



Pacific
Community
Communauté
du Pacifique



**Intra-ACP Agriculture Policy Programme
Steering Committee Meeting
Novotel Hotel, NADI
31 August – 1 September 2017**

INTRODUCTION

1. The third meeting of the Pacific Intra-ACP Agriculture Policy Program (PAPP) Steering Committee was held at the Novotel Hotel, Nadi, Fiji on 31 August – 1 September 2017. The meeting was chaired by Mr Michael Ho’ota from the Solomon Islands, supported by APP Adviser, Mr Vili Caniogo.

2. The following Pacific ACP countries were represented: *Cook Islands, Fiji, Federated States of Micronesia, Kiribati, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Tonga, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu and Vanuatu*. APP Steering Committee Observer representatives included: the Caribbean Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) and the Pacific Island Farmers Organization Network (PIFON). The EU Pacific Delegation (Ms Marta Brignone) also attended the first day. The EU Head of Cooperation, Mr Christophe Wagner also attended the afternoon session of the first day and launched the new *Regional Agricultural Policy and Research portals*.

3. The Meeting was officially opened by Mr Jitendra Singh, *Permanent Secretary, Fiji Ministry of Agriculture*. He observed that the PAPP had made significant in-roads to promoting regionalism, transparency and increasing focus on the need for evidence based planning that benefitted smallholder farmers. In that regard, he outlined steps that Fiji was taking in that regard to focus on strengthening its policy, statistics and information planning capacities. He also noted the need for the sector to embrace innovation, technology and for private sector partnerships to help accelerate growth in the agriculture and forestry sector. He welcomed the concept of an *Agricultural Planners Network* (that was being tabled at the meeting) which would strengthen planning capacity and linkages in the Pacific and – and on behalf of Fiji he offered to host the first one.

4. The overall objective of the meeting was to:
- (i) Provide an update of program activities and results to date
 - (ii) Discuss a number of regional initiatives that has been advanced to date and seek endorsement at the national level in lieu of the upcoming Heads and Ministers of Agriculture meeting (HOAFS/MOAFS). It was noted that the HOAFS/MOAFS was last held in 2012.

- (iii) Discuss the way forward post PAPP with regards to needs and priorities for the region.

5. Marta Brignone from the EU Delegation stated that the EU welcomed the opportunity to discuss and share experiences and noted the good working relationship between the EU and LRD. She noted that the intra-ACP PAPP showed some very tangible results linking policy research and farmers.

KEY MEETING DISCUSSION / OUTCOMES

6. The Steering Committee:
- a. **Noted** that many good results had been achieved across the Pacific over the last 3 years through APP at national and regional levels. They noted that the APP provided a much needed focus on *agriculture sector planning* and strategic development given the limited national resources available to Ministries.
 - b. **Welcomed** the focus by the APP on policy and planning capacity, stating that this was an area that was not covered by SPC previously or the plethora of agricultural development programs in the region.
 - The APP has increased the momentum at the national level regarding national policy capabilities; and that it was premature to stop this momentum at this stage. The committee unanimously **acknowledged** the benefit of having assistance in the policy space, particularly as this had not been a focus of the the plethora of development programs in the region or SPC-LRD before;
 - Noted that good strategic costed plans were already prompting further national government budget financing e.g. Samoa, Vanuatu.
 - In regard to farmer organizations in the region, much progress was made and countries were looking to engage farmer organizations to assist development. It was noted that FO's were also at an early stage and more support was needed to build their capacity, service provision and ability to advocate effectively for framers.
 - Welcomed the establishment of the *Pacific Island Rural Advisory Services network (PIRAS)* to better link research, extension and adoption and the research portal established within this network. (*Pacific Agriculture Information System (PAIS)*). Within this ambit, *the* valuable work carried out to promote taro breeding research through the Centre for Pacific Crops and Trees (CePaCT) and the Pacific Plant Genetic Resources Network (PAPGREN).

- c. **Noted** that from the outset of PAPP, there was recognition that member countries had a policy gap, and now most of the countries for the first time, had a sector plan.
- d. **Thanked** the project for its help going through this process, but they also acknowledged that there was a lot to learn, particularly in manoeuvring through that process of influencing the next levels of government. Most countries still had limitations to their capacity in formulating policy and transferring the knowledge right down to farmer-level.
- e. **Agreed** countries' national capacities were still at an early stage and that an APP closure would be premature. As such, developing an exit plan was important.
- f. **Queried** the EU as to whether a successor Pacific APP program or similar was likely particularly planning capacity support.
- g. The EU **welcomed** views from the countries especially noting the relevance and usefulness of the PAPP to their needs. The EU delegate stated it was important that countries always come forth to state their priorities and encouraged countries or this grouping to continue to advocate for their needs. The Delegate stated that it was open to supporting Pacific priorities noting that the EU had different funding envelopes it provided to the region.

Regional Approaches

7. The Steering Committee noted a number of initiatives through the Pacific APP had been taken to advance regional collaboration and complementary approaches.

Regional Agricultural Portals/Databases

- a. **Commended** the establishment of new regional portals for agriculture policies for policy and research (Agriculture Policy Bank (APB) and Pacific Agriculture Information System (PAIS) respectively) that would make information readily available to all stakeholders and promote regional collaboration. These portals were subsequently launched at the end of the meeting by the EU Head of Cooperation, *Mr Christophe Wagner*;
- b. **Commended** the *Policy Study Analytical work* by SPC PAPP (2015-16) that fleshed out the common priorities for the region in terms of issues, opportunities, commodities and farmer needs. This was a first of its kind – now an evidence based platform for **regional collaboration**. Noted that a *Publication or Compendium* would be initially launched at the PWA in Vanuatu (October 2017) to advocate this important regional step at a public forum that would only be held every two years. Mr Caniogo advised that a country section (Part B) was included which would

benefit from another active round of input by countries as some countries had now updated a number of their policies;

- c. **Agreed** that a simple regional sharing *PACT/MoU* or similar instrument be signed by countries and technical agencies to share, utilize and disseminate information. Noted that USP and NARI were already keen to sign up to such an instrument. This intent for greater investment and sharing of information was already agreed to by HOAFS/MOAFS in 2010. SPC would send a draft PACT/MOU to countries – through the PSC – by mid-November 2017. Countries will then be asked to sign before December or at a forthcoming inaugural Planners' Forum;
- d. **Agreed that** key regional portals such as these (and others at SPC LRD such as biosecurity, pest list database etc) be sustained and that a plan was needed to sustain and further strengthen the use, dissemination and overall advocacy of these KM portals. *SPC to prepare a paper on this.*

Regional Approaches/ Strategies/Plans

- e. **Noted** the following Regional Agriculture Strategies that have been developed through national and regional processes:
 - Pacific Island Extension Strategy (PIES)
 - Pacific Strategic Plan for Agriculture and Fisheries Statistics (P-SPAFS)
 - Updated Youth in Agriculture Strategy (YIA) – the original was approved by the HOAFS/MOAFS in 2010.
 - f. **Noted** that the PIES was a guiding document for the improvement of rural advisory services (extension) in the Pacific. PIES was driven by the Pacific research and extension network (PIRAS). P-SPAFS is the framework for a 10-year programme to improve the quality of agriculture statistics, capacity building and evidence based decision making. It was developed by SPC, FAO and PIC countries over the last 2 years. The YIA strategy extends and strengthens the existing strategy to 2025.
10. **Agreed** that copies of the Strategies would be made available to countries using the PSC mechanism so that relevant stakeholders are able to access and read these documents. Countries would then provide feedback as to their endorsement, suggested improvements/changes or if more time was needed. ***SPC APP to facilitate.***

Establishment of a Regional Planners Forum

- 11. **Welcomed** a presentation by Mr Greg Rawlins from the Caribbeans APP program that shared their results including the work of the Caribbean Regional Planners

Forum. He noted that the Caribbean Planners Forum was extremely beneficial and added value to the region mechanisms through their dialogue, pursuit of innovation and linking more cross-sectorally.

12. **Supported** a renewed focus on national planning capacities and policy development brought in by the PAPP and acknowledged that planning capacities within countries were weak and this was a key area that needed further support.
13. **Agreed** that a new Agriculture Planners' Forum would be highly relevant to the region and therefore be established, noting Fiji's offer to host the first meeting.
14. **Agreed** that a concept note for the Planners Forum be drafted by SPC and distributed to countries through the PSC representatives. Four countries offered to participate in preparing for the planners inaugural meeting – **Cook Islands, FSM, Samoa and Fiji**. SPC to facilitate a draft note prior to the PWA and also draw in any assistance from the Caribbean given the experience with the RPF in that region.

