

Report for the third Programme Steering Committee Meeting

Capacity building related to the Multilateral Environment Agreements in African, Caribbean, and Pacific countries (ACP MEAs Programme – Phase 2)
28-30 June, 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Day 1: Programme Partners' meeting	4
Component I, Regional Hubs - Africa, Caribbean, and Pacific regions presentations:.....	6
Day 2: ACP MEAs Programme Steering Committee Meeting	9
Opening Session.....	9
Programme status report.....	10
Closing the gap between the technical and policy level	11
Progress reports from the Programme partners	12
Communications and visibility	14
Mid-term evaluation	14
Thematic sessions on biodiversity and chemicals & waste	15
Concluding remarks	16
Day 3: Regional Hubs working session	16
Overall recommendations and follow up:	17



Group photo of participants at the third Programme Steering Committee for ACP MEAs 2 held on June 29, 2017 in Brussels, Belgium. Left to right (top): Ivy Saunyama (FAO), Elizabeth Maruma Mrema (UN Environment), Bart Missinne (DEVCO), Easter Galuvao (SPREP), Hyacinthe Armstrong Vaughn (IUCN), David Colozza (FAO), Paul Anderson (SPREP), Edmund Jackson (ACP Secretariat), Therese Yarde (CARICOM), Elena Lymberidi-Settimo (EEB-ZMWG), Ulf Bjornholm (UN Environment), Francesca Mancini (FAO), Karel Ameije (Independent Evaluator – SHE consultancy), Sefanaia Nawadra (UN Environment), Olushola Olayide (AUC). Left to right (bottom): Mamadou Kane (UN Environment), Raphaëlle Vignol (UN Environment), Livingstone Sindayigaya (AUC), Francisco Rilla (UN Environment). Absent from photo: Anjana Varma (UN Environment)

Introduction

The Programme Steering Committee (PSC) is the main annual meeting that brings together all partners and stakeholders involved in the ACP MEAs 2 (Programme hereon). The Programme was designed based on the recognition that ACP countries have various levels of capacity related to the implementation of multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and therein lies the opportunity to enhance technical and institutional capacity while promoting South-South cooperation between the ACP regions.

The PSC meeting was hosted by the Secretariat of the African, Caribbean, and Pacific Group of States (ACP Secretariat) in Brussels, Belgium on June 29, 2017. It was preceded by the all partner's meeting on June 29, 2017 and followed by the regional hubs meeting on June 30, 2017, which consisted of participation from UN Environment, the regional hub coordinators and the regional experts that had been invited.

It is expected that the presentation by the various programme partners to the ACP Secretariat and the European Commission representatives allowed the beneficiary group and the donor, respectively, to gain a stronger understanding of the programme's progress in the regions.

Given the vast geographical reach of the Programme, the meeting also provided an important shared platform for all the stakeholders to engage and learn from each other and realize points of synergy that could be explored in the remainder of the programme.

This year's annual meeting was structured as follows:

Day 1: All Programme Partner's meeting

Day 2: ACP MEAs Programme Steering Committee Meeting

Day 3: Post-PSC working session between the regional hubs and UN Environment

Day 1: Programme Partners' meeting

Objective:

The objective of this full day meeting was to prepare for the Steering Committee Meeting and strengthen the synergies between the main partners of the Programme.

FAO's Component presented by FAO colleagues Francesca Mancini, David Colozza & Ivy Saunyama

FAO presented its activities implemented over the last 12 months and its planning for the remainder of the Programme. The presentation covered the main expected results under FAO's logical framework: institutional capacity, national capacity, synergistic implementation, and field-based projects. FAO's presentation was complemented by a separate presentation on the project assisting the ratification and implementation of the Minamata Convention on Mercury from the European Environmental Bureau /Zero Mercury Working Group – one of the implementing partners for the FAO component.

