded in some cases where the people in the agencies are over-protective of their job and fearful of sharing too much information with other agencies. As a result, agencies do not cooperate or coordinate their work as much as needed by the NCSA. In other countries that had a larger staff complement working on environmental management issues, these individuals, being cheaper than consultants, were used to carry out NCSA project activities.

Assessment Methodology and Tools

The NCSA Resource Kit was designed to be flexible, allowing countries to tailor the assessment process according to countries' particular institutional environment. A number of countries expressed a general feeling of "assessment fatigue", given that every few years they are called upon to prepare national communications and reports to the secretariats of the three Rio Conventions. The NCSAs embody a similar assessment methodology, with the exception that it is one-off process. Regardless, some project coordinators described the NCSA as a tedious process that had some unnecessary components.

There were mixed messages on the utility of the NCSA Resource Kit. In some cases, it was felt that the NCSA Resource Kit did not provide adequate guidance to undertake the cross-cutting assessment. In other cases, there was a sentiment that there was too much information, making the NCSA process a seemingly overwhelming exercise. Reviewing the reports of completed NCSAs helped project coordinators better understand the expectations of the NCSA and the level of detail and analysis expected.



In some cases, it appears that the NCSA project coordinators felt that they were not adequately debriefed on the NCSAs, particularly on the assessment methodology and tools. Participants understood that UNEP perhaps offered a greater degree of flexibility in the implementation of the NCSAs than UNDP, in large part because UNEP does not have the country presence that UNDP does. However, this flexibility may have contributed to the longer time frames to complete the NCSAs.

An important criterion of a successful NCSA is to have an effective project steering committee, one that provides leadership and constructive guidance. However, in the Pacific, many project steering committees are *ad hoc*. In some cases, the project steering committee was ineffective as it did not include representation from key stakeholders. A weak committee could result in a range of problems, including consultants choosing not to adhere to NCSA Terms of Reference. Accountability also needs to be built into the management of the steering committee. This could be better achieved by including traditional leaders and provincial level leaders. In Thailand's case, the NCSA Project Committee was comprised of high ranking officials, which theoretically should have been the right composition. However, this committee did not include other stakeholder representatives that could help balance policy disagreements.

Funding

The launch of a number of NCSAs took longer than planned because of the delay in receiving funds from either the implementing agency or government executing body. In one case where NCSA funds were not being managed properly by the government, the NCSA team requested that the implementing agency take back project funds. The management of project funds is relatively flexible, and yet in some cases the funds were not disbursed on time as a result of a misunderstanding on how to properly re-phase the NCSA budget.

Participants expressed some concern about future funding to implement priority recommendations from the NCSA. Countries need to be steadfast in stressing their priorities to donors, working with donors to ensure that support is targeted to top priority capacity development needs. Participants agreed more funds are likely to be raised with a greater level of interest in the NCSA by stakeholders.

NCSA Reports

The NCSA reports are property of the Government, and must be submitted to the GEF Focal Point for approval. In some cases, the government may decide to submit the Final Report for parliamentary or cabinet approval. However, prior to government approval, the NCSA Final Report should be presented to a stakeholder workshop to validate the findings and recommendations. The implementing agencies should be consulted to review the draft reports.



Communicating the NCSAs and Capacity Development

The NCSAs also need a communication strategy to help promote the results of the NCSAs and an understanding of their contribution to developing countries' foundational capacities to meet their obligations under the Rio Conventions. The NCSAs need to be explained in terms that resonate with local people and other national stakeholders. Another part of a communication strategy would be to improve the NCSA to enhance support for the CB2 projects.

A recommendation that emerged during workshop is to develop a set of very simple and manageable set of briefing materials that effectively lays out the principles behind the NCSA and capacity development. These need to be written in simple language, such as "Capacity Development for Dummies" or "The Rio Conventions for Dummies", as well as written in local languages. Although there are a number of related guides, these are either not accessible due to their highly technical nature, or language. The preparation of a simple and accessible guidebook on capacity development could be undertaken as part of the Global CB2 project.