Sustainability Plan for PAPP

The Steering Committee:

15. **Discussed** a number of priorities that were important to build on from PAPP> These included;

- strengthened planning capacity and competencies with Agricultural Ministries;
- Systematic process to better articulate for national budgetary allocation;
- strengthen policy direction in growth areas such as tourism, value-addition, niche markets and manage risk such as DRM and climate change;
- proactively address standards and traceability;
- build capacity of farming organizations, service provision and policy advocacy;
- continue to strengthen the policy enabling environment.

16. **Noted** the wide range of initiatives and products produced by the Caribbean APP and Pacific APP and that both regions were now in a better position to share experiences and information. This could be usefully pursued within the Regional Agriculture Planners' Forum.

17. **Noted** that there were also key gaps that still need to be addressed (See Elements of an Exit Strategy in Session 11 on page 30) that include:

- Policy management, integration and review
- Strategic linkages to business
- Enabling support for, and better integration with DRM processes
- Improved measurement of policy impacts through greater investment in monitoring and impact evaluation
- Embedding agriculture policy and planning training in agricultural university curricula.
- Support for linkages to markets via pilots of Market Information Systems (MIS) and market studies and design
- Maintenance and expansion of ICT and KM platforms
- Strategic support for farmer partner organizations.

18. **Agreed** that SPC APP and a representative group from the PSC prepare a more detailed PAPP Sustainability Plan based on the priorities together with a group of at least 3 planning officials from the region following the ROM (ROM2)

19. **Agreed** that the following, at a minimum, need to be sustained:

- The Portals – APB (by the Pacific RPF) and PAIS
- Agricultural Planning capacity
- Agricultural statistics capacity
- Farmer organization support.

20. **Noted** also the number of initiatives from PAPP that are already incorporated into Government processes and /or work with other partners. These include Ag Intel (Cook Islands), MIS (Fiji Crops & Livestock Council), national policy information access (national governments) and the Pacific Islands Extension Strategy (PIRAS).

21. **Welcomed** the opportunity that PAPP has given countries to draw learnings from other sectors such as the tourism sector. Work on sub-sector policies will require external assistance, particularly technical/program support and this is an area that should be considered for any new program.

22. **Noted** the forthcoming Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) review of the PAPP and **acknowledged** the difficulty of doing a full impact evaluation, given the difficulties of attribution in such a wide-ranging project but also noted the importance of monitoring impact as far as possible.

Next Meetings

The Steering Committee:

23. **Noted 6-8 December 2017** for a subcommittee (See paragraph 14) meeting (See paragraph 14) to develop Terms of Reference and to progress planning of the inaugural Agriculture Planners' Forum and the APP exit plan (See paragraph 18).

24. **Noted February 2018** as the proposed date for a full APP-SC Meeting and inaugural Regional Agricultural Planners' Forum.

ANNEXES

Annex 1 – Participant List

Annex 2 – Details of sessions

Annex 3 – Meeting Agenda

Annex 1 List of Participants

	First name	Surname	Country Represented	Gender	Job title	Organisation	Contact details (e.g. email or phone)
1	Patrick Akaiti	Arioka	Cook Islands	M	Director of Policy	Ministry of Agriculture	patrick.arioka@agriculture.gov.ck
2	Jitendra	Singh	Fiji	M	Permanent Secretary for Agriculture	Ministry of Agriculture	rmafi@agriculture.gov.fj
3	Uraia Katisawani	Waibuta	Fiji	M	Deputy Secretary for Agriculture Development	Ministry of Agriculture	rmafi@agriculture.gov.fj
4	Kyle	Stice	Fiji	M	Manager	PIFON	manager@pacificfarmers.com
5	Jacqui	Berrel	Fiji	F	Strategic Communications Consultant	Inform Relations	jacberrell@yahoo.com
6	Samisoni Gaunasautu	Pareti	Fiji	M	Editor	Islands Business	sgpareti@gmail.com
7	Nacanieli Sikinairai	Tuivavalagi	FSM	M	Agronomy Researcher	CRE-College of Micronesia	nat.tuivavalagi@gmail.com
8	Taare	Aukitino	Kiribati	F	Secretary	MELAD	secretary@melad.gov.ki
9	James Mark Aliva	Poihega	Niue	M	Snr. Agricultural & Forestry Officer	DAFF	James.Poihega@mail.gov.nu
10	Fernando	Sengebau	Palau	M	Director	Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment and Tourism	fsengebau@palaunet.com; fsengebau@gmail.com
11	Faletoi	Tuilaepa	Samoa	M	Assistant CEO	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries	faletoi.suavi@maf.gov.ws
13	Michael Tapaholoiesi	Ho'ota	Solomon	M	Director of Extension	Ministry of Agriculture Livestock	Michael.Ho'ota@sig.gov.sb
14	Greg Cecil E	Rawlins	Trinidad & Tobago	M	Coordinator	Regional Integration, Caribbean Region	gregg.rawlins@iica.int
15	Viliami Toalei	Manu	Tonga	M	CEO	MAFF	viliamitoaleimanu@yahoo.com

16	Lonny	Jonah	Vanuatu	M	Director- Livestock Dept	MALFFB	lbong@vanuatu.gov.vu
17	Marta Anna	Brignone	Fiji	F		EU	Marta- Anna.BRIGNONE@eeas.eu ropa.eu
18	Christoph	Wagner	Fiji	M		EU	
19	Sakeasi	Waikere	Fiji	M	Representative from PM's Office	Fiji Government	
20	Samisoni Gaunasautu	Pareti	Fiji	M	Editor	Islands Business	sgpareti@gmail.com

ANNEX 2 Details of sessions

Intra-ACP Agricultural Policy Programme Steering Committee Meeting - Minutes

Thursday 31 August – Friday 1 September 2017

Novotel Hotel, Nadi, FIJI

Opening

Michael Ho'ota - Chair

Welcome Prayer

Patrick – A reading from Romans

Opening Remarks

Michael then welcomed Marta Brignone (EU), Jitendra Singh (PS, Agriculture Fiji) and Jan Helsen (Director, LRD SPC).

Marta Brignone:

Ms Brignone responded, that PAPP was one of the first teams that she worked with and so in the past 10 months she has watched the project's progress with particular interest.

The EU sees agriculture as a crucial sector for the development of Pacific countries. We welcome the opportunity to discuss and share experiences. This project is showing some very tangible results linking policy research and farmers. We can take stock of the challenges that need to be introduced in the future. How can we see the next steps in cooperation between your countries and the EU?

We are undergoing a formulation exercise for the next phases. For the agriculture sector, the discussions today will be very helpful to feed into that.

The EU will continue to support agriculture. Shared practice amongst different regions via the ACP is very beneficial and good. We will have, in the future, specific programs for this region though, as well as bilateral programs with countries. The EU wants to ensure that these regional projects are proactively managed by all of the host ministries.

Marta thanked SPC LRD Mr Helsen and his team for the good relationship that the EU has with them.

Michael – Thankyou for your encouraging remarks.

Jitendra Singh:

Dep Sec from the PM's office, EU, Caribbean representatives and member country representatives, we welcome you to Fiji for this meeting. Some of you have been involved in the meetings on technology and research but today we are here to hear about the APP and build on the lessons learnt from the project over the past 3 years.

A lot more needs to be done in Agriculture – internally we need to strengthen our own capacities. But there is room to expand on regional cooperation. We must look outwards to learn from other regions to expand our agricultural capacity. We must embrace innovation. Because of budgetary constraints it is difficult to invest – but we must modernise and innovate because this is where increased production will come from.

The APP has made significant in-roads to promoting regionalism. The portals for PAIS and APB promote transparency and provides the evidence base to seek economies of scale.

I understand that over the next 2 days – strategy approaches for research, statistics and regional capacity will be discussed. This complements well the goals of our own Fiji 2020 Agriculture plan that is about embracing new technologies, new ways of doing things and working tangibly with the private sector to address our key goals – growing the sector, reducing food imports, securing farmer economic livelihoods and building a more resilient and healthy nation. An example of this is in addressing important domestic markets such as tourism.

