

SAC  
39-2099  
REG  
1996  
61

SPC/Fisheries 26/Information Paper 2  
9 July 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

**SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION**

**TWENTY-SIXTH REGIONAL TECHNICAL MEETING ON FISHERIES**  
(Noumea, New Caledonia, 5 - 9 August 1996)

**1996 FIFTH SPC/FFA COLLOQUIUM REPORT**

**FORUM FISHERIES COMMITTEE**  
TWENTY-NINTH MEETING

**Vava'u, Kingdom of Tonga**  
13 - 17 May 1996

Agenda Item 18.2: SECTION III: Administrative Issues

Paper Title: SPC (5<sup>th</sup> FFA/SPC Colloquium)

**Summary:** This paper presents the report of the Fifth Colloquium meeting between FFA and SPC that was held in Honiara early in 1996. Among the issues considered at the Colloquium were the possible implications for SPC of the work of the FFC Sub-committee on Future Management Arrangements, the forthcoming Technical Consultation, the SPOCC Review of Institutional Affairs in the South Pacific, the regional VMS, the joint FFA/SPC UNDP programme, and relations with various donors such as CSPODP II, the EU and GEF.

Honiara  
March 1996

## **FORUM FISHERIES COMMITTEE**

### **TWENTY-NINTH MEETING**

**Vava'u, Kingdom of Tonga**

13 - 17 May 1996

**SPC**

### **5<sup>TH</sup> FFA/SPC COLLOQUIUM**

Honiara, Solomon Islands

31 January - 2 February 1996

### **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

1. Representatives of the Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and the South Pacific Commission (SPC) met in Honiara from 31 January-2 February 1996, for the Fifth FFA/SPC Colloquium. Those participating were:

#### **SPC**

Mafaitu'uga Va'asatia Poloma Komiti, Director of Programmes

Julian Dashwood, Manager Fisheries Programmes

Antony Lewis, Oceanic Fisheries Co-ordinator

#### **FFA**

Victorio Uherbelau, Director;

Camillus Narokobi, Interim Deputy Director;

Tony Kingston, Manager, Economics and Marketing Programme;

Andrew Richards, Manager, Monitoring, Control and Surveillance Programme;

Barbara Hanchard, Executive Officer;

Iabeta Beniteti, Trust Fund Officer;

Sam Taufao, Information Technology Manager

2. The FFA Director officially welcomed the SPC delegation to Honiara and in thanking SPC for its past contributions to FFA, the Director also expressed his desire to promote continued collaboration between FFA and SPC. The Director made special reference to several of the issues to be considered at the Colloquium, highlighting the Status of the FFA Sub-Committee on Future Management Arrangements and the Proposed Technical Consultation on the Collection and Exchange of Fisheries Data, Tuna Research and Stock Assessment.

3. In reply, SPC's Director of Programmes thanked the FFA Director for his welcoming remarks, reaffirmed that relations between FFA and SPC Fisheries Programmes are currently very close and expressed his hope that this will continue in the future.

#### **Meeting Procedures**

4. The meeting adopted the accepted procedures as applied in previous Colloquia. As host of the meeting, the FFA Director was appointed as chair while the record of the meeting will be jointly prepared by the two organisations. The Director of FFA forewarned the meeting about the concurrent FFA-organised Judicial Seminar and offered his apologies for the time he may be absent from the Colloquium to attend specific topics on the seminar.

#### **Adoption of Agenda**

5. Several additional items were added to the Other matters section of the draft agenda. The agenda approved by the Colloquium is annexed as **Attachment A**.

#### **Issues arising from the 1995 Colloquium**

6. FFA summarised the important issues arising from last year's Colloquium. Among the issues discussed were:

i) the collaboration in the coastal fisheries area, SPC requested that the services of FFA's Legal Programme could provide useful support for SPC's Coastal Fisheries Programme (CFP). FFA did not see any problems with this provided that the time and resources at FFA were available. FFA also advised the meeting that during FFC26, member countries wanted some assurance that the SPC CFP will continue the same level of assistance formerly provided by the FFA Research Coordination Unit. Further discussions of this point were deferred to agenda item 9.

ii) SPC confirmed core funding for the master fisherman post has been confirmed and that the recruitment process is almost finalised.