Mainstreaming

One of the challenges expressed was how to link the NCSAs with other focal area interventions. The NCSA was designed to take stock and assess the capacity development needs of the focal areas, and to do this effectively requires that key people from the country's key agencies are involved in the assessment process. A number of project coordinators also explained that the NCSA was to be implemented with the framework of the national environmental strategies and plans. However, many of these national sustainable development plans do not adequately incorporate environmental sustainability, in part because of an inadequate understanding of the how to operationalize environmental sustainability, but more importantly because of the historical separation between environment and sectoral economic development. Public administration structures are also designed along the latter traditional development objectives.

The NCSA has also stimulated environmental mainstreaming by linking up with a number of plans and projects, such as sustainable town planning dealing with land degradation and waste management, the JICA-funded solid waste management project, as well as capacity building for chemicals management. Given the nature of the NCSA to take stock of the institutional capacity challenges and needs to implement the Rio Conventions, many of these same challenges and needs transcend other environment and sustainable development challenges and needs, suggesting that further economies of scale can be achieved by further broadening capacity development recommendations beyond the Rio Conventions.

Notwithstanding, many of the opportunities to mainstream environmental issues broadly is limited as many of the capacity building activities are implemented as projects, which tend to operate independently. Even though members of the Project Steering Committee sit on the steering committees of other projects, capacity building is not necessarily a primary focus.

Indicators

At least one NCSA attempted to incorporate indicators into their work. The Cook Islands attempted to incorporate capacity development indicators into their national sustainable development plan, but they proved to be less effective than expected. The problem with the qualitative environmental indicators is that they are difficult to assess in the short-term, when compared to more quantitative type of indicators, such as those used for solid waste management. There is a clear need to improve the use of indicators to measure capacity development for environmental sustainability. In the short-term, process indicators, as proxy indicators must demonstrate a clear and strong linkage with outcome indicators of sustainability. Process and output indicators should also be used to monitor, evaluate, and hold responsible agents accountable for project deliverables.



Conclusion

The lessons learned from this workshop will contribute to an overall synthesis of lessons learned from other workshops and the NCSAs themselves. Specifically for Small Island Developing States, further consultations are expected to take place in the first half of 2010 as part of the development of a global programme for NCSA implementation targeted to these countries, as discussed above. Those NCSAs currently under implementation, as well as the Global Support Programme, are scheduled to come to an end by June 2010.

Workshop Agenda¹

Day One

Start	End	Duration	Activity	Presenter/Facilitator
Welcome				
9:00	9:45	0:45	Prayer and Opening Remarks	Pastor Vacca Mr. Epeli Nasome, Director, Dept. of Environment, Fiji Mr. Toily Kurbanov, DRR, UNDP Fiji MCO Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, UNEP/GEF
			Adoption of Provisional Agenda	Mr. Kevin Hill, GSP
Session One: NCSAs and support activities				Ms. Emma Mario
9:45	10:00	0:15	UNEP's support to NCSAs	Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp, UNEP/GEF
10:00	10:15	0:15	UNDP's support to NCSAs	Mr. Gabor Vereczi, UNDP
10:15	10:30	0:15	SPREP's support to NCSAs	Mr. Frank Wickham, SPREP
10:30	10:45	0:15	Coffee Break ²	
10:45	11:15	0:30	<i>Discussion</i>	
Session Two: Capacity Development in Focal Areas				Mr. Gabor Vereczi
11:15	11:30	0:15	Biodiversity Conservation	Mr. Greg Sherley, UNEP
11:30	11:45	0:15	Sustainable Land Management	Ms. Emma Mario, UNDP
11:45	12:15	0:30	<i>Discussion</i>	
12:15	13:15	1:00	Networking Lunch in Meeting Room ³	
13:15	13:45	0:30	Climate Change Mitigation	Mr. Thomas Jensen, UNDP
13:45	14:15	0:30	Climate Change Adaptation	Mr. Gabor Vereczi, UNDP
14:15	14:45	0:30	<i>Discussion</i>	
14:45	15:00	0:15	Coffee Break	
Session Three: NCSA Experiences				Mr. Kevin Hill
15:00	15:45	0:45	Developing a common understanding of capacity development	Mr. Kevin Hill, GSP
15:45	16:30	0:45	Vanuatu's NCSA ⁴	Mr. Albert Williams
17:00			Reception hosted by Global Support Programme	