A lot more still needs to be done. APP has helped build awareness of needs for capacity but we need to continue to think strategically and work smarter with partners. I would like to see this concept of an agricultural planners forum established for the Pacific – and we will be able to learn from the experiences of the Caribbean about this. Fiji would be prepared to host an initial Regional Planners Forum.

MoA is working on a new 5 year plan. We have had new sector plans with the crop & livestock strategies. Modernisation and innovation are at the heart of the new plan. The plan also emphasises not just technical capacity building but also capacity in policy formulation. There is still room for improvement. Strong exposure to other policies around the region is very helpful, and drawing on best practices. *Policies from other regions are like 'turn-key operations' that can be easily customised to our own agricultural policy landscape, and we must learn from these.*

An agriculture policy planners forum will greatly enrich our capacities in each of our national ministries. The challenge will be to find the resources for these additional initiatives, but I believe CIS and FAO and other donors would be supportive of this.

Introductions

Michael Ho'ota (Director, DOE), Vili Caniogo (PAPP SPC), Gregg Rawlins (Caribbean Representative), Lonny Bong (Director of Livestock Vanuatu), Patrick Arioka (Cook Islands), Miriama Kunawave Brown (SPC), Elenoa Tamani-Fuli (SPC), Cheryl Thomas (SPC), Kyle Stice (PIFON), James Poihega (Niue), Fred Sengebau (Palau), Michael Sharp (SPC Statistics Division), Marta Brignone (EU), Sakeasi Waikere (Dep Sec International Cooperation, Fiji Office of the PM), Taare Aukitino (Kiribati), Jan Helsen (Director LRD SPC), Jitendra Singh (PS Agric Fiji), Uraia Waibuta (Dep Sec MoA Fiji), Faletoi Suavi (Samoa), Jiu Daunivalu (FCLC, Fiji).

Session 1 Introduction – Vili Caniogo

Presentations are available online at <http://pafpnet.spc.int/our-events/icalrepeat.detail/2017/08/31/24/-/intra-acp-agricultural-policy-programme-steering-committee-meeting>.

The PAPP team leader gave a brief recapitulation of the program for the benefit of new members of the Steering Committee.

PAPP came from EDF10 with EUR 8.6M to the Pacific. Timeline for the project July 2014 and ends in May 2018. Cyclone Winstan delayed roll-out for 3-4 months. Key result areas have been in:

1. Policy – ‘a big word but it is really around capacity (and stats and regional approaches)’.
2. Crop research and extension (CePaCT, PIRAS)
3. Market linkages – better linkage of farmers to markets (especially the partnership with PIFON)

Prior to PAPP there was limited access to policies and knowledge and limited regional approaches. (90% didn’t know where to access agriculture plans & documents and over 50 % of public servants weren’t aware of ag sector plans or couldn’t access these documents). *The portals have been all about trying to organise information and make it available.*

National farmer collectives were not formally structured and therefore had weak advocacy; market information was weak or dispersed and generally farmers did not have access to it.

Summary of the review of the policies and common priorities: Nutrition, Economic development, Sustainability, Effective institutions.

The review of policies showed the need for better planning...which really involves recognising exactly what you needed to be chasing as a national ministry or organisation.

HIGHLIGHTS

KRA1:

- All countries can today access their national agricultural policies and plans easily
- National development of new sector or commodity plans
- Regional approaches plans

KRA2

- TWG Research and extension formalised to PIRAS
- PIES
- PAIS

KRA3

- stronger farmer support
- Supporting PIFON and raising their profile with a lot of training and events
- Catalyzing new markets/products for example agritourism, organics and MIS product

Quality processes: There has been an independent Results oriented Monitoring (ROM) in Dec 2015 and another one coming in October 2017.

Key lessons:

1. National agriculture planning capacity is key – there are limited resources and competing interests in NRM
2. Investing in organizing ICKM can pay off
3. Importance of farmer networks

4. Still pressing constraints eg. farmer finance
5. Scope for pooling of resources in a regional effort.

PICTs need to drive these, especially No 5.

So for exiting from the APP we propose the following focus:

- 1) Keep building capacity, evidence based approaches, cooperation , visibility of sector (including a structured approach to influence budget)
- 2) Coordinated extension approach (portals, use of ICT, clearly defined partnership arrangement with PIRAS, PIFON and others)
- 3) Regional information plan

Activities of PAPP in each country were distributed to the Steering Committee.

DISCUSSION

The Steering Committee **clarified** that there is no formal planned second phase, but that the EU was still very interested in working on agriculture policy projects in the Pacific, and that this could be via an ACP mechanism, or Pacific regional, or bilaterally with member countries. Funding for any new project will not commence before end of 2018.

The Steering Committee **noted** its appreciation of the EU's support to date, and acknowledged that, as the socio-economic landscape of PICTs is changing rapidly, the end of the PAPP project is an opportunity to re-design interventions for the next 5 years.

Session 2: Regional approaches: Research & Extension

- Omitted due to illness of the PIRAS chairman. A summary of activities in this area was presented by the PAPP team leader.

Session 3a: Regional Approaches: Research and Extension - Kyle Stice (PIFON)

- POWERPOINT PRESENTATION -

PIFON (Pacific Islands Farmer Organisation Network) is a network which covers 9 countries, currently 25 national farmer organisations with about 350 local farmer organisations (est. 25,000 farmers). We work to link people together.

'Farmer organisations can effectively and efficiently complement the work of government and aid agencies by extending the outreach of support to farmers.'

Overview of the PIFON-SPC PAPP partnership (2014-2016)

- Formally this was relatively short, but we hope that it has laid the foundation for future such partnerships
- FJD 400,000 over 2 years for advocacy and information outreach, promotion of sustainable production practices & Capacity building.

PIFON works in a range of areas:

- 1.1 Preparation of policy briefs for farmer organisations
- 1.2 Training of Farmer Organisations (FO) focused on ICT training
- 1.3 Support to FO in the upgrading of communication strategies.
- 1.4 Training FOs to write up lessons learnt
- 1.5 Supporting Farmer to Farmer exchanges
- 1.6 Provide representation of FOs.

Within the partnership PIFON achieved 24 distinct activities with 12 national farmer organisations directly; 8 countries benefited and approximately 500 farmers directly benefiting.

'We have learnt from PAPP to show that there are new strategies for working with farmers. 'Farmers need training on how to conduct themselves in the business world.' Kyle Stice

Key messages:

1. Farmer Organisations (FO) have an important role to play in advocacy and policy engagement in the Pacific but need to strengthen their capacity to be more effective in this role.
2. FOs can be effective and efficient (cost efficient) partners working with government and development partners to support agricultural development in the region
3. Farmer organisations should be viewed as *partners* and not just beneficiaries by government and development organisations.

PIFON thanked SPC and EU for their support.

www.pacificfarmers.com

DISCUSSION

The committee **complemented** PIFON on the enabling role that it is playing, particularly in getting the growers and buyers in one room so that everyone understands what can be supplied and when, and getting agreements that growers can take to their banks to secure loans. They **noted** that PIFON needs to train its FOs on good governance but also acknowledged that there is a role for governments in setting standards for good governance.

Session 3b National policy developments and partnerships – Country presentation 1 – FIJI

Uraia Waibuta

- POWERPOINT PRESENTATION -

The Ministry of Agriculture has adopted the following Vision: A modernised agriculture sector providing nutritious food and income security for all Fijians.

Mission: To excel in the provision of customer-focused and market-driven services in the agriculture sector.

We are now talking about nutrition now, instead of 'food for all'.

The Fiji 2020 Agriculture Plan policy agenda is huge and ambitious. We are currently focused on the crop and livestock strategy plan areas.

Fiji's government is still investing strongly in agriculture – the MoA budget has remained at around 40M for government programs. This year the Land and Water RM has moved to its own Ministry.

Priorities are supporting private sector-led initiatives to improve and develop the commercial agriculture Sector.

MoA Fiji noted its thanks for the regional programs for facilitating regional cooperation.

Mr Christoph Wagner, Head of Cooperation with the EU Delegation to the Pacific, was welcomed by the committee.

Session 4 Regional approaches: climate Smart Agriculture – Logo Waqainabete

- POWERPOINT PRESENTATION -

Mission of CePaCT: To support agricultural development in the region through the effective conservation and efficient use of plant genetic resources.