iii) the UNDP Regional Fishery Support project. FFA's Director reported that during FFC26, the recommendation from the Colloquium was carried out ie transfer of some training activity funds to SPC. SPC asked that their appreciation for FFA's endorsement of SPC's request for additional funds from this project be noted. They also suggested that a Tripartite Review of this UNDP project involving SPC, FFA and UNDP be planned to coincide with FFC29 in Tonga. This was endorsed and further discussion on this topic was deferred until agenda item 10.

iv) FFA's Manager, Monitoring, Control and Surveillance briefed the meeting on the current status of a regional Vessel Monitoring System (VMS). It was noted that a set of business requirements had been developed for a regional VMS and that this document will be used to develop the request for tender documents for the system. It was noted that the Australian government has committed funding to this project for 2 years. FFA expressed its appreciation to SPC for Peter Williams' involvement in 5th VMS consultations in Honolulu last year and agreed to keep SPC informed of all developments.

#### **Status of the FFC Sub-Committee on future management arrangements**

7. FFA presented an overview of the current status of the work by the FFC Sub-committee on Future Management Arrangements. The sub-committee had been asked to review the effectiveness of existing fisheries management arrangements in the region and to recommend appropriate alternatives as necessary.

8. The Sub-committee will also be reviewing the role of the FFA secretariat, the scientific input to regional fisheries management structure, and the financial implications of any new structure.

9. It was noted that the Sub-committee is also considering the manner in which FFA member countries can consult with other coastal states and with DWFNs to manage the region's tuna stocks. In this context, the Sub-committee will need to ensure that any proposed structure is compatible with UNCLOS and its recently concluded Implementing Agreement.

10. It was stated that the Sub-committee is adopting a fisheries-management rather than a legalistic approach to the problem, that the work of the Sub-committee is evolving over time, and that the third Sub-committee meeting, to be held immediately following this Colloquium, will further progress these issues.

11. It was noted that the work of the Sub-committee has important implications for the OFP programme and its relations with FFA member countries. There are also broader implications for OFP and its relationship with non-FFA member country scientists.

12. Appreciation was extended to SPC, and the OFP in particular, for their on-going support of the Sub-committee. The report of the Sub-committee will be submitted to FFC29 in May, and any endorsements from FFC29 will go to the next Forum.

13. SPC made general comments, appreciating the summary being provided, and the wishes to fast-track the process on behalf of FFA member countries. There was some discussion about the recommendation for OFP to become incorporated with FFA, though several reservations were expressed on this point relating to funding and the membership issue. SPC noted that the organisation's position on the institutional review is to be presented to CRGA in May.

14. FFA expressed the view that the work of the Sub-committee and OFP's possible move to FFA are best considered separate issues. The Sub-committee is considering how scientific input can best be provided to the management process and how the best available scientific input can be provided. In this context, it was considered that membership of SPC may not be a serious issue.

15. FFA also advised that during next week's Sub-committee meeting, there will be further discussion on the proposed structure. This will, as far as possible, try build upon and formalise many of the existing but ad-hoc scientific and management bodies.

16. At this stage, FFA's Director referred to the recent SPOCC meeting on the institutional review question and its recommendations that organisations affected sit down and discuss things among themselves. FFA is receptive to the idea, subject to SPC's agreement, and to the decisions of the respective governing bodies.

17. In terms of the SPOCC proposal, SPC considers that the decision hinges on two major issues - funding and membership. Basically, SPC at present sees no real advantages in amalgamation, and it is understood that the Territories are completely opposed to any OFP amalgamation with FFA. FFA again repeated that the movement of OFP to FFA and the reorganising of existing scientific structures in the region can be treated separately.

18. The meeting then discussed the implications of the Sub-committee's work on the OFP work programme and the need to formalise the relationship between SPC, through OFP, and FFA. The meeting noted that a draft Memorandum of Understanding had been drafted to formalise the existing relationship between the two organisations, but agreed that detailed consideration of the draft memorandum would be more appropriate once the Sub-committee had completed its deliberations.

#### **Developments in French and US Territories**

19. FFA noted that Guam was expressed interest in possibly applying to join FFA and that CNMI might have similar thoughts. The situation in American Samoa was not clear, though it was noted that it has previously benefited from computer training opportunities

with FFA, at their expense. There has been no change in the status of the French territories, with French Polynesia continuing to enjoy observer status, but New Caledonia and Wallis and Futuna so far showing little interest.