Key points (from presentation and following discussion):

- FAO has worked much more at the regional institutional rather than the continental level in Africa which has been an effective strategy in not only working on regional priorities but also strengthening the link between field work and policy level.
- when working on a goal such as harmonizing pesticide regulatory mechanisms and framework, institutional collaboration in the region on the enforcement of relevant Conventions has also led to greater ownership of the harmonization process itself.
- there continues to be a high level of disparity in the capacities related to pesticide registration and regulation between developed and developing countries. For example, there may only be a handful of people working on pesticide registration in an African country as opposed to nearly 500 in a European country.
- In terms of knowledge building, the presenters highlighted the Post-Graduate Diploma on Pesticide Risk Management which has been effectively running in collaboration with the University of Cape Town in South Africa and has built capacity of graduates – mid-level professionals from project target countries –which can strengthen the work in this field. Besides strengthening technical capacities, the programme has been found successful in building a network across the three ACP regions, which has favoured opportunities for information exchange and South-South cooperation.
- It was recommended that the two Technical Guidance Documents on “Mainstreaming ecosystem services and biodiversity into agricultural production and management”, launched in 2016 targeting East Africa and the Pacific Islands, and which were positively acknowledged by the Ministries of Environment and Agriculture in Kenya, and in the Pacific – should also be simplified, and taken down to the community level so that it is just as relevant to them. In this sense, for Kenya, FAO announced that training modules are in preparation to build capacity of farmers on implementing measures to improve, and build on agro-biodiversity for agricultural production. The modules will be launched later in 2017.
- Caribbean Hub Coordinator complimented FAO for the work on safeguarding and disposal of obsolete pesticides in the Caribbean region, while representatives from the African Union requested more collaboration; and the SPREP representative requested more support in Pacific countries, including in relation to the preparation of training materials for farmers and further support to cross-sectoral policy dialogues on agro-biodiversity in the region, including expanded support to other countries. FAO attendees confirmed their continued interest in providing support and collaborating across the three hubs, considering what is realistically achievable within this second phase of the ACPMEAs programme, scheduled to end in March 2018.



Francesca Mancini and Ivy Saunyama from FAO

European Environmental Bureau/Zero Mercury Working Group (EEB/ZMWG): presented by Elena Lymberidi-Settimo

Key points (from presentation and following discussion):

- The EEB/ZMWG has been working in four countries in Africa, contributing to the implementation of the Minamata Convention with a focus on (a) assisting the work on developing national action plans (NAP) for artisanal and small scale gold mining(ASGM) in Tanzania and Ghana, and (b) assisting the development of strategies to phase out mercury added products in Nigeria and Mauritius.
- NGOs in the respective countries have been cooperating with their Ministries of Environment and Mines as relevant; the project has been embraced by the governments and become part of their national focus and activities.
- Important outcomes include:
 - Two African Regional conferences held in Nairobi together with UN Environment, on the two issues, 22-26 May 2017;71 participants: Environment and Mining ministries from 30 African countries, Jamaica and China, UN Environment, UNIDO, UNITAR, UNDP, BCRC Caribbean, AUC, AI, NGOs, academics, private sector, consultants
 - Very good feedback from participants on the conferences, knowledge of information met participants expectations and information gained was applicable to their work.
- On ASGM: Baseline information leaflets on the countries developed; miner's voice brought to the discussion; miners' consultation guide developed/published.
- On Products
 - A draft checklist developed for Governments on steps towards phasing out mercury added product- which was used from Governments to draft their national roadmaps.
 - Elements of this checklist developed for the two countries – e.g. stakeholder identification, study on market transition to convention compliant products, legal gap analysis, and draft laws developed.

The discussion following the presentation by EEB/ZMWG indicated that the links remain strong among the ACP MEAs partners. Examples include the African Union Commission's participation in the conference in Nairobi and EEB/ZMWG's collaboration in the Caribbean with the participation of Jamaica and the BCRC Caribbean. Furthermore, contacts have been established in the Pacific for follow up.

Component I, Regional Hubs - Africa, Caribbean, and Pacific regions presentations:

Objective:

For the Hub coordinators to present their achievements through their activities in the past 12 month implementation period, present planned activities for the remainder of the programme, as well as discuss the impact and challenges in implementation.