- Pacific accessions originate from 16 PICTS
- 25 % are cleared as free from viruses and able to be shared

CePaCT backup collections will be restored as a priority for CePaCT. Most accessions in the last year have been distributed with funding from EU – PAPP. Most of crop distributions are back out to Pacific islands. A focus for the accessions is on nutrient rich varieties and which are likely to be highly marketable (taste good). For the future CePaCT will be looking at Taro Leaf Blight resistant taro lines, Open Pollinated kumala and cassava etc and virus indexing – taro, banana, sweet potato, yam, bele (*Abelmoschus manihot*) is on hold.

On-going research into:

- Stem cutting research for tree crops (breadfruit is on hold)
- Greenhouse screening for drought tolerance in 4 kumala varieties
- Optimisation of the *in vitro* drought screening protocol for taro and aroids
- Field drought tolerance studies of taro (Tolo's work)

New research:

- *In vitro* protocols for different species

Capacity building:

- exchanges to the Caribbean for training and Caribbean Week of Agriculture
- tissue culture training within the Pacific
- new training on coconut embryo culture
- mutation breeding (IAEA) project
- etc.

Promotion & Awareness:

- mailing list (>2000 people)
- databases (PACGEN & Genesys)
- press releases etc.

Session 4b - The benefits of sharing genetic resource through global, regional & national collaboration: The case study of Taro Leaf Blight in Samoa

Moafanua Tolo Iosefa

This work is a collaboration because no country in the region can afford to do this work on their own. TLB totally changed the diet of Samoa when it arrived in 1990, when taro production stopped and therefore rice and wheat.

This had a massive impact on exports of taro. The narrow genetic basis of pacific food crops is like not having any money in the bank account for future generations. This was a driver for the establishment of CePaCT.

The taro breeding programme – the challenge was to find resistant varieties, but also meet the demanding taste requirements of Samoan communities at home and abroad, and provide for a shelf life that would allow export by sea. The challenge was met by a plant breeding program with the active participation of growers.

The program achieved this through a long term intervention of crop breeding now in its 9th cycle of selection and improvement.

There is now a regional taro breeding program with work in the Cook Islands, Tonga and Fiji. His group is also working on other species such as yams.

‘Faafetai’ – thankyou.

Session 5 – Country report – COOK ISLANDS AgINTEL

Patrick Arioka

Department of Policy, Planning & Projects, Ministry of Agriculture

Patrick presented on the Cook Islands method of surveying its farmers so that they have meaningful data for planning and monitoring. While still employing sporadic (5 year) agricultural censuses they have moved to monthly surveys (quarterly for outer islands) for commodity production. They are returning this data to the users via the AgINTEL system developed with support from PAPP.

AgINTEL – Main objective was to obtain data on crop production and value (price) performances from the market and other sources like hotels and restaurants and households.

Farmers are starting to use the newsletters to be more informed about what their prices. The bulletin has stimulated interest in forecasting future prices (but this isn’t a regular part of the bulletins). SPC Statistics for Development Division was interested to learn about their conversions from non-standard units, such as baskets of taro and bunches/hands of bananas.

Session 10 Program Update – Vili Caniogo

Vili summarised the project results against the logical framework, emphasising the following:

KRA1

- APB and PAIS are a critical pieces of infrastructure and a handbook/compendium of what is common in the policies of the region is now in draft form.
- Regional Agriculture and Fisheries Statistics Strategy
- Supported 2 national agricultural censuses (FSM & Tonga)

KRA2

6 trainings on crop breeding/technology transfer and organising the material

- PIRAS, which is part of the Global FRAS and a regional research database PAIS
- 4 collaborations with young farmers at rural training centres
- Ongoing partnership with Hango to strengthen local seed and livestock systems.

- 1 national scoping and gap analysis on local poultry feed (Kiribati) & training on local poultry husbandry and feed production on 4 islands in Vanuatu and 2 locations in Solomon Islands.

KRA3

- Supported 13 + exchanges involving farmers
- 3 agri-tourism exchanges in Samoa, Tonga and Fiji – this synergy is really weak at the moment, and there was no home for pursuing this kind of work.
- We have worked well with SPTO, ICA
- 2 Market Information Systems pushed countries to engage with ICKM approaches.

In terms of €8.6M, as at end of June we have spent 68% of budget.

DISCUSSION

The Steering Committee had a frank discussion about the merits and difficulties of the PAPP project's wide-ranging Logical Framework. The committee unanimously **acknowledged** the benefit of having assistance in the policy space, particularly as this had not been a focus of SPC LRD before.

The SC **acknowledged** the difficulty of doing a full impact evaluation, given the difficulties of attribution in such a wide-ranging project but also noted the importance of monitoring impact as far as possible.

The EU commented that, further to the earlier discussion about funding processes and cycles for any possible future project, countries needed to really consider their priorities and ask themselves whether they will be able to continue implementation of strategies independently, or whether this was still a priority for further funding. Ms Brignone continued that the forthcoming ROM in October 2017 would be an opportunity for the countries to discuss honestly about whether PAPP is sustainable, what has been achieved, and what have been the impacts?

Members of the SC **commented** that from the outset of PAPP there was recognition that member countries had a policy gap, and now most of the countries now for the first time have a sector plan.

They **thanked** the project for its help going through this process, but they also **acknowledged** that there is a lot to learn, particularly in manoeuvring through that process of influencing the next levels of government. Most countries still have limitations to their capacity in formulating policy and transferring the knowledge right down to farmer-level.

They **noted** that many activities are starting implementation now and they will need financial support. In particular there is planning work to do to ensure that there are adequate and predictable amounts of resources for new industries.

The committee also **noted** the work with FAO to develop a food security cluster to cope with climate change and that, therefore the role of good planning is more critical than ever.

They **acknowledged** the support of PAPP in terms of development of specific strategies and **noted** members' concerns about how best to resource the process of addressing specific issues identified at the national and community level.

The committee **noted** the opportunity that PAPP has given countries to draw learnings from other sectors such as the tourism sector. Work on sub-sector policies will require external assistance, particularly technical/program support and this is an area that should be considered for any new program.

Christoph Wagner from the EU noted the concerns but also recognised that there are other sources of funding, and that the nature of projects is that they come to an end and planning for the exit phase is crucial. From the EU's point of view, part of that process is to ask:

- What are the findings for development?; and
- How are we progressing the Sustainable Development Goals?

The key for the future is to have agriculture policies and priorities well documented and appropriately flagged in national development strategies. These then form the core of country advice to the EU about priorities for funding.

PAPP has been conscious of building tools and mechanisms. Inside these national policies there is good economic momentum and payoff by focusing specifically on particular sub-sectors e.g. agritourism, coffee, coconut. This type of conversation is needed in setting priorities within the agriculture sector in the Pacific. PAPP has also helped to highlight just how stretched the national ministries are.

From the point of view of the Caribbean experience, the CAPP addressed the exit strategy by trying to link the results with the work programs of their partner institutions. It was critical to give some of the work a 'final push' so that it was in a suitable state to be taken over by other organisations. It would be very helpful for the two regions to continue to work together to leverage the results. The ACP APP was very multi-dimensional (policy, research, markets) and we were able to benefit from the linkages and 'interruptions' of the various dimensions. The other dimension that was very unique was including non-conventional (traditional) participants such as farmers themselves, youth and that has brought strong extra benefits.

The EU noted that one of the reasons why they work with crop agencies rather than a room full of consultants is so that research isn't lost and there can be continuity. It is expected that these institutions will have some capacity to continue the work.

The PAPP team leader thanked the SC for the discussion. In summary:

- There is a need for planning support and capacity support
- This is one of the very few programs in this region that has been going into policy (only one third!) and that this has been welcome
- Attention to building planners' capacity has been very helpful
- Linking plans to national budgets can be improved a lot and we need more work on this
- It is important we are ready for the planning and funding windows from EU and the TCP from FAO.

SPECIAL SESSION - Launch of Agriculture Policy Banks & Pacific Agriculture Information System

(Combined with PIRAS Forum and PAPGREN participants)

The Agricultural Policy Bank (APB) and the Pacific Agricultural Information System (PAIS)

were launched by the European Union Delegation for the Pacific's Head of Cooperation, Mr Christoph Wagner, with APP representatives from 15 Pacific ACP countries (Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Vanuatu). Development of the tools was funded by the European Union through the Pacific Community's Intra-ACP Agriculture Policy Programme.

Mr Wagner said, "The EU is very proud to support the work of the Pacific agriculture policy project, and particularly in launching these two important pieces of regional agricultural communication infrastructure. It will be a chance for all stakeholders to remain updated and benefit from direct access to policy and research of the region."

