

Concept Proposal for PacPlan Plus 2025 -2035, and beyond.

Executive Summary

PacPlan needs revising and updating. It faces a myriad of current and future challenges. SPREP identified structural, organisational and resourcing options to allow SPREP, as regional PacPlan administrator and coordinator, to strengthen its ability to address and overcome these challenges. Option Three (of four) offers a pragmatic proposal, providing for dedicated staff, organisational arrangements, improved governance and accountability, strategic and business planning, and technical support and coordination. However, whichever option is endorsed, it will also require recommitment to member capability development, investment in regional solutions, and new funding and resourcing solutions for SPREP.

Is recommended that:

SPREP seek Noumea Convention endorsement to:

- implement (through detailed design, structure and function),
- resource (through funding, staffing and inhouse and regional technical capability), and
- deliver through inhouse and regional capacity (expertise, systems and technology)

a new model of PacPlan, suitable for and as agreed by, Members and Metropolitans, where the structure, organisation, resourcing and deliverables are akin to Option Three, subject to resources and funding mobilisation.

1. Problem Summary

- 1.1. PacPlan is no longer fit for purpose. It may once have a suitable collaborative and cooperative approach to addressing maritime spill risk and response, but it now suffers from a number of challenges and constraints faced by all such programmes and projects operating in a more challenging space, environment and economy of the Pacific (see detailed listing in Annex One). Many members are simply unable (resourcing, capacity or capability) to establish or maintain over time their own national systems, let alone take advantage of regional support. Regional support is often thin, inappropriately focussed or inconsistently applied. A framework document is no longer sufficient. Its purpose and vision need to be supported by credible resourcing, structure, expertise and governance, among other attributes.
- 1.2. Each of the country components of PacPlan (Members, Metropolitans, and SPREP) are challenged in the way they contribute to their own needs and PacPlan as a whole. It was (and is) envisaged as a regional framework to: (paraphrased from PacPlan 2019)
 - Promote and implement regional cooperation in prevention, planning, response and training for marine spills;
 - Facilitate operational response action and cooperation consistent with international conventions;
 - Outline arrangements for maintenance of PACPLAN and associated systems by SPREP.
- 1.3. These can be achieved in many ways. Members can resource their own capability development across all elements of prevention, preparedness, response and recovery. Members can receive and use development funding or other technical support from Metros or other bilateral support programmes.
- 1.4. Metropolitan countries now contribute in a variety of ways, both bilaterally and multilaterally to Members, both within their zone (as primary responders to Tier 3 requests) and across a wider group of members. This encompasses direct funding, technical cooperation, and in-country programme delivery. Contact between Metropolitan lead agencies with their Member country counterparts varies from

- regularly (at least annual), to ad hoc meetings, to response only requests. This adds to inconsistency of delivery and readiness, and so increases uncertainty and risk for both the Members and their Metropolitan responders.
- 1.5. Not all Members have equivalent access to any of these resources, and so there is a growing inconsistency of preparedness, response and recovery capability across the members. Plans need updating, staff (maritime and others) need training and exercising, systems need developing or adopting, international and domestic legislation needs constant review, bilateral and regional technical support needs reviewing and updating.
 - 1.6. SPREP's role in all of this is to provide consistency, cooperation and coordination across the four zones defined by the Metropolitan support model. The diversity of Member capabilities, needs, and expectations creates challenges. The diversity and intensity of Metropolitan support to their own zone (and other) members also creates challenges. SPREP's own capability (staffing and resourcing) has rarely been sufficient to undertake its expected roles as laid out in the detail of PacPlan, without recourse to ad hoc and irregular project funding from donors. There has been no consistent allocation of funding and staffing within SPREP during the life of PacPlan.
 - 1.7. The recent DFAT funded PacPlan Resilience Project has provided sufficient coverage for its three-year duration, which has allowed a breathing and re-evaluation space (this Proposal), but also highlighted what could be achieved with more sustained capability within SPREP. This project concludes (funding and staffing) in May 2025.
 - 1.8. SPREP has no allocated core funding it can apply to this. And the reality is that all PacPlan Members are challenged to fund their own NatPlan (and other maritime) programmes sufficiently through current domestic and international support funding, and so a consolidated Member contribution to SPREP of funds is not a viable option.
 - 1.9. One example of this, is the offer by OSRL to provide response support cover to all PacPlan Members for the price of one country coverage (c.f. USD75,00 p.a.), that had to be foregone due to a lack of centralised funding.
 - 1.10. A better supported SPREP could better support Members (and Metropolitans) better target resources, find alternative sources of support (funding, technical, training, equipment, etc.), make more efficient and effective use of regional (and Metropolitan-sourced) contributions, and provide the core cohesion such a framework requires (governance support,

2. Solutions Summary

- 2.1. A strong PacPlan needs three core components working in a cohesive, cooperative, and collaborative manner.
 1. Effective Member capability (relative to its risk, threats and needs), based on direct support from their Metropolitan country, SPREP and other providers.
 2. Effective Metropolitan delivery of the capability (funding, services and support) they can offer, to both their own Members and the wider regional needs (other Members and SPREP).
 3. Effective SPREP capability to support regional needs, deliver regional and Member support, and provide a hub and centre for Member needs and Metropolitan offers of shared technical capability.
- 2.2. This model places SPREP at the centre as a communications, contacts, coordination and technical capability point. This requires This Concept of Operations focuses primarily on addressing SPREP's relevance, role and resourcing. We contend that, as the core to PacPlan, a stronger, more capable SPREP, offers both Members and Metropolitans increased effectiveness and efficiency in their interactions and programmes.
- 2.3. SPEP also contends that only through increased, long-term (5-10 year) sustainable funding for SPREP will it be able to deliver a more relevant, better organised, more credible and better aligned, coordinated and leveraged programme to members. Supported by a wider range of beneficial stakeholders (i.e. Pacific rim/APHOMSA

members, sector agencies and organisations) than simply the current Members (with all attendant challenges) offering technical and other solutions.