Day Two

Start	End	Duration	Activity	Presenter
9:00	9:10	0:10	Review of Day Two agenda	Mr. Kevin Hill
9:10	9:50	0:40	Thailand's NCSA	Ms. Chaweewan Hutacharern
9:50	10:30	0:40	Cook Islands' NCSA	Ms. Heimata Karika
10:30	10:45	0:15	Coffee Break	
10:45	11:25	0:40	Kiribati's NCSA	Mr. Taulehia Pulefou
11:25	12:05	0:40	Papua New Guinea's NCSA	Ms. Rose Waigl Alphonse
12:05	12:45	0:40	Fiji's NCSA	Ms. Kelera Tokalau
12:45	13:30	0:45	Networking Lunch in meeting room	
Session Three: Lessons Learned and Best Practices				Mr. Kevin Hill
13:30	15:00	1:30	<u>1. Priority implementation of NCSAs</u>	
		(0:15)	Overview of the EC-UNEP-SPREP MEA project	Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp
		(0:15)	Results of the EC-UNEP-SPREP-MEA Conference	Mr. Frank Wickham
		(0:15)	Presentation of Global CB-2 Proposal	Mr. Prakash Bista
		(0:45)	<i>Discussion</i>	
15:00	15:15	0:30	Coffee Break	
15:15	16:00	0:45	2. Facilitating an inclusive consultative assessment process	
16:00	16:00	0:45	3. Synthesizing cross-cutting capacity development needs	

Day Three

Start	End	Duration	Activity	Presenter
Session Three: Lessons Learned and Best Practices (cont.)				Mr. Kevin Hill
9:00	10:30	1:30	4. Formulating management strategies to achieve sustainability	
10:30	10:45	0:20	Coffee Break	
10:45	12:15	1:30	5. Monitoring and evaluating institutional performance	
12:15	13:00	0:45	Lunch	
13:00	15:00	2:00	Country Clinics: One-on-one discussions ⁵	
15:00			Workshop Closure	

Notes

¹ The agenda was provisional until the workshop began, when it was reviewed and agreed upon by workshop participants

² Coffee/tea will be available outside the conference room.

³ Lunch is being provided by workshop organizers for Day One and Two.

⁴ NCSA presentations are to be a maximum of 25 minutes, leaving 10-15 minutes for Q&A.

⁵ Participants are invited to discuss their particular NCSA issues with other workshop participants and resource persons.

Workshop Participants

Mr. Prakash Bista
Project Manager NCSA
United Nations Environment Programme
5 Xinyuan Nanlu, Beijing 100027,
China
Tel: (417) 8629-9649
Fax: (417) 8629-9649
E-mail: prakash.bista@unep.ch

Ms. H. Louisa Karika
Project Coordinator/Senior Environment Officer
Tu'anga Taporoporo
National Environmental Service
P.O. Box 371, Avarua
Rarotonga,
Cook Islands
Tel: (682) 21-256
Fax: (682) 22-256
E-mail: louisa@environment.org.ck

Mr. Thomas Lynge Jensen
Regional Technical Advisor, Climate Change
Mitigation
UNDP Pacific Center
UNDP Private Mail Bag,
7th Floor Kadavu House, Suva,
Fiji
Tel: (679) 330-0399
Fax: (679) 330-1976
E-mail: thomas.jensen@undp.org

Mr. Toily Kurbanov
Deputy Resident Representative
UNDP Multi-Country Office
UNDP Private Mail Bag,
8th Floor Kadavu House, Suva,
Fiji
Tel: (679) 322-7703
Fax: (679) 330-1718 / (679) 330-3131
E-mail: toily.kurbanov@undp.org



Ms. Emma Mario
Environment Programme Analyst
UNDP Multi-Country Office
UNDP Private Mail Bag,
8th Floor Kadavu House, Suva,
Fiji
Tel: (679) 322-7709
Fax: (679) 330-1718 / (679) 330-3131
E-mail: emma.mario@undp.org

Mr. Epeli Nasome
Director, Department of Environment
P.D Patel Building
90 Raojibhai Patel Street, Suva,
Fiji
Tel: (679) 331-1699
Fax: (679) 331-2879
E-mail: enasome@govnet.gov.fj