The regional Agriculture Policy Bank (<http://pafpnet.spc.int/policy-bank>), contains more than 160 policies, plans, guidelines and relevant reports from 15 Pacific Island countries and territories, enabling ready access to these national guiding documents. The collation of the various government policies and plans relating to the national agriculture Ministries will enable the community of agricultural practitioners in the Pacific (including donor organisations, NGOs, consultants and governments themselves) to refer to policy documents easily, thereby facilitating the co-ordination of priorities and projects early and efficiently. Making existing policies accessible was a key step in helping countries better engage and formulate their policies.

The second major achievement launched was the Pacific Agricultural Information System (PAIS), an on-line database of scientific research, training materials and other information to enable rural advisory services to draw upon the wealth of knowledge and information that has been built up through decades of work. To date over 38,000 digital records have been uploaded into PAIS from Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Fiji, Vanuatu and SPC. The system, which builds upon existing national systems, has both an on-line and off-line version and will continue to be supported with resourcing from these four countries plus Land Resources Division of the Pacific Community (SPC).

The support for the development of the Pacific Agricultural Information System (PAIS), provides a major piece of knowledge management infrastructure for agricultural researchers and extension officers operating in the Pacific, and is symbolic of the sense of cooperation that is occurring within the Pacific Community.

The Pacific Agriculture Policy Bank is available online at <http://pafpnet.spc.int/policy-bank>

The Pacific Agriculture Information System is in the final stages of being transferred from its current off-line structure to a fully searchable online database.

DAY 2

1/9/2017

Session 6 Michael Sharp –Policy Development and Statistics

- PRESENTATION -

Pacific – Strategic Plan for Agricultural and Fisheries Statistics (P-SPAFS) a 10 year strategic plan for the development of sustainable agricultural statistical systems in the Pacific. Mr Sharp outlined the strategy and noted that they are seeking the Steering Committee's endorsement so that at HOAFS & MOAFS the P-SPAFS can be fully endorsed there.

COMMENTS

The SC **agreed** not to overload the HOAFS and MOAFS meetings with 3 different strategies and proposed that there should be a validation workshop prior to full endorsement, which could occur during the PWA in Port Vila in the week of 16 October. The committee commended the committee who had developed P-SPAFS for their work and were supportive of finalising the process as quickly as practical to get the strategy in place.

Dr Riannni Malo, CEO for Department of Agriculture in Tonga had joined the meeting and was also welcomed.

Session 7: - Samoa net agricultural policy plans and developments to date

Dr Faletoi Suavi

- PRESENTATION -

Faletoi updated the meeting on the integration of Samoa's planning tiers. New agricultural policy plans were itemised, and the ministry is actively restructuring elements of the department and infrastructure to address these issues and roll out programs to deliver these strategies.

Specific foci are on stimulus package programs and an agritourism development project, using a value-chain approach. They have a strong emphasis on partnerships, and a credit scheme.

A graph of the National budgetary funding envelope shows that they have progressively increased because of all of all of these structured strategies, plans and programs.

Opportunities: - Areas within the Ministry and key partnerships to be strengthened

- Strengthen ag sector coordination to improve ASP implementation
- Promoting ag commercialization and farm mechanization
- Strengthen extension services – more staff, more media programs
- Formulation of sub-sector (crops, livestock & fishers) strategies/ policies
- Development of farmer Orgs (SFA, SFFI & SFS)
- Youth unemployment in urban/rural areas
- Etc.

Regional collaboration :

- Cocoa
- Kava
- Coconut industry revitalization
- CCN pests & diseases
- -promoting import substitution
- Improved hygiene in abattoirs
- Area that increase national budget allocations for ag:
 - - crop sector operation budget increased due to current R& D programs (Rhinoceros etc
- Quarantine
 - Supplementary budget for SP farmers in 3-4 years

- Coconut genebank at Mulifanua
- Global breadfruit summit
- Annual agricultural show

COMMENTS

Samoa is an example where planning has been done well and been able to attract increased funding. There is real evidence there of the benefits of doing this, as Departments justify their increases.

Session 8a – APP Highlights of results achievements and contributions of the EU-APP Caribbean Action

Gregg Rawlins

- PRESENTATION -

Overview of the CAPP.

Target beneficiaries were small producers/entrepreneurs, particularly those organised regional associations and networks, including women and youth etc.

Implementation strategy was strongly linked to what the individual countries wanted.

They developed Market information tools and regional strategies. There were 10 new national agricultural policies and plans drafted.

They also revitalized the Regional Planners Forum for Agriculture.

Conclusions & Lessons

- Adhere to good processes and don't rush
- Accept true leadership within a partnership . It is important to establish/agree on the respective roles of all 'partners' in a multi-partner model, when only one party has ultimate accountability.
- Adequate time for pre-implementation activities
- Clear procedures to manage implementation at all stages. Project management tools – what contract, what resources, must be clear and consistent and built on modern project management tools. Don't mix planning and implementation.
- Defining a practical post-project strategy – considerations of 'what next' should be integrated in the inception of planning for all interventions.
- Improved and increased knowledge and skills to guide implementation of national ag policies and plans etc.

Session 8b - Regional Planners Forum in the Caribbean

There is a Caricom (Caribbean Community) and there has been a long tradition of cooperation and capacity building on agricultural policy. In 2010 there was the Caribbean Regional Policy Network (CaRAPN) building on the African FANRPAN very dynamic model from South Africa, which is now at the stage of really mobilising resources – it even has its own staff.

CaRAPN – contributed to multi-sectoral policy analysis; member states continued to request support for policy formulation and instrumentation, project development & implementation and M& E.

CaRAPN was the precursor to the RPF and was driven by the need:

- for continuous capacity improvement in the policy environment
- to engender interactions amongst planners prior to ministers' meetings.

Members – those with direct responsibility for national planning instruments. Core purpose to fill key policy gaps and is focussed on MoA planners/policies, includes the private sector. It was *deliberately not set up as a formally constituted mechanism* – it wasn't intended to duplicate the formal meetings; and deliberately has no formal work programme since the Region has sufficient regional policies strategies and plans that require action – the need is to *animate implementation*.

It must be *relevant and responsive* to planners needs, but it needed recognition by MoAs and needed to be owned by them, also recognised by development agencies.

It started to take on the form of a formal closed pre-Ministerial meeting, but it then moved to an open 5-day dialogue with multi-stakeholder, multi-topic forum strategically scheduled at the start of the year, and not linked to the pre-Ministerial meeting.

In the Caribbean there has been a strong preference for face-to-face engagement. The forum has generated sequential and well formulated technical information. It has become a platform for networking, knowledge sharing and building planning competence. It offers planners an opportunity to have open and free-flowing policy dialogue.

Caribbean experience is that as long as it is not construed convened or managed as a formal meeting it will work. You can optimise both virtual and F2F meetings. Also important to think about strategic scheduling of materials. The problem of course is resourcing it – so they are trying to 'piggy-back' on other meetings.

If you just leave it to the countries they can't send people every year, so that is where donors have come in to support. Both regions share common SIDS related challenges, including that of costly logistics which complicate the efficiency and effectiveness of the regional policy agenda.

COMMENTS

The SC noted that the regional integration process is a lot more mature than in the Pacific; the Caribbean have regional mature processes and institutions in place, and it reflects in the breadth of work that they are able to do.

Session 11 – Sustainability going forward

Jan Helsen opening remarks

Speaking about post-process strategy, you have to build it in right at the start. The project will end, but the activities will not. There were a massive number of outputs, but these will need to be consolidated and put in a new strategic context after the project. Thirdly, within the context of the Intra-ACP, we have to look at the gaps that were NOT addressed by PAPP. Five questions:

1. When we are handed these projects, should I implement or should I be a service provider? Are we the glue through policy enhancement or the service?
2. Looking at national policies and integration, we have to develop within the national frameworks but some of them can then be regionalised too.
3. Disaster Risk Reduction strategies and food security – are these driven by Climate Change, or is it based on vulnerability related to entrenched poverty etc.
4. We have a policy environment where we are linking to markets; we have to let the market and the communities drive us (a demand pull strategy). A good example is the use of cassava for a baking flour. In East Africa it was a poor person's crop, but it changed and became a Presidential initiative to start using cassava flour instead of importing. The message is '*We can do better with what we can produce locally*'.
5. We have a ROM coming up for PAPP – it will take many of the outputs to a global higher level by addressing 5 key things: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency (we can do more efficiently than just workshops), Sustainability (if a government puts forward money for a process it becomes sustainable; we have to draw our nations who are struggling for resources & capacity along) and finally Cross-cutting issues (youth, gender, equity etc.). I am mentioning the ROM because we will be going to Brussels early next year and we will be putting up a project for our PC countries, so we must draw these lessons together to make our case for other projects.