To view the presentations and details on activities, refer to Annex for links.

Africa Hub

Presented by the Africa Hub Coordinator – Livingstone Sindayigaya

Key points/highlights:

- Through the discussions, it was highlighted that though we implement activities such as workshops, there needs to be a more enhanced monitoring and evaluation mechanism so that the feedback can lead to better future implementation.
- The programme would need an extension, to ensure proper finalization of activities as well as closure of the programme. The delay in the implementation of activities is partially due to a long process for request and disbursement of cash.

Caribbean Hub

Presented by the Caribbean Hub Coordinator - Therese Yarde

Key points:

- In the region, there continues to be a need for knowledge and capacity building and awareness-raising in regards to certain MEAs. For example, it became evident through a workshop organized in conjunction with UN Environment and CMS in Barbados in August last year, that there is a lack of awareness or knowledge of CMS. a key success highlighted was that 3 countries (St. Lucia, Barbados and

Trinidad & Tobago) confirmed that they would be joining CMS, after they attended the workshop organized in Barbados.

- Providing on-site expertise – a first in the region under the Programme - at the 13th Conference of Parties for the Convention on Biological Diversity (in Cancun, Mexico) proved to be very effective in supporting the national biodiversity focal points present from the Caribbean region.



Therese Yarde from CARICOM presenting on the Caribbean Hub

- After the launch of the Regional State of Biodiversity for the Latin America and Caribbean report in May 2016, there was feedback that the Caribbean region 'gets lost' at the continental level and thus a more context- and region-specific report was needed. Owing to that and through the programme, the Caribbean region will have its Regional State of Biodiversity Assessment report which is now in its final stages of publication.

Pacific Hub Presentation

Presented by the Pacific Hub Coordinator – Paul Anderson

Key points:

- SPREP's Strategic Plan 2017-2026 takes into account our work and its relevance as regional goal 4 under the Plan refers to the importance of environmental governance. This is indicative of the convergence of environmental governance work as a key priority for both SPREP and UN Environment, with the ACP MEAs programme as a key manifestation.
- Key achievements:
 - Increased membership of key Conventions ex. Tonga recently [joining](#) CITES and the Republic of Marshall Islands expressing keen interest in joining the Waigani Convention.
 - The Republic of Marshall Islands updated their National Environment Management Strategy – a key national level 'blueprint' on environmental strategy – which was last updated more than two decades ago in 1994.
- The Programme has allowed the development of key resources such as region-specific negotiations training material developed in Phase 1 and 2, which continues to be used in preparatory meetings for different Conference of Parties to empower negotiators.
- Through the discussions, it became evident that SPREP is uniquely placed to continue the work on environmental capacity building with over 70 partnerships tied to the organization.
- The challenges of environmental monitoring remain pertinent especially with the geographical distances in the region and the limited number of people involved in the work. However, it is crucial to continue following up and indicate continued and stable engagement to the national governments.
- Environmental impact assessments has been an important area of work for SPREP, especially under the Programme, and its relevance for the region remains as it can at times be the only enforcement tool or intervention in some developing countries.

Day 2: ACP MEAs Programme Steering Committee Meeting

The Meeting was chaired by the ACP Secretariat.

For all presentations made during the PSC and related to the status of the Programme's activities please refer to the Annex of this report.

Opening Session



Edmund Jackson and Viwanou Gnassounou from the ACP Secretariat

Opening from Viwanou Gnassounou, Assistant Secretary General, Sustainable Economic Development and Trade Department, ACP Secretariat, where he emphasized that the work on MEAs remains a priority for the ACP Secretariat and that it is important to assess whether those agreed priorities are being implemented.

Introductory remarks from Bart Missinne, Programme Manager, DEVCO, European Commission, where he stated that it was good to see the people behind the programme, especially

as everyone is geographically very far from each other. He remarked that the meeting especially allows the participants to look into lessons learnt as we go into Phase 3 – a major and important Phase – and specifically, allows him to understand what the priorities are for the future.