20. SPC briefly outlined the extent of its working contact with the six territorial members.

#### **Institutional review of marine affairs in the South Pacific**

21. The Chairman felt that this matter had been adequately covered in previous discussions and that little else could be progressed until the respective governing councils - CRGA and FFC - had completed their reviews of the report.

#### **Proposed technical consultation on collection and exchange of data**

22. FFA reviewed recent developments on this issue, noting that the consultation was one of the outcomes of the December 1994 Multilateral High Level Consultation on South Pacific Tuna Fisheries (MHLC) and that it had initially been scheduled for mid-1995. However, the Consultation had been postponed, at FFA's request, to early 1996. FFA had recently written to both the US and Japan to seek their views on the timing of, and arrangements for, the Consultation. No substantive response had yet been received.

23. The understanding/preference of both FFA and SPC was to hold the Consultation in mid-July, probably just prior to the Standing Committee on Tuna and Billfish. This would allow time for the FFC Sub-committee on Future Management Arrangements to report to FFC29 in May. It was agreed that the Consultation should be hosted in Noumea, with SPC/OFP as secretariat. The issue of the nature and level of participation from each country attending the Consultation had not been clarified, and is likely to be left to each individual country to decide. It was also noted that a draft agenda has been prepared, this having been completed during FFC26 in Port Moresby in May 1995.

24. It was recognized that details on the Consultation should be finalised as soon as possible, if satisfactory arrangements are to be made.

#### **Oceanic fisheries issues**

##### *Domestic industry development*

25. FFA reported that the FSM arrangement for Regional Fisheries Access became effective in late 1995. Under the Arrangement, vessels that meet the agreed licensing criteria can, with a single licence, gain access to the EEZs of all countries that are parties to the arrangement. The cost of this licence is considerably lower than if the vessel were to otherwise enter into separate bilateral access agreements with the countries concerned. Countries signing the Arrangement have also agreed to give these vessels priority in terms of licence allocations. Provided the vessel continues to meet the licensing criteria, the vessel therefore is assured of continued access in the region. With easier access to the principal fishing grounds, at a cheaper price, and with greater long-term security, the Arrangement provides purse seine vessel owners a real incentive to base their operations in an FFA member country.

26. In terms of longlining, FFA noted that fishing activity in some countries, such as FSM and Palau, appears to have slowed, while Solomon Islands, Kiribati and Papua New Guinea are hoping to increase longline activity in the future.

##### *Status of new multilateral access arrangements*

27. FFA reported that there has been no significant movement on a multilateral arrangement with Japan since the Forum decision of 1994 in Brisbane. FFC27 in October 95 decided that FFA will be the signatory on behalf of member countries for a multilateral

agreement with Taiwan. On a proposed multilateral arrangement with Korea, FFA advised that this was probably the easiest for the secretariat to pursue because there is no nomenclature hurdle. It is hoped that this issues will raised during FFC28 in Nadi later this month

28. In response to a query from SPC whether one multilateral arrangement had priority over the other, FFA confirmed that negotiations between FFA and both Korea and Taiwan have the same priority. FFA will raise the issue again at FFC28 and request the member countries for some direction. However, it was noted that there appears to be only limited support for multilateral arrangements at the technical level from the member countries.

29. FFA commented that negotiations on the proposed longline arrangement between Taiwan and some FFA member countries (the Polymelon arrangement) appear to have stalled. Taiwan wants the agreement to make concessions for transshipment at sea, though FFA member countries consider the transshipment ban to be non-negotiable. It was noted that at present, only Vanuatu and Niue continued to maintain a bilateral agreement with Taiwan, while Fiji has a special commercial arrangement operating between the Taiwanese vessels and the Pafco cannery at Levuka.

30. SPC advised that for the proposed March 96 SPAR meeting in Rarotonga, FFA member country participation can be financed by financial support received from Taiwanese government and industry.

#### *ACIAR study*

31. FFA reported that progress on the ACIAR study has been slower than expected, partly due to the limited time available to FFA staff to provide input to the study and partly a result of the University of Queensland collaborator's unfamiliarity with many aspects of the region and the fisheries. Nonetheless, the project is progressing and a planned review meeting on the project is scheduled for mid-year.

32. SPC noted that SPC/FFA involvement on project was on the insistence of ACIAR, following problems with a previous research project in PNG. SPC's role is to develop population dynamics models to support bioeconomic models for Solomon Islands and the region as a whole. Good progress is being made with this component of the project.