If CTA had linked the two areas better we probably would have done more together with the Caribbean. So be very honest in the ROM and have a regional brainstorming about some of these issues.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Elements of an exit strategy:

1. What would a new ag policy program look like?
2. 3-5 key priority needs
3. What can you put on the table?
4. Suggestion as how we establish the RPF
5. Identify actions that have been prioritised and need to be sustained.
6. How can we ensure that our stakeholders access and use our APB?
7. How can you ensure that policies are relevant to stakeholders? And be used?

Group 1

Elements of an exit strategy:

1. What would a new ag policy program look like?
 - Strengthening technical capacities via a Regional Planners Forum of the Pacific towards a sustainable agriculture AND NATURAL RESOURCES (land, water, forests)
 - o 1. Policy management coherence through budgetary streamlining
 - o 2. Policy integration in all other sector-level goals "All agriculture" (avoiding duplication so that there's not competition for funding)
 - o 3. Sector policy reviews – we need capacity to help (incl. AgPER)
 - o 4. M&E system development, towards having greater impact

- 5. Developing best practices policy guidelines which are agriculture specific to monitor sector level interventions.
 - 6. Measuring policy impacts with the use of surveys, stats etc.
 - 7. Supporting farmer organisations' own policy formulation and governance, to enable market financial access.
 - 8. Project management capacity enhancement.
 - 9. Establishing policy networks and capacities via exchanges and reciprocating work.
 - 10. Develop policy course into Agricultural tertiary education.
2. 3-5 key priority needs
 - a. Policy management, integration and reviews coming via an M&E process (1,2,3 & 4)
 - b. Coherence of policy with NGOs engagement (relationships for delivery)(5 & 7)
 - c. Measuring policy impacts (evaluations)(6)
 3. What can you put on the table?
 - a. Using country-level capacities both in-country and through exchanges and regional dialogues (this could be part of the policy statement on capacity development)
 - b. PAIS contact lists of people.
 - c. Products and tools to access, communicate and share with farmers and other countries.
 4. Suggestion as how we establish the RPF
 - a. Yes, this is a relevant forum to address items above, especially where there are policy gaps where we have not yet identified solutions/strategies to address.
 - b.
 5. Identify actions that have been prioritised and need to be sustained.
 - a. The efforts so far have been at the 'infant' stage but it needs nurturing to develop.
 6. How can we ensure that our stakeholders access and use our APB?
 - a. Achieving policy coherence and coordination and engagement. We need to have outreach to our stakeholders, to sell the policies and their relevance for them.
 - b. It is a government requirement that policies consulted and shared with CSOs to ensure that they are relevant. So that they understand that this is where the money flows.
 7. How can you ensure that policies are relevant to stakeholders? And be used?
 - a.

Q2. Key priorities – Planning capacity – need people trained in strategic planning (5 points) especially trying to focus on results not just actions.

Q3. On the table a regional version of the TCP from the a Pacific; link the current policies to the issues like CC.

Q4. Need a clear concept note for the first regional planners forum, which Fiji has offered to host. Need to ensure that we choose critical themes that are of a regional scope.

Group 3.

Q2. Key priorities:

- National Agriculture policy
- Connectivity between research extension and farmers.
- Elevate SIDS
- National seed policies
- In country feasibility study of priority – CBA

Q4. Establishment of the RPF

- Coordinate or initiate RPF by SPC and then subsequently let nations take ownership

Q6. Have an annual forum that includes a report on the APB

There are two jobs to be done: one is to craft the concept note for the RPF (Oceania & Pacific) 'and the other is the Concept Note on "Elements of an Exit Strategy" which we can submit after Christmas.

Vili has a clear roadmap which will be in the concept note. The other essential part of the CN must include linkage with the private sector; secondly, Disaster Risk Reduction can create the enabling environment.

Budget for PAPP allows for one RPF and one more Steering Committee, which might entail some training.

Closing Session

Key messages.

- a. Many good results have been achieved
- b. The launch, with the European Union of the APB and PAIS
- c. Agreement to develop an information sharing MOU
- d. Endorsement of moving towards a regional planners' forum
- e. Support for the work on the various strategies: PIES, P-SPAFS, YIA

We may include support of the portals into the Concept Note.

A special thankyou to Miriama and Cheryl for all their help, work and support. Thanks also to Greg from the Caribbean.

We need to aim high and make sure that we invite many countries to the RPF, including countries.

Closing remarks from Patrick

A vote of thanks for the PAPP team, noting particularly members such as Anna Fink who have left already, and Cheryl Thomas and Miriama Brown who are leaving the team soon. Thanks also to Gregg Rawlins for coming from the Caribbean and sharing the benefit of their

experience. It is important for the national representatives to confirm the strategies within their organisations.

We can be satisfied that much of what we planned and discussed has been achieved.

For many years SPC didn't have a policy planning project so this project has been very welcome. And it is important that we find a mode of continuing support for national policy and SPC/LRD/APP

01 October 2017

(DRAFT) Meeting Record SUMMARY

The following is a summary of presentations and discussions that took place during the meeting.

DAY ONE - THURSDAY 31 AUGUST 2017

Meeting Opening – EU and Fiji

Marta Brignone noted that the EU was undergoing a 'formulation exercise' for the next phases. For the agriculture sector, the discussions today will be very helpful to feed into that process which will involve discussions in Brussels early in 2018. She noted that the EU will continue to support agriculture and that the sharing of practice amongst different regions via the ACP has been very beneficial. She anticipated that in the future there are likely to be specific programs for the Pacific region though, as well as bilateral programs with countries.

The Permanent Secretary of the Fijian Ministry of Agriculture referred to his Department's Fiji 2020 Agriculture Plan, and particularly the need to embrace new technologies and work closely with the private sector to secure farmer economic livelihoods and build a more resilient and healthy nation. He noted that the APP has helped build awareness of needs for capacity and emphasised the need for better strategic policy and engagement with partners.

The Permanent Secretary also congratulated the PAPP on the proposal for a Regional Agriculture Planners' Forum and offered to host the first one.

Session 1: Introduction

Lessons from the project:

6. National agriculture planning capacity is key – there are limited resources and competing interests in NRM
7. Investing in organizing Interactive communications and knowledge management (ICKM) can pay off
8. Importance of farmer networks
9. There are still pressing constraints eg. farmer finance
10. Scope for pooling of resources in a regional effort.

So for exiting from the APP by June 2018, the team leader proposed the following focus:

- 4) Keep building capacity, evidence based approaches, cooperation , visibility of sector (including a structured approach to influence budget)
- 5) Coordinated extension approach (PAFPNet portal with APB and PAIS, working in conjunction with PIRAS and other strategic partners.

6) Regional information plan

Activities of PAPP in each country were distributed to the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee **clarified** that there is no formal planned second phase, but that the EU was still very interested in working on agriculture policy projects in the Pacific, and that this could be via an ACP mechanism, or Pacific regional, or bilaterally with member countries. Funding for any new project will not commence before end of 2018.

The Steering Committee **noted** its appreciation of the EU's support to date, and acknowledged that, as the socio-economic landscape of PICTs is changing rapidly, the end of the PAPP project is an opportunity to re-design interventions for the next 5 years.

Session 2: Regional Approaches: Research and Extension

This session was omitted due to illness of the Chairman of PIRAS. A brief update was provided by the PIRAS Secretariat, which noted:

- the close to final version of the Pacific Islands Extension Strategy
- the successful second PIRAS forum, held over the preceding 2 days
- Improving linkages with the Global Forum of Rural Advisory Services (GFRAS)

Session 3a: Regional Approaches: Farmers Support through PIFON

Kyle Stice noted that *'Farmer organisations can effectively and efficiently complement the work of government and aid agencies by extending the outreach of support to farmers.'*

The PIFON – SPC PAPP partnership was effective in reaching small holder farmers in the region with regards to value chain development, crop training and policy advocacy. A total of FJD \$400,000 was given over 2 years for advocacy and information outreach, promotion of sustainable production practices & Capacity building. Farmer Organisations (FO) have an important role to play in advocacy and policy engagement in the Pacific but need to strengthen their capacity to be more effective in this role. They can be effective and efficient (cost efficient) partners working with government and development partners to support agricultural development in the region

Session 3b: National policy developments and partnerships – Country presentation 1 – FIJI

Uraia Waibuta, Deputy Secretary, Agriculture Development spoke about the Departments mission to excel in the provision of customer-focused and market-driven services in the agriculture sector. He noted that Fiji's government is still investing strongly in agriculture – the MoA budget has remained at around FJD \$40M for government programs. Priorities are strongly oriented to supporting private sector-led initiatives to improve and develop the commercial agriculture sector.