This was followed by **remarks from Elizabeth Mrema**, Director, Law Division, UN Environment on a number of points, which include:

- highlighting the crucial link between MEAs and SDGs;
- environmental governance, underpinning much of the work (including ACP MEAs) at the Law Division, is a key enabler for environmental goals, whether at the international, regional or national levels;
- the Programme is still extremely relevant to the work and mandate of UN Environment, especially in the promotion of effective environmental governance in ACP countries;

This was followed by **remarks from Francesca Mancini**, Project Coordinator, FAO, emphasizing the following:

- the programme continues to be an important and relevant intervention in FAO's goals to end hunger and promote sustainable agriculture.
- the reconciliation of environment goals and food production is important for the long term, and the ACP MEAs programme has the potential to make this a reality;
- FAO has the framework and field work to enable management of both chemicals and biodiversity;
- the importance of bringing both environment and agriculture together at the policy level to find a way forward, citing the mainstreaming biodiversity platform launched by FAO at CBD COP 13 – as an example.

This was followed by a tour de table and a launch of the [new promotional video](#) on the ACP MEAs Programme produced by UN Environment's Communications Division.

Programme status report

Status of implementation of the programme, lessons learned, opportunities presented by Mamadou Kane, Project Manager for the ACP MEAs programme.

The presentation briefly went over the overall structure of the Programme and UN Environment's role as the coordinator and facilitator.

- UN Environment was able to conduct backstopping missions in all three Hubs as part of its annual coordination to review the status of implementation of activities in the regions. Specifically, it played a central role in providing technical and substantive report during the reporting period in Africa through the UN Environment's headquarters in Nairobi as well as its Liaison Office in Addis Ababa.
- The Project Manager also provided an overview of the budget, details of which are available in the powerpoint presentation.
- Taking into account the need to gain greater political support, it was recommended that there are meetings organized with senior management of partner institutions to advocate for project priorities to be further mainstreamed in their respective programmes.
- Challenges:
 - Due to the multiplicity of partners involved with varying internal management structures, there are different layers of reporting that can prolong the reporting process overall. While being cognizant of these variations in internal processes/rules/regulations, as a programme there should be a mechanism for a seamless work flow that takes into account this challenge.
 - Defining and demonstrating impact, a challenge faced more broadly in development work.



Elizabeth Mrema, Mamadou Kane, and other colleagues from UN Environment

Closing the gap between the technical and policy level

During the discussions, the representative from DEVCO made the point that technical training and capacity building does not always translate into uptake at the political/policy level. He raised the important question: how do we bridge this gap and have greater involvement at the decision-making level?

FAO made the point that often they engage technical people who have the authority to sign into effect a certain measure i.e. policy-determining empowerment and ability, thus indicating that the gap is non-existent in certain scenarios.

UN Environment agreed that it is important to have higher level of engagement at the policy and political level. However, it was also noted that the kind of stakeholders that often participate in certain activities may be technical experts as it depends on the technical or thematic nature of the training, workshop or intervention. For example, in the revision of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans, a biodiversity focal point would be more valuable than a political figure that is unlikely to attend. Thus, it is important to make that link between the technical experts with those in the policy sphere. What is also notable is that not all interventions are technical in nature, citing the twice held Parliamentary Colloquium which successfully engaged parliamentarians and led to the Green Bird Africa network – as an example.

Progress reports from the Programme partners

FAO presented on its implemented activities, planned activities, challenges and impact overall under its component on sustainable pesticides and pest management and removal of obsolete pesticides.

One of the successes discussed by FAO under their component included the Pesticide Registration toolkit which was launched in March 2016 and designed fully under the Programme. It is estimated that 2 million people get hospitalized annually due to pesticide poisoning with health costs running into the billions. Thus, pesticide registration is an important first line of defense that marks what is legal or illegal. The capacity gap remains a crucial problem as the same registration would be done by nearly 700 people in the US as opposed to only a handful in sub-Saharan Africa.