#### **Coastal fisheries**

33. The Manager of the SPC Fisheries Programmes briefed the meeting on the British-funded 3 year ICMAP project, involving work in 6 SPC member countries. This project will study coastal fisheries resources in those 6 countries and provide advice on how best to manage and exploit these resources. SPC will look to assistance from the FFA Economics and Marketing and the Legal Services sections of FFA. There is also scope for collaboration in training, particularly under the UNDP project. This might be handled similarly to the last Deckhand Certification Workshop which was co-funded by both FFA and SPC.

34. FFA noted that its Legal Services already offers advice on drafting fisheries legislation covering coastal fisheries, and it is important to have some consistency. On the Economics/Marketing side, SPC is not quite clear yet which areas they expect FFA to assist with. The live grouper fishery is an example, and SPC may be asked to devise a plan on how that resource should be optimally exploited. Potentially, any fishery being studied biologically is very likely to need a complementary economics/marketing study.

35. FFA confirmed that it is available to assist, with the main constraint being limited time given the current demands on the two programmes concerned. The Director reiterated the current heavy work load on FFA staff but stated that FFA will endeavour to assist wherever possible. He also stated that FFA will look forward to receiving such requests from

SPC and that if FFA is unable to assist from its own direct resources, it will help SPC identify possible consultants to do the work.

#### **UNDP Regional Fisheries Support Programme**

36. SPC stated that it has had communication problems with both FFA and UNDP on the reporting requirements for this project. Noel Omeri's departure from FFA has been a setback, and at the time of the 5th Colloquium, SPC was still unaware of Noel's replacement for this project at FFA. FFA confirmed that George Beck has officially taken over Noel's role regarding the UNDP project.

37. SPC sought clarification on certain aspects of this project:

- i) the Inshore Fisheries Management workshop resulted in a financial overrun, though it is believed that additional funds have been allocated from FFA for this workshop. SPC advised that the cost overruns were largely due to publication of material for the workshop.
- ii) SPC has discussed the operational procedural problems of the project with UNDP officials in Suva, and they all agreed that the current arrangements have to change for the better. UNDP has expressed concern that FFA and SPC have not been keeping up with the agreed spending schedule agreed for the project.

38. FFA's Trust Fund Officer gave an updated rundown of the current financial status of the UNDP project. Until June 1995, SPC has used up \$11,000 out of \$135,000 it has received. FFA has received \$382,000 and up to December 1995 had spent \$152,000. SPC received \$236,000 from FFA up to December 1996. No project report has been received from SPC for the Sep - Dec 1995 quarter. FFA sent UNDP their reports for the same quarter on 31 January. SPC will check on the reasons for the delay in forwarding its report.

39. The meeting agreed that SPC and FFA should make a concerted effort to improve communication and operational procedures on the execution of this project. With a proposed tripartite review of this project at FFC29, it would be in the interests of the countries if FFA and SPC can demonstrate progress in this area.

40. The meeting also agreed that George Beck of FFA will contact Julian Dashwood (SPC) as soon as possible on operational procedures to be adopted from now on regarding the implementation of the project. These procedures will ensure consistency of report content and format between SPC and FFA

#### **Other Matters:**

##### **CSPODP II**

41. SPC expressed disappointment at CIDA's decision that SPC, along with SOPAC, had been excluded from eligibility for direct CSPODP II funding. SPC suggested that there might be some easing of its original position and that it might be possible to develop joint SPC-FFA projects for consideration by CIDA.

42. SPC advised that in 1994 it had submitted 2 tuna-related projects for consideration by CIDA. These projects concerned an analysis by-catch and discards of tuna fisheries, using observer data, and an albacore stock assessment project. This latter project might now be covered under separate funding obtained from Taiwan.

43. FFA advised that it still very hard to deal with CSPODP-II and that even though FFA is dealing bilaterally with CIDA, there has been little progress. FFA has to resubmit new projects, as the previously submitted projects are long-dated owing to the delays experienced with CIDA. FFA has received a letter from SPREP informing that there is profiling meeting in March 1996, this being the first contact following the November meeting.

44. FFA welcomed SPC's suggestion of developing joint projects for consideration by CIDA and expressed its support for the two organisations maintaining close dialogue on this matter in the future.

#### **ACP/EU matters**

45. During the recent ACP/EU ministerial meeting in Suva, it was noted that problems have been experienced in the implementation of several EU-funded regional projects. SPC commented that it has had problems with some EU-funded agricultural projects, while FFA advised that its EU-surveillance project has also encountered difficulties.