Mr. Praneet Kumar Ram
Administrative Finance Staff- Environment
UNDP Multi-Country Office
UNDP Private Mail Bag,
8th Floor Kadavu House, Suva,
Fiji
Tel: (679) 322-7738
Fax: (679) 330-1718 / (679) 330-3131
E-mail: praneet.ram@undp.org

Mr. Inoke Ratukalou
Land-Use and Resource Policy Advisor
Secretariat of the Pacific Community
Luke Street, Nabua, Suva,
Fiji
Tel: (679) 337-0733
Fax: (679) 337-0021
E-mail: inoker@spc.int

Ms. Kelera Tokalau
NCSA Project Assistant
Department of Environment
P.D Patel Building
90 Raojibhai Patel Street, Suva,
Fiji
Tel: (679) 331-1699 or (679) 331-0858
Fax: (679) 331-2879
E-mail: kelera.tokalau@govnet.gov.fj

Ms. Jyoti Mathur-Filipp
Senior Communications Advisor
United Nations Environment Programme
Private Mail Bag P.O. Box 47074 (00100)
Nairobi,
Kenya
Tel: (254-20) 762-3765
Fax: (254-20) 762-4041/2
E-mail: jyoti.mathur-filipp@unep.org

Mr. Taulehia Pulefou
Pollution Control Officer/NCSA Coordinator
Environment and Conservation Division
P O Box 234, Bikenibeu, Tarawa,
Kiribati
Tel: (686) 28000 or (686) 28211
Fax: (686) 28334 or (686) 28425
E-mail: Taulehia.ecd@melad.gov.ki

Ms. Rose Waigl Alphonse
NCSA Project Assistant
Department of Environment & Conservation
P. O. Box 6601,
Boroko, NCD,
Port Moresby,
Papua New Guinea
Tel: (675) 325-0180 or (675) 325-0184
Fax: (675) 325-0182
E-mail: ralphonse@dec.gov.pg

Mr. Gabor Vereczi
Regional Technical Advisor, Climate Change
Adaptation
UNDP Multi-Country Office
Private Mail Bag, Matautu-uta, Apia,
Samoa
Tel: (685)23670
Fax: (685)23555
E-mail: gabor.vereczi@undp.org

Mr. Frank Wickham
Capacity Development Advisor
South Pacific Regional Environmental
Programme
Box 240, Apia,
Samoa
Tel: (685) 21929
Fax: (685) 20231
E-mail: frankw@sprep.org

Ms. Chaweewan Hutacharern
NCSA Project Manager
Office of Natural Resources and Environmental
Policy and Planning,
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
118 Sukhumvit 64, Pongwate 2 Soi 3,
Bangkok 10260,
Thailand
Tel: (668-1) 823 6005
Fax: (662) 332-4198
E-mail: chahut@csloxinfo.com

Mr. Kittisak Prukkanone
Environmental, Practitioner Level
Office of Natural Resources and Environmental
Policy and Planning,
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
60/1 Soi Phiboonnattana 7, Gandennai,
Bangkok 10400,
Thailand
Tel: (662) 265-6612
Fax: (662) 265-6612
E-mail: kittisak@onep.go.th

Mr. Christopher Theriot
Global Support Programme Intern
1129 Ferdon Road,
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105,
USA
Tel: (734) 302-3575
E-mail: ctheriot@umich.edu

Mr. Kevin Hill
Global Support Programme
UNDP
304 East 45th Street,
New York, NY 10017,
USA
Tel: (347) 851-7100
E-mail: kevin.hill@undpaffiliates.org

Mr. Albert Williams
Principal Consultant/Former NCSA Coordinator
Environment Health & Conservation
Private Mail Bag 9063, Port Vila,
Vanuatu
Tel: (678) 25-302
Fax: (678) 22-227
E-mail: ehsconsultancy@vanuatu.com.vu

All photographs copyright Kevin Hill, 2009, unless otherwise stated.

Citation: Hill, Kevin and J. Christopher Theriot (2009), *Workshop Proceeding of National Capacity Self-Assessment Workshop, Nadi, Fiji, 16-18 November 2009*, Global Support Programme, United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Environment Programme, November 2009, 14 pp, New York, USA