- 2.4. Depending on the ability of a PacPlanPlus programme to attract this funding, and using the current PacPlan Resilience Project funding model (AUD\$2mil over three years gives approx. USD\$450K p.a.), four levels of funding support are offered as possible resourcing scenarios for SPREP, with analysis of what they can deliver (USD\$0, \$250K, \$500K and \$750K.). Each scenario comes with commentary against a list of deliverables, including membership and governance status, strategic and business planning, technical advice, regional training and exercising, and technical; services provided at a regional level, all largely dependent on increasing staff capability and mobility.
- 2.5. An analysis of the four funding scenarios is provided in a table format, based on more detailed discussion in Annex Two.

3. Regional context

See also Annex Two.

- 3.1. Membership and coverage is always going to be a challenge. The Pacific Marine Oil Spill Contingency Plan (PacPlan) was designed with a bold vision. No matter whether or not a country was a member of the Noumea Convention (SPREP member), they could be a member of PacPlan. This was largely due to belief in strength from total coverage and the principle that no country should be left behind. The support of the then five metropolitan countries was tangible. This has become less so in the 2020s. Some nations are still not members of the Noumea Convention, nor its emergency response or pollution protocols, and so continue to gain benefit without contribution or direction setting.
- 3.2. The quality of the marine and maritime environments in the Pacific are not issues of nuisance, inconvenience or distaste, as they are elsewhere in the world. Many Pacific people rely on their coasts and near coastal waters for daily subsistence. Technologies (refrigeration) and convenience (food stores) taken for granted elsewhere in the world, especially around food, are either non-existent or limited in many island communities. Food comes daily fresh from the sea (as well as the land) and pollution creates a significant impediment and threat to this.
- 3.3. Economics – There is no need to go into detail about the Pacific members state economies. All 14 member countries are members of the Small Island Developing States (with three listed as least developed states). They have little to no opportunity to create economies of scale. Whilst they tend to share similar attributes, characteristics and challenges, they are also highly diverse. Economy size ranges over three orders of magnitude from less than USD\$100mil to more than USD\$30bil. Nonetheless they are all small but growing populations, limited resources, remoteness, wide geographic distribution with limited internal transport infrastructure, susceptibility to natural disasters, vulnerability to external shocks, excessive dependence on international trade (especially imports), and fragile environments. Their economies (growth and development) are often constrained or held back by high communication, energy and transportation costs, and irregular international and national transport capabilities. They have either disproportionately expensive or low capacity public administration due to their small population size. Engaging with the world requires expensive and extensive travel. They consist of some of the most vulnerable countries to anthropogenic climate change. And they are the largest by area bloc of this nation type globally.
- 3.4. Member economies, needs, capabilities and priorities are highly diverse across the region. Papua New Guinea is unique in having an offshore oil and gas sector. Some countries have aging world war wrecks with not only oil, but also munitions and war grave status. We have countries spanning vast ocean areas larger than 75% of most other global countries, across which you can drive.

- 3.5. Maritime dependence – As a region they rely on maritime transport at every level and for almost every economic and social purpose, and have the least ability to protect themselves from its impacts and pollution. This is both their legacy and their future. Other forms of transport are unlikely to supplant shipping in the near future. The Pacific has long been the region where shipping standards are lowest, and support from larger and more capable Pacific rim countries has supported risk management within the Pacific itself, such as the influence of the Tokyo MOU for Port State Inspection. Nonetheless, fishing fleets, trading vessels, and similar still manage to pollute, sink or be abandoned and leave countries with legacies they can not afford to address.
- 3.6. Historical metropolitan country (and other donors i.e. IMO) support has been crucial to get the PacPlan to where it is today. Without the consistency of technical support and presence from some metros, and the generosity of others, many of the members would be domestically much worse off. Nonetheless, some have no functioning plans, no functioning preparation, and almost no credible response capability, nor the ability to tap into external (regional or international support).
- 3.7. Risk perception is often driven by return frequency, not overall impact. Having not had a major fire at home for 25 years some households may no longer seem to treat fire as a credible threat, so cancel their fire insurance, shelved any planning for escape, decommissioned or not replaced the fire extinguisher or the fire-escape, and not maintained the fire truck inlet for sprinklers.
- 3.8. Many countries are receiving more shipping volumes than ever, or seeing more transit shipping through their waters (not terminating at their ports). This shipping is now safer and less likely to have an accident or spill due to significant improvements in ship safety, construction and management over the past three decades, but the consequences for the receiving country of a less likely spill remain the same.
- 3.9. In a previous paper, a number of issues and problems were raised and explored. It is these we return to here and below, to propose and explore a future structure and capability for a revised PacPlan (referred to as PacPlanPlus.)
- 3.10. To do this, informal reviews of other regional activity centre models have been undertaken to see if they might shed light on what might work elsewhere, and for other purposes. All seem to have common elements, and so without providing detailed analysis of the successor otherwise of these other entities and functions, we present the following as necessary components to consider. Some elements of the existing PacPlan approach are retained as they remain relevant to the Pacific context and values.
- 3.11. Purpose remains the same. The PacPlan Plus would continue to be a regional collaborative and cooperative capability, with the purpose of supporting all members to develop and deliver their own capability (to reflect their own needs, risks and capabilities), supplemented by an external support as needs (preparedness and response) increase.
- 3.12. This is not a one-size-fits-all approach. Realistically, no country can carry its own risk nor deliver its own response capacity. Membership currently has two types, member and metropolitan. Members are grouped geographically and geopolitically so that there is logic to metro support. This grouping approach has significant benefits for each party, when relationships and support are strong, but can also end up with members having differing access to metro support and levels of focus depending on their geographical grouping, as metropolitan political priorities change. Being able to have a process to both support and to lighten metro support across all the members would be an advantage.
- 3.13. Nor should the task of protecting the Pacific be limited only to the current members and metros. Other resources (technical and funding – outside the members and metros) could and should be leveraged. These include other international governmental entities (i.e. IMO, UNEP, etc.), other Pacific rim countries with international maritime transport interests in or across the Pacific (e.g. APHoMSA members), and technical and other maritime sector entities involved in risk and threat mitigation (i.e. insurance, response, etc.).