46. The meeting noted that the ACP/EU Bureau in Suva is to be incorporated into FORSEC and that the changeover will occur over the next 18 months. It was noted that the ACP Ministerial meeting occurs only every 3 years and felt that some of the problems that have been experienced may have been avoided had there been more regular meetings and consultations. This also extends to the current situation regarding programming for the 2nd Financing Protocol which is almost 2 years behind. At present, there are no clear indication of how much money is involved, and what priorities there are. The ACP/EU council have proposed a workshop to work out priorities and that from these priorities, programming will take place on the details of projects and implementation.

47. The meeting noted that a Pacific ACP/EU ministerial meeting scheduled for June 1996 will discuss wide priorities regarding EU assistance to the region.

#### **Global Environment Facility (GEF)**

48. SPC also advised the meeting about the current regional position on accessing part of the \$2 billion funding under GEF. The four broad development areas which targeted by GEF are:

- i) climate change;
  - ii) biological diversity;
  - iii) international waters; and
- depletion of the ozone layer.

49. Both SPC and FFA were represented at the GEF Regional Scoping Workshop in July/August 1995 in Nadi where they presented a joint project submission on behalf of their respective organisations. The fund does not have any special allocations by sector, except maybe for Small Island Developing States (SIDS). SPOCC organisations eventually decided to develop a mega-regional submission, with SPREP having the co-ordinating role.

50. SPC confirmed that it is not aware of any progress having been made on developing the mega-regional project since the August Scoping workshop. SPC advised that the next opportunity for GEF project submission is April 1996 and clearly nothing will happen by then. SOPAC has also confirmed that there has been no correspondence from SPREP on this matter. SPC suggested that perhaps FFA and SPC should submit a joint project proposals rather than wait on the SPREP-coordinated regional project, but the meeting agreed that this issue should first be considered by FFA's and SPC's respective governing Councils. It was noted that the approval process for GEF projects may be an 18 months- 2 year process.

#### **Aqua-culture project:**

51. SPC reported that the South Pacific Aquaculture Project, supported by the FAO and managed by Tanaka-san, is a 5 year project with 3 more years to go. SPC believes that Tanaka would like to see the activities of this project gradually absorbed by an existing regional organisation and that Tanaka has approached SPC on this matter. Japanese funding for this project (Japan/FAO) appears set to finish after the current funding cycle. SPC

believes it may be asked to do provide support for aquaculture development in the region in the future but that funding constraints may prevent SPC's active involvement in this area. SPC believes that FAO might seek to raise this issue at FFC29 and possibly RTMF 26.

52. FFA stated that with the focusing of the Agency's activities on the region's tuna fisheries, it is difficult to envisage FFA taking a very active role in aquaculture in the future. FFA also noted that, if the funding constraint can be overcome, SPC appears well-placed to assume increased responsibilities in the aquaculture area.

**VMS brief - current status:**

53. FFA advised that it had extensive discussions on the project with Dr Kroner, of the EU, in Honiara last December. FFA had subsequently received official notification on 31 Jan 1996 of project termination.

54. It was noted that the ACP meeting in Suva had not been critical of FFA's handling of the VMS project, but as previously stated, countries were concerned about the low implementation rate by regional organisations of EU projects.

55. The FFA Director summarised that the member countries direct FFA and the secretariat's work programme and that the revised requirements of the VMS, including funding arrangements, came directly from the member countries. FFA considered that these changes are still consistent with the objectives of a regional VMS appropriate for the region.

56. It was noted that the EU has expressed a desire to move on from the disappointments of this project and that it views the current problems as being a momentary downturn in an otherwise healthy relationship. The EU wants to maintain a strong relationship with FFA, continues to recognise the importance of the fisheries sector to the Pacific region, and has encouraged FFA to develop a new proposal to utilise the funds set aside for the VMS project. In this regard, the meeting noted that there might be potential to develop a joint SPC-FFA project consistent with the work being undertaken by the FFC Sub-committee on Future Management Arrangements. It was agreed that the two organisations would work together on this approach, though it was noted that nothing definite could be completed until the Sub-committee's report had been considered by FFC29.

**Future management arrangements of Tuna longline fishery:**

57. FFA advised that AusAID funds are available to assist countries to develop a longline management arrangement in the region. One problem in this arrangement might be the fact that countries are at different levels in their development of their tuna fisheries and that this might cause problems in terms of establishing an equitable management arrangement. However, the immediate FFA priority is to finalise the work of the FFC Management Sub-committee and work on the longline fishery is not anticipated to begin until after FFC29 in May.