Session 4: Regional approaches – climate smart agriculture

The manager of the Centre for Pacific Crops and Trees (CePaCT), Ms Logo Waqainabete, discussed outcomes from the concurrent PAPGREN (Pacific Agricultural Plant Genetic Resources network) meeting and current activities of CePaCT, including programs for genetic conservation, distribution of plant varieties to member countries and internationally and research into 'climate-resilient' varieties of principal food crops of the Pacific.

Session 4b: The benefits of sharing genetic resources through global, regional & national collaboration: the case of Taro Leaf Blight in Samoa

Mr Moafanua Tolo Iosefa described the taro breeding program which he has been conducting since the early 1990s when taro leaf blight severely affected the food security and export economy of Samoa. The challenge was to find resistant varieties, but also meet the demanding taste requirements of Samoan communities at home and abroad, and provide for a shelf life that would allow export by sea. The challenge was met by a plant breeding program (now in its 9th cycle of selection and improvement) with the active participation of growers.

There is now a regional taro breeding program with work in the Cook Islands, Tonga and Fiji. His group is also working on other species such as yams.

Session 5: National policy developments and partnerships – Cook Islands

Mr Patrick Arioka presented on the Cook Islands method of surveying its farmers so that they have meaningful data for planning and monitoring. While still employing sporadic (5 year) agricultural censuses they have moved to monthly surveys (quarterly for outer islands) for commodity production. They are returning this data to the users via the AgINTEL system developed with support from PAPP.

Session 6: Regional Approaches: Policy Development and Statistics

Mr Michael Sharp from SPC's Statistics for Development Division presented on the Pacific – Strategic Plan for Agricultural and Fisheries Statistics (P-SPAFS) a 10 year strategic plan for the development of sustainable agricultural statistical systems in the Pacific, developed jointly by FAO and SPC. Mr Sharp outlined the strategy and noted that they are seeking the Steering Committee's endorsement so that at HOAFS & MOAFS the P-SPAFS can be fully endorsed there.

The SC commended the Technical Working Group for their work on the strategy and were supportive of finalising the process as quickly as practical to get the strategy in place.

Special Session – EU launch of APB and PAIS

Mr Christoph Wagner from the European Union launched the Agriculture Policy Bank and the Pacific Agriculture Information System before an audience including members from the PIRAS forum and the PAPGREN meeting. He commented that they were two important pieces of regional agricultural communication infrastructure which would assist in enabling all stakeholders to remain updated and benefit from direct access to policy and research of the region.

DAY TWO – FRIDAY 1 SEPTEMBER 2017

Session 7: Samoa net agricultural policy plans and developments to date

Dr Faletoi Suavi itemized some of the areas to be strengthened in Samoan agricultural policy in the near future. These included: Strengthening agricultural sector coordination to improve their national plan implementation; promoting agricultural commercialization; strengthening extension services; formulation of Sub-sector (Crops, livestock & fisheries) strategies /policies; enhancing partnerships using a Value Chain approach; development of farmer organizations

(SFA, SFFI & SFS); addressing youth unemployment in urban/rural areas; encouraging Organic Farming Systems and development of a national seed bank.

He presented data suggesting that the national budgetary funding envelope for agriculture has steadily increased over the past 4 years.

Session 8a: APP Highlights of results achievements and contributions of the EU-APP Caribbean Action

Mr Gregg Rawlins from the Caribbean gave an overview of PAPP's sister program, the Caribbean Agriculture Policy Project. Amongst lessons learnt from a large and complex project are:

- Adhere to good processes and don't rush
- Accept true leadership within a partnership . It is important to establish/agree on the respective roles of all 'partners' in a multi-partner model, when only one party has ultimate accountability.
- Clear procedures to manage implementation at all stages. Project management tools – what contract, what resources, must be clear and consistent and built on modern project management tools. Don't mix planning and implementation.
- Defining a practical post-project strategy – considerations of 'what next' should be integrated in the inception of planning for all interventions.

Session 8b: - Policy Planners Network

Mr Rawlins continued, on to describe the evolution of a Caribbean Planners Forum. He emphasized that it must be relevant and responsive to planners' needs, but it also needs recognition by the relevant Ministries. It has become a platform for networking, knowledge sharing and building planning competence. It offers planners an opportunity to have open and free-flowing policy dialogue.

The SC **noted** that the regional integration process is a lot more mature than in the Pacific; the Caribbean have regional mature processes and institutions in place, and it reflects in the breadth of work that they are able to do.

Session 9: Agreement Promoting Agricultural Information Sharing and Public Transparency

The meeting discussed a proposed Pacific Agriculture Information Sharing Agreement, building on the Agriculture Policy Bank, Agriculture Research Bank, PACGEN, etc., for potential endorsement to Pacific Ministers of Agriculture meeting in October 2017.

The meeting agreed that the agreement should be circulated with the Outcomes to enable countries to assess it, preferably before the Pacific Week of Agriculture Heads of Agriculture and Forestry meeting on 19th October 2017.

Session 10: Programme Update

The Steering Committee had a frank discussion about the merits and difficulties of the PAPP project's wide-ranging Logical Framework. The committee unanimously **acknowledged** the

benefit of having assistance in the policy space, particularly as this had not been a focus of SPC LRD before.

The SC **acknowledged** the difficulty of doing a full impact evaluation, given the difficulties of attribution in such a wide-ranging project but also noted the importance of monitoring impact as far as possible.

The EU commented that, further to the earlier discussion about funding processes and cycles for any possible future project, countries needed to really consider their priorities and ask themselves whether they will be able to continue implementation of strategies independently, or whether this was still a priority for further funding. Ms Brignone continued that the forthcoming ROM in October 2017 would be an opportunity for the countries to discuss honestly about whether PAPP is sustainable, what has been achieved, and what have been the impacts?

Members of the SC **commented** that from the outset of PAPP there was recognition that member countries had a policy gap, and now most of the countries now for the first time have a sector plan.

They **thanked** the project for its help going through this process, but they also **acknowledged** that there is a lot to learn, particularly in manoeuvring through that process of influencing the next levels of government. Most countries still have limitations to their capacity in formulating policy and transferring the knowledge right down to farmer-level.

They **noted** that many activities are starting implementation now and they will need financial support. In particular there is planning work to do to ensure that there are adequate and predictable amounts of resources for new industries.

The committee also **noted** the work with FAO to develop a food security cluster to cope with climate change and that, therefore the role of good planning is more critical than ever.

They **acknowledged** the support of PAPP in terms of development of specific strategies and **noted** members' concerns about how best to resource the process of addressing specific issues identified at the national and community level.

The committee **noted** the opportunity that PAPP has given countries to draw learnings from other sectors such as the tourism sector. Work on sub-sector policies will require external assistance, particularly technical/program support and this is an area that should be considered for any new program.

Session 11: Sustainability Going Forward

Mr Jan Helsen made some opening remarks, including that the next evaluation of the PAPP in October, and he encouraged the SC members to prepare for that review process and think hard about the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability or the projects and any positive or negative interactions with cross-cutting issues.

The meeting then broke up for a group discussion to answer questions as follows:

8. What would a new agriculture policy program look like?
9. 3-5 key priority needs
10. What can you put on the table?
11. Suggestion as how we establish the RPF

12. Identify actions that have been prioritised and need to be sustained.
13. How can we ensure that our stakeholders access and use our APB?
14. How can you ensure that policies are relevant to stakeholders? And be used?