A total of 35 capacity building events have taken place in Phase 2 under FAO's component.

The EEB/ZMWG presented the activities under their project assisting four African governments with implementation of the ASGM and mercury added product phase out provisions of the Minamata Convention. (See details from Day 1)

Highlights:

Although governments appreciated well NGO inputs, it appears challenging and time consuming to foster harmonization amongst different agencies, and government schedules need to be accommodated.

Outcomes included: building capacities of governments, NGOs, agencies to better assist in implementing the Minamata Convention, the interest and motivation of the representatives of the conference participating Ministries of Environment/ Mines has increased as a result they pushed mercury higher within their national agenda, including relevant reference in the Libreville declaration – AMCEN 2017; the project served as additional enabling activity, resource, to assist understanding of national situations to facilitate ratification; in the longer term products phase out roadmaps, and drafted laws developed through the project, to be adopted and enforced by countries.

Presentations were given by the three Hubs with a discussion that followed on what has worked and what has been a challenge to the implementation.

In the Africa Hub, the coordinator discussed the lack of staff as a great challenge as from late 2015 onwards they have been working with less than half the number of staff earmarked for the Programme.

The evaluator highlighted that during consultations at the African Union Commission, he was informed that due to small budget it is very difficult to change the structures of the AUC to fully

integrate ACP MEAs. This brings up the challenge of institution building and ownership of the programme within the regional and political entity that represents the African continent.

In light of all this, the programme manager from DEVCO recommended that this issue should be raised with DEVCO/EC so that another channel can be adopted whereby this issue is taken forward by their Ambassadors in Addis Ababa.

In the Caribbean Hub, a key point brought forth is that the programme's work through the Hub has been based on the priorities of the region. In particular, the Hub chose to give greater prominence to the work in biodiversity cluster because the existing Basel Convention Regional Centre based in Trinidad & Tobago has been a key player that works on issues of chemicals and waste (the second cluster).

A recent success highlighted was the adoption of a training module on using integrated environmental assessment tools for improved MEAs implementation. After it was adapted in the context of SDGs, it was accepted for inclusion in May 2017 in the SDG Acceleration Toolkit hosted by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) and coordinated by UNICEF.

The Caribbean Hub was highly commended and appreciated for the growth and positive evolution of the Hub over the years and the excellent work done in building capacity for MEAs.

In the Pacific Hub, the coordinator highlighted that the activities under the Programme have complemented other ongoing projects which is indicative of the high level of integration of the Programme into SPREP work overall.



Left to Right: Sefanaia Nawadra from the UN Environment sub-regional office in Pacific, Ester Galuvao and Paul Anderson from SPREP

The Pacific Hub has continued to provide substantial support in strengthening national environmental institutional, systemic and individual capacity and processes. In the past year, it supported the government of Vanuatu in writing its National Environment Policy and Tuvalu in drafting its National Environment Management Strategy (NEMS). As mentioned previously, SPREP lent support in reviewing and renewing the NEMS which had not been updated since 1994. In 2018, SPREP is

planning to review and develop the NEMS in Tonga, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia and Kiribati.

Through the discussions, SPREP was acknowledged for being a key player that can 'close the loop' between technical and political/policy work it is responsible for reporting on progress directly to the Ministers through their annual meeting. The following was also highlighted:

- It is Important to get Papua New Guinea on board, as it is a country with high level of endemism and rich in biodiversity;
- Environment Impact Assessment implementation needs more support and could be stronger, something worth exploring in Phase 3;
- Even if countries are not party to certain MEAs, working on NEMs and State of the Environment Reports helps them at the national level in data gathering, planning, which lay the ground work and lead them to becoming Party eventually.

Communications and visibility

Presented by Anjana Varma, the communications lead at UN Environment for the Programme.

The presenter briefly discussed the importance of communications output to be achievements and impact-focused, showcasing environment as key for sustainable development and poverty alleviation, while being timely, newsworthy and adapted to suit target audience.