58. FFA also advised that funding is available to assist in undertaking a regional fuel distribution and pricing study. Fuel costs in the region are expensive, discouraging fishing enterprises from basing themselves in the country. One of the objectives of the study is to consider the existing fuel distribution procedures and to identify the reasons why fuel is so expensive. Then, options might be considered to improve the existing situation. This is a joint project between FFA and FORSEC, and has potentially significant results for the region. The study will also consider the impact of various government fuel pricing policies on the development of the local fishing industry.

59. FFA informed SPC of an information technology project that will focus on FSM this year. FFA will allocate approximately 3 man-month of resources to this project, and seek the contribution and involvement of computing staff from SPC. FFA recognised that it had not properly briefed SPC on this issue, but that the project has only just begun and that aside

from the first review visit of FFA's Senior Projects Analyst in February 1996, all remaining stages of the project will hopefully be carried out jointly by both organisations. FFA will report all events to SPC, and consult on all significant decisions to progress the objectives of this project. It is hoped that a model for development and management of information technology systems will be a deliverable from this project, which will subsequently be applied to all member countries.

#### **Observer programme**

60. FFA expressed appreciation to the co-operation from Peter Sharples on observer activities especially in member countries where there is renewed interest to develop domestic observer programmes. FFA also encouraged SPC observers when in Honiara to visit the FFA office.

#### **SPOCC**

61. SPC outlined the history of SPOCC and expressed disappointment that the regional solidarity promoted by SPOCC appeared to splinter during the November CSPODP II meeting. SPC also noted that this regional strategy will also be used to negotiate the 2<sup>nd</sup> protocol of LOME IV.

62. Both FFA and SPC expressed concern at the number of SPOCC meetings in 1995 and the consequent amount of staff time required to attend these meetings. The meeting considered the need for SPOCC to review its real functions.

63. It was noted that officials from SPC and FFA met in December 1996 in Brisbane and agreed on a standard set of forms for fisheries data collection. These will now be used for all fisheries agreements in the region, and also cover observer programmes. The first set of forms was issued to a Korean purse seine vessel on the 31<sup>st</sup> January 1996. The standardising of catch report forms has been an outstanding issue for a long time, and the success of the Brisbane meeting represents a great success for the region and for both organisations.

#### **Closing of Colloquium**

64. FFA's Director thanked Poloma Komiti for his contributions to the region and FFA during his services as SPC's Director of Programmes. Thanks were also extended to the SPC staff, notably fisheries and executive management, for continuing to promote the strong relations and joint activities of the two organisations.

65. In thanking the FFA Director for his touching comments, Poloma noted reminisced that in 1989, he represented Western Samoa to the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary meeting of FFC and that since that time, he has maintained a special interest in FFA and its important role in the region. He noted that where SPC and FFA have worked together, the manner has been very professional, and assisted through personal relations. Poloma wished the Director well for the remainder of his current term, and any additional years of services to the region.

66. In closing the Colloquium, SPC commented that it looks forward to the continued warm and frank relations between the two organisations, noting that at the end of the day, both organisations are here to serve the development needs of their member countries.

**FIFTH FFA/SPC COLLOQUIUM**

**Honiara, Solomon Islands**

**31 January - 2 February 1996**

**AGENDA**

1. Opening remarks
2. Meeting procedures
3. Issues arising from 1995 Colloquium held in Noumea
4. Status of the FFC sub-committee on Future Management Arrangements
  - a) Possible implications for Oceanic Fisheries Programme
5. Developments in French and US Pacific Territories
6. Institutional Review of Marine Affairs in the South Pacific
7. Proposed Technical Consultation on the Collection and Exchange of Fisheries Data, Tuna Research and Stock Assessment (planned for July 1996)
8. Oceanic fisheries
  - a) Domestic industry development
  - b) Status of new multilateral access arrangements
  - c) ACIAR study
9. Coastal fisheries
10. UNDP Regional Fisheries Support and National Capacity Building Programme
11. Other matters
  - a) CSPODP II
  - b) ACP/EU
  - c) GEF
  - d) VMS
  - e) Longline management arrangements
  - f) Observer programme
  - g) SPOCC
12. Record of proceedings
13. Close