- 3.14. SPREP, as both Pacific IGO and PacPlan administrator, should be in a position to promote and deliver this. So, the PacPlanPlus proposal is unashamedly focussed on developing and strengthening SPREP capability to administer and deliver PacPlanPlus support and outcomes across the members, irrespective of the source of the support.
- 3.15. So, one major element is regional capability, to supplement or augment national capability and technological shortcomings (for whatever reason).
- 3.16. Member capability and development varies from zero to limited. At present, in my estimation, does only one pacific country have an approved, credible national contingency plan, suitable to for national use, with recognised (always inadequate) personnel and resources, and able to likely successfully engage with international support (PNG). I wish there were more. Each other has shortcomings varying from no risk assessment to no (approved) plan, from no trained personnel to no functional equipment, and some with no credible relationship with their support metro.

4. The big issue: Sustainable funding and resourcing.

- 4.1. The following analysis focusses on a range of areas, issues and elements. But fundamental to it all is sustained and sustainable funding and resource availability. Members should be able to fund their national needs (to the extent they choose to or can) for basic needs. Funds for this can be raised in a few different ways, from taxation, through sector levies. This is a decision for the national administration. Metropolitan states can and do offer their coverage members both funding and in-kind support across all aspects of prevention, preparedness response and recovery. This should be recognised and encouraged. Despite it being a core SPREP function (under the Noumea Convention), SPREP receives (and allocates) no core funding to support PacPlan, other than contributing to the (salary) time of the Pollution Adviser, and any executive or administration support that position receives.
- 4.2. In recent years, Australia has contributed project funding (DFAT) to SPREP to support PacPlan work, and various in-kind contributions from AMSA. New Zealand has contributed funds to provide a regional response capability offered at a significant discount by OSRL. In the last 12 months the USCG has restarted PacPlan support activities through deployment of its new Marine Environment Response Regional Activity Center (MER-RAC) resources and personnel. All are very welcome and have been deployed and leveraged to great advantage. But all have suffered or will suffer to greater or lesser extent from a lack of overall coordination from a capable, credible and resourced central coordination entity, such as a SPREP PacPlan Office.
- 4.3. The generous OSRL offer and the equally generous offer by NZ to resource it has ceased and come to very little after three years because of low uptake by the members. The reasons for this are likely myriad, but the time it was on offer coincided with a period when both members and SPREP were focussed on other priorities, such as covid, and SPREP was focused on waste and plastics pollution in SPREP. So, there was no PacPlan technical resource to promote the concept.
- 4.4. The Australian PacPlan Resilience Project 2022-25 has provided a resource to improve member country preparedness and response capability, and lower their risks of long-term damage to environment, community or economy from a spill and response. So far, it is considered a success with support and capability development both to the target countries and more broadly across PacPlan. But being project funded with no sustained programme beyond May 2025 (originally 2024), member benefits are likely to dissipate and wane over time. Member expectations of centralised credible support have been built (and delivered), but have also had to be tempered to reflect the project closure in mid-2025, with no discussion of future support.

5. 2023 and 2024 extra external support leveraged by the SPREP and PacPlan.

- 5.1. The USCG MER-RAC advent arrived in mid-2023 and started working the northern Pacific members since then. However, by their own admission, they required SPREP charter and support (as the US metro delivery agency) to do this work. Had SPREP not coincidentally had an experienced response technical expert (as opposed to simply a project manager) for the Resilience project, the USCG MER-RAC influence and capability opportunity for PacPlan would likely have been much lower and directed elsewhere within their wider sphere of interest.
- 5.2. The UK Oceans Country Partnership Programme (OCP) has provided also started to make an impact in 2024, with targeted basic training support to two Members in 2024 and early 2025. There is the possibility of more in the future, if Members can be successful bidders. But this option is not open to all Members, nor SPREP to apply for.
- 5.3. The US Navy, through the INDOPACOM Environmental Security Programme, also offered one regional training in 2024. There may be others in the future.
- 5.4. Metropolitan training and development opportunities are likely, as are offers from other countries and organisations (such as IMO), but not always is SPREP aware of these, and when it is, it doesn't always have the time or resources to try to leverage the opportunity across the membership.
- 5.5. Without SPREP having a PacPlan technical expertise able to engage in and leverage many of these related efforts and programmes, there would be little opportunity to promote PacPlan outcomes, especially around lowering (incident) spill risk, developing technical capability and credibility in countries and across the region, and mitigating impacts.