The following results achieved during the year were presented:

- One publication providing insight on the successes of Phase 1 of the Programme;
- One factsheet providing a snapshot of what has been achieved so far in Phase 2;
- Regular launch of newsletters which provide quarterly updates from the Hubs and partners on the work they are doing;
- Updated website and routinely updated capacity4dev portal which carries important documents developed through the Programme;
- Visibility items that include pens and USBs made from sustainable material such as wood, hardcover notebooks, folders – all carrying appropriate logos under the Programme.
- The launch of a short promotional video on the raison d'être of the Programme.
Many communication activities presented from the different partners – booklets, workshops, articles etc.

Mid-term evaluation

The mid-term evaluation was presented with a following discussion. Since during the PSC meeting the evaluation was still in draft form pending inputs and feedback, the presentation an opportunity for an open dialogue and a first viewing of the evaluation. The final and independent mid-term evaluation for Phase 2 can be accessed [here](#).

Thematic sessions on biodiversity and chemicals & waste

The purpose of these sessions was to discuss the relevance of the biodiversity and chemicals and waste clusters for the programme beneficiaries and to take into account the following questions:

Is the biodiversity and chemicals and waste agenda a priority for the region and why?

Should the programme continue to focus on these areas?

What has happened in that field of work that could be attributable to the ACP-MEAs programme?

How could impacts of the programme be built on and clearly profit beneficiary countries?

How could the activities be re-designed to deliver the foreseen support for ACP Member States?

The session started with a quick overview from UN Environment on both topics in general and status of implementation of its related MEAs in the ACP region, also highlighting its links to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The session was an interactive one, where project partners and other experts actively contributed to the discussions and propose concrete ways of improving the quality of the activities in the regions.

The following key points emerged from the discussions:

The Pacific Hub Coordinator pointed out that though SDGs have entered as an important global framework, they do not capture all pressing issues. For example, corals are not covered in the SDG indicators but they are covered through Aichi target 101 under CBD indicating that biodiversity MEAs continue to stay relevant in complementing the SDGs. Biodiversity remains a global priority, and especially relevant in the Pacific, where it forms a major part of their subsistence.

There is a need to engage another level of stakeholders, for example, the food producers, to raise awareness of their key role in agro-biodiversity, food production, waste, and environmental impact. Also need to engage non-traditional stakeholders such as in civil society, as well as in the political realm.

- The sound management of chemicals and waste is an extremely important issue that affects human health, livelihood and the environment yet it has not reached sufficient attention because it is a hard issue 'to sell' and can be perceived as at times too technical.
- With a tenfold increase in the use of pesticides, their management is crucial driven in large part by the commercialization and scaling up of agriculture.
- Africa is championing ratification of Minamata and it is worth observing the progress on that front.

¹ Target 10: By 2015 the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.

- It would be important to continue promoting the work on implementation of the Minamata Convention now that it is entering into force in August 2017, to keep the momentum and in view of achieving real mercury reductions. The NGOs can play an important role in assisting governments, building capacities and raising awareness at the same time.
- There needs to be a greater uptake of MEAs and all entities need to be doing more, including MEA Secretariats, highlighting the consequences of non-action.

Concluding remarks

The day was concluded as being an informative and comprehensive one on the Programme, allowing for a dynamic and engaging discussion throughout. Some of the closing remarks highlighted that:

- There is great value in working across the regions and learning from each other's experiences in the field;
- The programme is working well in delivering technical capacity but it needs extra work to take this knowledge to the higher-level decision making;
- Even as we continue to complete Phase 2, we should start assessing with great introspection, what has been the impact of the programme so far
- An evaluation is meant to make things better so we should take into account the feedback received;
- With the acknowledgement that political and programmatic structures stay the same , such as the ACP Secretariat and countries continuing to be the final beneficiaries, it would be appreciated if those implementing the programme (such as the Hub entities) are able to participate in the programme design process. This is to encourage ownership, especially among the Hubs, and avoid total top-down decision making.