The summary of these discussions was:

Elements of an exit strategy

8. What would a new agriculture policy program look like?
 - Strengthening technical capacities via a Regional Planners Forum of the Pacific towards a sustainable agriculture AND NATURAL RESOURCES (land, water, forests)
 - o 1. Policy management coherence through budgetary streamlining
 - o 2. Policy integration in all other sector-level goals “All agriculture” (avoiding duplication so that there’s not competition for funding)
 - o 3. Sector policy reviews – we need capacity to help (incl. Agriculture Public Expenditure Reviews (AgPER))
 - o 4. M&E system development, towards having greater impact
 - o 5. Developing best practices policy guidelines which are agriculture specific to monitor sector level interventions.
 - o 6. Measuring policy impacts with the use of surveys, statistics etc.
 - o 7. Supporting farmer organisations’ own policy formulation and governance, to enable market financial access.
 - o 8. Project management capacity enhancement.
 - o 9. Establishing policy networks and capacities via exchanges and reciprocating work.
 - o 10. Develop policy course into Agricultural tertiary education.
9. Key priority needs:
 - d. Policy management, integration and reviews coming via an M&E process (1,2,3 & 4)
 - e. Coherence of policy with NGOs engagement (relationships for delivery)(5 & 7)
 - f. Measuring policy impacts (evaluations)(6)
 - g. Increased planning capacity through better training in strategic planning
10. What can you put on the table?
 - a. Using country-level capacities both in-country and through exchanges and regional dialogues (this could be part of the policy statement on capacity development)
 - b. PAIS contact lists of people.
 - c. Products and tools to access, communicate and share with farmers and other countries.
11. Suggestion as how we establish the RPF?
 - a. Yes, this is a relevant forum to address items above, especially where there are policy gaps where we have not yet identified solutions/strategies to address.
 - b. A concept note is needed, which includes linkages to the private sector, integration with disaster risk reduction, and scope.

- c. Initially this should be initiated by SPC but then subsequently the member countries will need to take ownership.
- 12. Identify actions that have been prioritised and need to be sustained.
 - a. The efforts so far have been at the 'infant' stage but it needs nurturing to develop.
- 13. How can we ensure that our stakeholders access and use our APB?
 - a. Achieving policy coherence and coordination and engagement. We need to have outreach to our stakeholders, to sell the policies and their relevance for them.
 - b. It is a government requirement that policies consulted and shared with CSOs to ensure that they are relevant. So that they understand that this is where the money flows.

planning in the Pacific.

ANNEX 3 Agenda

INTRA-ACP AGRICULTURAL POLICY PROGRAMME STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

THURSDAY 31 AUGUST - FRIDAY 1 SEPTEMBER 2017
NOVOTEL HOTEL, NADI, FIJI

Day 1 – PROGRES S TO DATE	Thursday 31 August 2017	Purpos e	Session Description	Speaker/P resenter	Agenda Paper / link
08.30 – 09.00	Arrival and Registration				
09.00 – 09.30	Opening Session <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome Prayer Opening Remarks 	N/A	<i>Welcome to all participants</i>	Country representative EU Delegation	
09.30 – 10.30	Session 1: Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of Programme, Objectives and Key Outcomes for the meeting Overview of Pacific Agricultural priorities & relevant interventions by PAPP 	For informat ion	<i>Relevance of the APP against PIC priorities, key achievements to date and goals of this APP Meeting.</i>	Vili Caniogo, PAPP Team Leader	Agriculture & Forestry Policies in the Pacific 2016
10.30 – 11.00	COFFEE BREAK & GROUP PHOTO				
11.00 – 11.45	Session 2: Regional Approaches: Research and Extension Progress to Date including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pacific Islands Extension Strategy (PIES) Pacific Agriculture Research Bank (ARB) Introduction to Information Sharing Agreement 	For informat ion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Sharing progress made by Pacific Islands Rural Advisory Services network (PIRAS)</i> <i>Next Steps</i> 	PIRAS representative	Regional Research Extension Forum Outcomes 2015
11.45 – 12.30	Session 3: Regional Approaches: Farmers Support through PIFON <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmer to farmer learning exchanges Capacity building 	For informat ion	<i>Overview of outcomes from the two year SPC-PIFON partnership, including key achievements,</i>	Kyle Stice, PIFON Manager	PIFON Annual Report 2016

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocacy and information outreach 		<i>organisational growth and knowledge management products; Benefits of working in partnership with farmer organisations.</i>		Newsletter June 2017 Newsletter April 2017
12.30 – 13.30	LUNCH				
13.30 – 14.30	Session 4: Regional Approaches: Climate Smart Agriculture Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PAPGREN Highlights • Centre for Pacific Crops and Trees (CePaCT) • Taro breeding • Caribbean – Pacific learning exchanges • Study on PIC Crop Evaluation Capacities • Fate of CePaCT germplasm 	For Information/ Discussion	<i>Overview of climate smart agriculture initiatives supported by the APP, including climate-resilient plant variety evaluation and distribution, taro leaf blight resistance breeding work, and learning exchanges to the Caribbean. Sharing key outcomes from the Pacific Plant Genetic Resources Network (PAPGREN) Meeting (28-31 August).</i>	Logo Waqainabete Ulamila Lutu	PAPGREN 2014 meeting outcomes Fate of CePaCT Germplasm Summary
14.30- 15.00	Session 5: National policy developments & partnerships <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country presentation 1 – Tonga • Country presentation 2 – Vanuatu • Policy Assistance • Regional Policy Compendium 	For information	<p>(i) <i>New Ag Policy Plans and Developments to date.</i></p> <p>(ii) <i>National Budgetary Funding envelope – what does it cover, trends over last 3 years</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>Opportunities</i></p>	Tonga Vanuatu	

15.30 - 16.00	Session 6: Regional Approaches: Policy Development & Statistics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Analyses • Agriculture Policy Banks (APBs) • Pacific Strategic Plan for Agriculture and Fisheries Statistics (P-SPAFS) • Regional Agriculture Policy Planners Capacity 	For information	Overview of key policy and statistics work conducted by the APP, including the regional agriculture policy online repository, policy compendium publication, and new statistics strategic plan.	Vili Caniogo Michael Sharp, SDD	Attach or link: Pacific Agriculture Policy Banks factsheet Draft Pacific Strategic Action Plan for Agricultural and Fishery Statistics
16.00 - 17.00	Break				
17.00 - 19.00	Launch of Agriculture Policy Banks & Pacific Agriculture Information System (Combined with PIRAS Forum and PAPGREN participants)				

Day 2 - MOVING FORWARD	Friday 1 September 2017	Purpose	Session Description	Speaker/Presenter	
9.00 - 9.15	Session 7: National policy developments & partnerships <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Country presentation 3 - Fiji 	For information	1.New Ag Policy Plans and Developments to date.2. National Budgetary Funding envelope – what does it cover, trends over last 3 years 3. Opportunities	Fiji	
9.15 - 10:00	Session 8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy Planners Network 		Discussion of a proposed new forum	Vili Caniogo Gregg Rawlins, IICA	Issues paper (to be circulated at the meeting)
10.00 - 10.30	COFFEE BREAK				
10.30 - 11.15	Session 9: Agreement Promoting Agricultural Information Sharing & Public Transparency	For discussion and	Review and discuss proposed Pacific Agriculture Information Sharing	Vili Caniogo	Issues Paper &

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review & discuss • Seek endorsement for signature at HOAFS/MOAFS 	agreement	<i>Agreement, building on the Agriculture Policy Bank, Agriculture Research Bank, PACGEN, etc., for potential endorsement to Pacific Ministers of Agriculture meeting in October 2017.</i>	Anju Mangal	Draft Agreement (to be circulated at the meeting)
11.15 – 12.30	Session 10: Programme Update Brief presentation on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APP 2016-17 Annual Progress Report • Update from the 2017 APP Global Steering Committee Meeting • Negotiating outcomes-based funding for agriculture 	For information	<i>Highlights from the APP 2016-17 Annual Report, and update from the APP Global Steering Committee held in January.</i>	Vili Caniogo	Issues Paper (to be circulated at the meeting)
12.30 – 13.30	LUNCH				
13.30 – 15.30	Session 11: Sustainability Going Forward Discussion on key priority next steps and a sustainable exit strategy for PAPP	For discussion	<i>Discuss next steps for the region in the evidence-based agriculture policy and statistics space, including resource mobilisation options for a possible future project/program. Outline a sustainable exit strategy for APP, including ongoing hosting of key platforms (PAFPNet, APB, ARB) and continuity.</i>	Vili Caniogo Jan Helsen	
15.30 – 16.00	Wrap up and Conclusion		<i>Short summary of key meeting decisions and next steps. Farewells.</i>		
16.30	MEETING CLOSE				