6. Exploring a new model for PacPlan Delivery by SPREP (with resource-based scenarios)

Concept of Operations proposal

- 6.1. In originally trying to develop a full Concept of Operations proposal, to address:
 - Purpose – outcomes, objectives, for a planned, regional, collective approach
 - Design – overcoming constraints & challenges
 - Delivery model – structure, governance, planning, resources, operations, administration, etc.
 - Resources needs – SPREP technical resources (staff, etc.) to support members, including in-country.
 - Funding needs – SPREP funding, to support regional & occasionally inadequate national funding
- 6.2. it became clear that there were fundamental issues to get clear before any detailed design could be undertaken. So, what follows is a thumb-nail assessment and analysis of versions of the current PacPlan Resilience Project (described as Nominal) based around funding, administration and delivery options for SPREP.
- 6.3. This model deliberately does not attempt to address the means to improve capability in Member countries and agencies, other than to propose that increasing resourcing to SPREP will improve SPREP's ability to support all Members and Metropolitan countries in their desires to improve capability and capacity, or to supplement it with regional capability.

Purpose

- 6.4. The purpose of a new (or revised) PacPlan delivery would be little changed:

To provide SPREP with the sustained capability, funding, technical resources and business support to deliver PacPlan to its Members and Metropolitans.
- 6.5. There are many ways the relevant issues and challenges facing PacPlan marine pollution preparedness, response and recovery can be addressed across the Pacific. These are

broken down and grouped as described below, so that they can be addressed both for their own value, and to be able to fit within a simple costing and funding options framework.

- 6.6. This is one model (in different resourcing levels) of improved delivery. If others are possible, SPREP would welcome comment and suggestions on what these may be and how they might work to deliver support to the PacPlan Members.
- 6.7. Details about these elements, analysis and conclusions is included Table 1.in Annex Two.

Summary of proposed options, elements, costs and feasibility

None = no progress or delivery. V. Limited = delivery is unlikely to be significant or useful. Limited = Progress or delivery likely limited by location or member. Useful = likely to be useful to most (but not all) members. Full = all-member implementation across space & time.				
Outcomes / delivery elements (Annual funding to and through SPREP - estimates based on current PacPlan Resilience Project expenditure – see last slide.)	Status Quo (\$0)	Minimal (\$250K)	Nominal (\$500K)	Optimal (\$750K)
Staffing (1=Tech Adv.), (1.5= +0.25 Dir & 0.25 Admin), (2.3 = +1.0 Dir & 0.3 Admin)	None	1 FTE	1.5 FTE	2.3 FTE
Membership coverage increase push (Noumea Convention)	Limited	Useful	Full	Full
Governance (Members/Metro Steering & Operations)	V. Limited	Useful	Full	Full
Planning – Strategic (5-10yrs) and Annual Workplan	V. Limited	Limited	Useful	Full
Risk change & assessment support (environmental scanning)	None	V. Limited	Useful	Full
Regional strategic alignment (other strategic initiatives)	V. Limited	Limited	Useful	Full
SPREP PacPlan staff & admin support capacity to members or metros	None	V. Limited	Useful	Full
SPREP technical capacity to support members	None	V. Limited	Useful	Full
Regional technical/response services (intel, legal, observation, forensics, etc.)	None	V. Limited	Limited	Full
Regional commercial (OSRL) or metro response support coordination	None	Limited	Full	Full
National & regional training support	None	V. Limited	Useful	Full
Qualifications development and delivery	None	None	Full	Full
National & regional exercises support (e.g. IMO ITCP project?).	None	None	Limited	Full

Risk change/recognition

- 6.8. Need to have a regional capacity to address maritime risks, on a national and regional level. This could be a SPREP PacPlan technical capability or a contracted expertise.
- 6.9. Shipping into and through the Pacific Islands is largely similar to other regions, incl. tankers, containers, fishing, and cruise vessels. Call frequency may be lower, but often ports are less well prepared to deal with them or their incidents. Support can be delayed by wealth, distance and time. Transit vessels create risk and make no local contribution.
- 6.10. New risks and threats come from maritime casualties (physical damage from grounding or sinking), and losses of other pollutants (i.e. cargo, plastic pellets, other fuels – ammonia may be coming).
- 6.11. Wrecks, incl. WW2 legacies (3800), and more recent abandoned wrecks create threats of ecological damage from iron pollution, or plastics.

Convention Ratification (SPREP/PacPlan membership & coverage)

- 6.12. Many PACPLAN members have not ratified the IMO Conventions necessary, nor are they members of the Noumea Convention or its Emergency Protocol. Some are missing laws, others National Plans. All find the increasing costs of preparing for (having full-time specialist maritime lawyers), responding to (evidence collection, analysis and court delivery), and enforcing maritime and pollution laws prohibitive. This is recognised and taken advantage of by unscrupulous operators. Even PacPlan metropolitan countries find chasing and prosecuting polluters to be a constant challenge.
- 6.13. One option to explore is the concept of associate members to PacPlan, or adoption of PacPlan as a mechanism for APHoMSA members to be able to support.

Strategic alignment with other important regional frameworks (e.g. waste & pollution)

- 6.14. SPREP has also used of the technical resources of the Resilience Project and the MER-RAC (among others), to further PacPlan and related strategic interests. The Clean Pacific Strategy on waste and pollution control review and revision has benefitted from engagement with pollution prevention, preparedness and response staff across the Pacific. Shipping not only creates the threat or risk of pollution, it is also the major means to remove it. Spill response can create extraordinary amounts of oily (and other) wastes during the response. In the Pacific management of these wastes from normal domestic and commercial (and limited industrial) sources often stretch and stress local waste management systems, so coordination and collaboration for their use with spill response waste is critical, so they simply do not collapse or shift the pollution problem from one location or sector to another.
- 6.15. Maritime sector strategic planning is also underway, and risk identification of pollution from shipping and its impact management are significant elements of this. The support the PacPlan has been able to give to the development of the Pacific One-Maritime Framework initiative of The Pacific Community (SPC) and IMO, reflects the integrated nature of the sector and the role PacPlan specialists can play. Similarly for pollution within ports, and the development in 2022 of the Pacific Ports Recognition Framework.