Day 3: Regional Hubs working session

With the opportunity of all regional hub coordinators and UN Environment team being together, the third day was designed as an internal working session to iron out issues in implementation and improving efficiency in delivery.

The session mainly discussed the following agenda items:

- 1) How to involve better decision makers and political influencers in the programme;
- 2) Feedback on the mid-term evaluation (Hubs were to send feedback to UN Environment by the 7th July, 2017 for overall compilation);

- 3) Actions to be undertaken between now and end of Phase 2 to influence/affect Phase 3
- 4) Wrap up of Phase 2 and no cost extension logistics

Overall recommendations and follow up:

1) Increase the political buy-in of the Programme:

- The technical and institutional capacity building work of the programme needs to be further complemented by greater political and policy participation and effort.
 - Raise visibility and communication channels to target that specific audience.
 - Improve the Programme's engagement in high-level forums/conferences/meetings/events to not only raise the visibility but to depict the value-add of the programme to the relevant member states and decision makers. This could include increasing engagement at the SPREP annual meeting, ACP-EU Joint Parliamentary Assembly, UN Environment Assembly, COTED, African Union meetings, COPs, regional summits, and so on. Compile a prioritization table of upcoming major events and meetings, such as regional ministerial forums, where the programme could participate in raising its visibility.
 - This crucial subject should ideally feed in to the designing of activities in Phase 3, as well.

2) Further develop the coordination mechanisms:

- In the design of potential Phase 3, there is a need to critically analyze coordination and work flows across the partner institutions. Otherwise, the risk of working in silos remains.
- Create a mechanism for inter-hub collaboration: preparations for negotiations are an important area to make it happen. (esp. between Pacific and Caribbean, and SIDS in Africa) – for example used in the SIDS climate change topic already

3) Develop a more efficient reporting on outcomes

- Annual reporting – a change as already occurred from quarterly reporting in Phase 1. This allowed the overall process to flow better with more comprehensive analysis. But it was recommended that more than the activity level, it is important and more interesting to report at the outcome level, emphasizing the causal link between the intervention and the result. It was recommended that reporting deadlines be respected as the financial disbursement from the EC is linked to the report submission. Use reporting tools like the dashboard for comprehensive tracking and ease in annual reporting.

- Explore possibility of harmonized reporting, standardized between UN Environment, FAO and other partners (in Phase 3).

4) Enable sustainability

- As institutionalizing and integrating the Programme into the AUC structures remains a challenge, it is important to acknowledge that other budgets within the institution such as for example, peace and security, are much bigger and given prominence. Thus, targeted push and influencing is needed to enable the absorption of the programme into AUC for longer term sustainability.
 - Learn from SPREP on how they integrated the ACP MEAs programme through their organization, enabling greater project ownership.
SPREP has showcased a key lesson for us all: how it utilized \$1 million to raise \$4.3 million in future project funding.

5) Obtain a one year no-cost extension:

A no-cost extension for the programme was discussed and a timeline agreed, including steps to materialize the extension. To that effect, the UN Environment is to send correspondence as soon as possible to the ACP Secretariat formally requesting for no-cost extension up to December 2018.

6) Support the development of Phase 3

- With the acknowledgment that the scope and magnitude of the third Phase will be ultimately determined by the European Commission and the ACP Secretariat, UN Environment will closely follow up on the process while availing itself of any opportunities to provide technical and institutional support and assistance in its design and structuring;
- UN Environment to increase its targeted exchanges, engagement and meetings with High Level ACP Secretariat officials as well as in-house, with the Executive Office. Not only to justify Phase III but to negotiate for it to be a mutually beneficial, greater package overall;
- Similarly, UN Environment will conduct greater engagement with the ACP Ambassadors in Brussels directly and through the Hubs hosting institutions and governments at national and regional levels;
- The regional hubs will to write to the ACP Ambassadors in Brussels and formally indicate interest in Phase 3 and its designing.