Governance and membership (PacPlan as a member-led organisation)

- 6.16. Strategic Planning – Pac Plan has a its own strategic purposes and expected outcomes and outputs. PacPlan as written is very static. So, its components need to be better described and developed for regional and strategic alignment and delivery.
- 6.17. Regular (biennial or annual) face-to-face meetings of all PacPlan members and regular (annual or biannual) virtual meetings of PacPlan Executive Board (4 metros and 4-6 members)
- 6.18. Business planning – outputs and delivery have cost (time and resources) implications. These need to be better planned so members and associates and partner organisations can align and engage with SPREP/PacPlan. There is much to be gained through aligned leverage.
- 6.19. Regional (SPREP) technical support to members. As noted elsewhere, many countries will not be able to have the expertise and technical programmes to provide all the necessary capabilities for planning, response, training or exercising.

Regional Response Capacity (supplementing national capabilities)

- 6.20. Some capabilities are so specialist they should be developed and delivered as regional. These are often costly individually- or can only be sought and delivered through very specialist (often Metro-based) agencies or commercial suppliers.
- Technical intelligence capability – shared resources across & beyond metros
 - Legal advice (at all stages of an incident or response)
 - Forensic capacity (evidence collection through to prosecution & cost recovery)
 - International commercial expert response (e.g. OSRL, satellite obs, etc.)

Regional Preparedness

- 6.21. Some activities are most efficiently and effectively developed and delivered as regional. These are often costly individually, and should ideally not be duplicated in every member.
- PacPlan/NatPlan doctrine (documents, plans, policies, processes & systems)
 - Financial costs of preparedness
 - Training and qualifications
 - Exercises and planning/preparedness evaluation
 - Local (members) rapid response to augment metropolitans

Levels of funding and organisation - assumptions and caveats.

- 6.22. Each of these are the assessment and opinion of the current PacPlan Project Officer. In assessing each, focus has been on trying, as much as possible, to identify and prioritise the fundamentals required, so that elements like membership promotion, strategic and business planning, governance, and technical capacity (for virtual advice and leveraging) are prioritised over actual delivery into the region or members. There will be other valid configurations.
- 6.23. Realistic and credible funding, administrative, travel and delivery models at the four funding levels have been provided. Again, there are many possible variations and configurations.
- 6.24. For each Option, funding and resourcing level, it is assumed existing contributions from existing Metropolitan and partners to member continue or are improved, due to improved capability at SPREP. Only in Options 3. (Nominal) and 4. (Optimal) are these contributions really effective, through having credible technical expertise in the various SPREP roles and their ability to leverage and multiply PacPlan and external capabilities.

7. Funding and Delivery Models

- 7.1. In all models and options, SPREP has been identified, assessed and evaluated as the only credible delivery mechanism for the reasons described below. SPREP has the Noumea Convention mandate.
- 7.2. Each of the Options is a discrete model. They are designed to show differences in capability and capacity. None is an exact proposal for funding or delivery. They are discrete points on a continuum of functions, delivery and funding.
- 7.3. Each Option is made up of three components for delivery of the core PacPlan functions.
 - 7.3.1. The first fundamental component is staff with technical capacity and credibility. The role will deliver organisational and business management support as a secretariat. It will also be to advocate for the PacPlan, within and outside the Pacific region. it should also be to provide some technical support.
 - 7.3.2. A second component is having the staff located within an organisation committed to and capable of housing them, and to supporting the business of delivering the PacPlan arrangements. Further capacity can be sourced, offered and leveraged from other stakeholders, members and partners. SPREP has the regional mandate, the strategic intent, and the means to do this.
 - 7.3.3. The third component is the technical programme to support outputs, solutions and outcomes. This technical capability can come from many sources within PacPlan (the members, the metropolitan countries, and SPREP) and from external stakeholders and partners. SPREP's role is to ensure effectiveness and efficiency, through coordination and cooperation across all the various components. Technical delivery could be undertaken by agencies other than SPREP. But none have the regional mandate, the connections, nor partnerships across the region, internationally, and across all the PacPlan Members.

7.4. **Option One – Status Quo – no funding for a SPREP PacPlan function (USD\$0/yr, 0 FTE)**

(Similar to PacPlan delivery during 2016-2022)

Note: *This is now remains as a straw-man comparison option – see section 9 below, for recent SPREP initiative to provide funding for a core position to support PacPlan work.*

No dedicated SPREP staff resource – no one dedicated to incoming phone or email, or any form of cross-programme coordination, or any form of regional or member (in-country) support delivery.

Limited capacity for SPREP advocacy for Noumea membership increase & activity (to avoid a two-tier PacPlan membership – Noumea members and not!)

Very Limited Governance or Business/Strategic Planning delivery, based on staff at SPREP able to fill gaps and find time.

Cannot be delivered

- National/regional risk assessment support (inclusive of PPWs)
- Regional strategic alignments & collaborations
- SPREP technical staff & admin support capacity
- In-country technical advice to members
- Any regional technical/response capacities (intelligence, legal, observation, forensics, etc.)
- Regional commercial response support (e.g. OSRL)
- National and regional training, qualifications & exercises

7.5. Option Two – Minimal SPREP funding (USD\$250k/yr, 1.0 FTE)

(Similar to 2023-2024 under PacPlan Resilience Project, but without member state support, and no regional workshops or meetings)

One SPREP admin/technical resource – technical expert person, desk, phone, and very limited regional travel.

Could usefully address:

- Membership increase & activity and establishment of useful Governance processes (membership driven)

Limited capacity for:

- Strategic (out-years) & business planning (with SPREP support)
- Regional strategic alignments & collaborations

Very limited capacity for:

- National/regional risk assessment support (inclusive of PPWs)
- External commercial response support
- SPREP technical staff & admin support capacity
- In-country technical advice to members
- Any regional technical/response capacities (intelligence, legal, observation, forensics, etc.)

Cannot be delivered

- Any regional and national training, qualifications & exercises

7.6. Option Three – Nominal SPREP funding (USD\$500k/yr, FTE 1.5)

(Similar to 2023 and-2024 under PacPlan Resilience Project, without counting the extra external support and resources supplied during those years from metropolitan countries – see section)

One expert, full-time, technical resources, supported by 0.25 Director & 0.25 admin / project support.

Can be addressed & delivered– primarily due to dedicated director/admin resources

- Membership increase & activity
- Governance (membership driven)
- Strategic (outyears) & business planning
- SPREP technical staff & admin support capacity
- Qualifications development and delivery

- External commercial response support (e.g. OSRL)

Likely full service should allow:

- National/regional risk assessment support (inclusive of PPWs)
- Regional strategic alignments & collaborations
- In-country technical advice to members

Unlikely to be delivered:

- All regional technical capacities (intelligence, legal, observation, forensics, etc.)
- National and regional training & exercises

7.7. Option Four – Optimal SPREP funding (USD\$750k/yr, FTE 2.3)

(Similar to, but greater than, the resourcing and funding for SPREP during 2023 and 2024 under PacPlan Resilience Project, but with significant extra external support and leveraging – PacPlan has never seen this level of delivery)

Two expert resources (1. technical, 1. director/technical), + 0.3 admin/project support, with sufficient member/in-country/regional travel.

This should allow and deliver all aspects:

- Membership increase & activity, and full governance (membership driven)
- Strategic (outyears) & business planning
- National/regional risk assessment support (inclusive of PPWs)
- Regional strategic alignments & collaborations
- SPREP technical staff & admin support capacity to members
- In-country technical advice to members
- Regional technical capacities (intelligence, legal, observation, forensics, etc.)
- External commercial response support (e.g. OSRL)
- National and regional training, & exercises
- Completion and delivery of relevant qualifications framework components
- Grants to support small in-country capability projects, not otherwise funded.

8. Scenario Conclusion

- 8.1. SPREP recommends and proposes that Option Three (Nominal) would be the most pragmatic, affordable and sustainable option to work towards supporting.
- 8.2. Option Three (Nominal) is effectively what has occurred for the past three years under the PacPlan Resilience Project funded by Australian DFAT, with the extra external support from other sources described in Section 5 above.
- 8.3. Should a similar level of support (of funding and technical resources) to the last three years be able to be sourced and applied, SPREP accepts that a similar level of support could be delivered across the PacPlan membership. SPREP's PacPlan core programme functions could then be used to effectively seek, guide and augment technical project support from external sources.
- 8.4. When fully operational, this new PacPlanPlus capability within SPREP would have the following components, to a greater or lesser extent, depending on resourcing available:

Structural or organisational capacity

- A designated PacPlan Unit and positions within SPREP, reflecting its significance as a core (Noumena Convention and SPREP Agreement) function.

- One designated technically expert staff resource (PacPlan Officer), with a further 0.5 FTE designated management and administrative support:
 - 0.25 FTE shared Director or Lead Technical
 - 1 FTE PacPlan Officer
 - 0.25 FTE shared Admin/Project Support.
- A project to advocate for increasing Noumea Convention membership to all 14 PacPlan Member countries, to assist their active involvement in SPREP, PacPlan and Noumea convention activities and decisions.
- Establishing and running a virtual PacPlan Strategic and Business Planning Committee structure (to be developed with membership, structure and rules to suit the full PacPlan Membership, including Territories and Metropolitans).
- A PacPlan Strategic Plan, consistent with regional and other external strategies, addressing expectations and outcomes of PacPlan as an entity for outyears.
 - Regional strategic alignments & collaborations.
- An agreed Annual Business Plan and Budget outlining SPREP's PacPlan workplan for the year and Member expectations of service delivery.
- Suitable office accommodation space and resources at SPREP to offer opportunities for short-term secondees, volunteers or similar, from Members, Metropolitans or other relevant entities, to assist with delivery of PacPlan.

Technical support from PacPlan

- Sufficient funding for the technical officer to visit and work with each PacPlan Member once every two years.
- Sufficient funding for travel to relevant regional engagements and professional development for PacPlan Officer.
- Regional technical capacity (through staff, or other leveraged or partnership sources) to assist Members in-country with resources, advice and support, such as:
 - Preparedness – support for national/regional risk assessments (inclusive of PPWs), plan development, national and regional training, and exercises, external funding applications for equipment purchase or supply, etc.
 - Back-up National Capacity to remotely cover short term-absences in key positions and roles.
- SPREP technical staff & admin support capacity to members to attend regional trainings, workshops, regional qualifications framework, development of bilateral funding proposals, etc. and to leverage
- Offer small grants to support in-country capability projects (such as trainings or exercises), not otherwise funded, through the member's annual budget.

PacPlan capacity to support and augment external offers of regional or bilateral technical support

Depending on how these are offered and supplied (Metropolitan or donor services could be extended to all members, regional commercial contracts, IGO or other development partner funding or services, etc.), a core SPREP PacPlan capacity (person) may be able to plan for, coordinate, support and deliver:

- Regional technical capacities (intelligence gathering, model supply, legal services, remote observation, investigation, forensic analysis, etc).
- National and regional trainings & exercises.

9. SPREP actions towards resourcing the proposed option.

- 9.1. Funding and resourcing a capability such as PacPlan ideally requires members to be able to address their activities, metropolitan countries to be able to support their zone members, and SPREP to be able to coordinate and deliver from the centre across the

region. The reality is that member capability stretches from almost zero to moderately self-sufficient. None of the members are fully self-sufficient. SPREP's role is to support all members where regional intervention is the most effective action, and to work with individual members, when this is most effective. It is also to be available when required and to be able to leverage opportunities when these arise.

- 9.2. Irrespective of PacPlan/NatPlan funding through or of members, SPREP requires its own source of funding to deliver whatever functions members desire to come from SPREP. The reality is that without dedicated funding, specifically allocated to deliver PacPlan capability and functions, SPREP will likely largely fail members and metropolitans, within the overall goal of delivering a cooperative framework that PacPlan is and should be.

New Marine Pollution Officer Position in SPREP

- 9.3. In early 2025 SPREP agreed to fund a new 'core' Marine Pollution Officer position. This can follow on from the delivery of the PacPlan Resilience project resources, and the development of this proposal. Whilst not exclusively PacPlan focussed, a suitably qualified appointee will be able to use their time and expertise to provide continuity from the PacPlan Resilience Project, continue to provide technical and administrative support to PacPlan members, assist with future PacPlan arrangements, and work with SPREP, development partners, and other donors to seek funding and resourcing opportunities. This investment by SPREP is a commitment of rebuilding core capacity within SPREP towards whichever PacPlanPlus future is eventually agreed by members.
- 9.4. This new capacity within SPREP means that the proposed changes can be addressed with members and partners in principle, for endorsement as a future direction and expectation. Then, specific proposals for further funding and resourcing be contemplated and addressed by SPREP in its normal donor and partner engagement processes.
- 9.5. This initiative means that Option One has become a straw-man comparative option only. SPREP has already agreed to fund a PacPlan 'core' position.

Recommendation

It is recommended that SPREP seek to:

- implement (through detailed design, structure and function),
- resource (through funding, staffing and inhouse and regional technical capability), and
- deliver through inhouse and regional capacity (expertise, systems and technology)

a new model of PacPlan, suitable for and as agreed by, Members and Metropolitans, where the structure, organisation, resourcing and deliverables are akin to Option Three, subject to resources and funding mobilisation.

Annex One – Key Challenges to the overall PacPlan Programme

Key Challenges identified across SPREP and member countries.

Financial risks to members: Increasing costs of basic preparedness, and unpaid legitimate response and restoration, rehabilitation or recovery are becoming prohibitive for many PacPlan members, without external support from insurers, donors or other support. Not all can turn to internal funding measures like a Pollution Levy on traffic, due to low traffic frequency, yet all face the same minimum costs for preparedness. The as-yet unrecovered Solomon Trader response costs are in excess of USD\$10 mil. For a Least Developed Country to carry these costs (despite significant financial and other support from Australia) demonstrates the risks these countries face. Likely costs and source of finance should not be overriding and determining factors about mounting a response. Also, lack of preparation could raise response costs, due to delayed or inadequate local resources or expertise.

Risk: Shipping into and through the Pacific Islands is little different to other countries. Tankers, containers, fishing, and cruise vessels terminate. Others transit. Call frequency may be lower, but they come into ports less well prepared to deal with them or their incidents. So, the risk remains. Response assistance is often delayed by distance and time. Transit vessels create risk and make no local contribution to preparedness. High traffic rates in Jomard Channel create transit risk for PNG. Similar, but lower frequency, locations exist throughout the Pacific.

Emerging risks and threats from spills other than oils and hazardous and noxious substances. Other significant types of spill risk to the Pacific include maritime casualties (near spills and physical damage from grounding or sinking), and losses of other pollutants (i.e. cargo, plastic pellets, other fuels – ammonia and lithium).

World War II Wreck risk, a legacy of the WWII there are over 3500 WWII Wrecks in PICTs EEZ with over 50 of these wrecks identified as high risk because of the potential for bunker fuel spillage. A corrosion study by Earthwatch in 2008 estimated the hull of these wrecks would begin to fail by 2023. The recent Australia funded WWII Wreck project in Chuuk Lagoon in FSM with Major Projects Foundation has confirmed the poor state of many wrecks there. Sovereignty, war graves, and explosives complicate the issue. PacPlan has to be part of any regional solution.

Abandoned and unsalvaged vessels, whether cleared of normal pollutants or not, litter the Pacific. These create their own threats, whether from simple local unsightliness in otherwise pristine areas, to threats of ecological damage from rust (excess iron oxide can change a coral dominated area into an algal dominated ecosystem) or from the older wrecks of the Pacific wars, leaking oil and very toxic oils.

Conventions, laws and compliance systems gaps: Many PacPlan members have not ratified the IMO Conventions necessary, nor are they members of the Noumea Convention or its Emergency Protocol. Some are missing laws, others National Plans. All find the increasing costs of preparing for (having full-time specialist maritime lawyers), responding to (evidence collection, analysis and court delivery), and enforcing maritime and pollution laws prohibitive. This is recognised and taken advantage of by unscrupulous operators. Even PacPlan metropolitan countries find chasing and prosecuting likely polluters to be a constant challenge.

Legal capacity for addressing criminal and insurance liability for financial and other risks management. The international system for addressing oil spills, as a technological threat is historically well-developed, with international planning, response and recovery regimes in place. However, the international and domestic law that underpins incidents, emergencies, salvage, response, insurance and compensation is complex and crucial to outcomes. In a spill there is almost always a liable criminal party (the spiller) and insurance. Decisions made in the first few hours determine success or otherwise. Rarely do PacPlan member countries have timely and unfettered access to this expertise.

Forensic capability. To make the criminal case and so set up to get compensation or behaviour change, often requires evidence and successful prosecution (or at least the threat of one). There is a need for a regional capacity to address expert analytical capability, to deliver the often long and tortuous path from evidence collection to successful prosecution involves many steps and actors. Biosecurity has emerged as the latest obstacle to overcome, as evidence samples are now considered entry risks to countries with analytical capability, unless rigorous standards are met. Isolation and remoteness challenges logistics and chain of custody requirements.

A more strategic approach. PacPlan 2019 is not offering all it could, for effective and efficient regional capability. Globally, similar regional agreements and entities exist to deliver such programmes for members, and we need to learn from these, about how to establish regional strategic and operational capacities to support member states, how to fund sustainably, how to cooperate with international agencies to garner support, etc.

Strategic alignment between PacPlan and other strategic documents is limited. The key pollution management and control programme in the region, the [Cleaner Pacific 2025: Pacific Regional Waste And Pollution Management Strategy](#), which addresses many forms of waste and pollution, but does not specifically address spilled oils, chemical spills or cargo spills.

Governance of PacPlan: To ensure good governance, and to provide necessary technical and policy oversight, a new governance structure involving all members and SPREP would set the outcomes, objectives, responsibilities, accountabilities, principles, processes, etc. A formal governance entity should be able to adjust the new PacPlan Strategy between large formal reviews, as context and needs require.

Partnerships: the original (and current) model of PacPlan is very limited in how risk and support are distributed. The 21 members have been generally fully reliant on the support of the Metropolitan countries, although some are graduating to developing their own small tier 2 capabilities. Nonetheless, many Pacific rim countries create the risk of shipping facing the PacPlan members. Many Pacific rim countries also have sophisticated spill preparedness and response systems and capabilities, that could be extended to or shared with PacPlan members through regional or bilateral development support arrangements, guided within an overall PacPlan Strategic Plan.

Timely Response: Timely advice and support, especially with legal advice, or technological intelligence, early in the response, can prevent damage, save time and effort, and produce a better result. There is a need for regional capabilities as not every country (member or metropolitan) can hold or offer all the needed resources. One option is to encourage local bilateral arrangements within member groups, to augment member response support in the event of a spill. Another would be to develop a team, of member-sourced regional experts, as a rapid-deployment strike team, the Pacific Ready Response Taskforce.

Three-tier response system: This potentially constrains international support. Within PacPlan, three levels or tiers of incident and response severity are defined. This rigid definition is long out-of-date. It has no nuance in its relatively rigid stepwise approach. It takes little account of remote technical capacities available. It also translates to National Plans. Countries should be able to ask and receive international (remote or in person) technical assistance to address their spills and responses as they grow in capability and confidence, without having to change Tier (response accountability). This type of change will flow through to national planning, regional capability delivery and international support and assistance.

Shared Capability development: through collaboration in disaster and emergency management through the emerging Pacific Emergency Incident Management System, now in use or in training to address all natural, technological and health disasters.

Core secretariat capability: Key to effective support of members needs and regional needs, is having a technically expert, cohesive administrative centre, currently the allocated functions of SPREP. With infrequent and uncertain project funding from Metropolitan countries (and other

development partners) SPREP has been unable to provide constant and effective support to members or the PacPlan programme, as a whole. Under the current structure without sufficient sustainable investment in SPREP (as the administrative and technical core of PacPlan), to have the capacity to deliver its allocated functions, much of the rest of the PacPlan system mooted above will be constrained or challenged, especially if the contributions of the metropolitan countries to the needs of the members requires constant coordination.

Sustainable funding and resourcing: This will always be an issue. Current support and funding models appear to be constrained in focus to projects (time, location, resources, or recipient). Metropolitan (and IMO) project funding needs to be supplemented with programme support from a wider range of potential partners. With limited donor, SPREP or member country consultation or planning, even well-meaning support (planning, training and capability building) can be diminished in value. There is a risk that the value of the PacPlan Resilience Project (and others) will quickly diminish, as changes in maritime and Pacific context, risk, threat and expectations will likely continue to change as well.

Annex Two – Tables of Scenario Analysis.

Table 1. Estimated costs of various elements of structure	USD\$ (approx.)
Senior level (management) staff member (annual all up costs)	\$130,000
Technical expert level staff member (annual all up costs)	\$100,000
Admin/project support (annual all up costs)	\$60,000
OSRL response membership (all 21 members)	\$75,000
Average flights and in-country subsistence for one week	\$6,000
Cert IV Qualifications management	\$25,000
One regional costs 5-day face-to-face training, workshop or exercise (1 attendee per member (21)) travel and subsistence (e.g. location in Nadi Fiji) (expect 2 p.a.)	\$85,000
Consultants for one set of five days of in-country or regional training or exercise activity. (expect 4 p.a.)	\$50,000
Satellite retainer, risk and AIS contract (if permitted as regional resource)	\$25,000
Legal maritime services (law firm on retainer call, maintaining international & country legal systems knowledge)	\$25,000
Biennial face-to-face members governance meeting (combined with biennial SPREP meeting) (21 members & 4 metros – latter meeting own costs) (expect 1 per 2 years)	\$50,000
Commercial fate and behaviour modeling services (annual retainer & access)	\$25,000

Table 2. Summary of the impacts and delivery of the various design elements under each funding scenario.				
None = no progress or delivery. V. Limited = delivery is unlikely to be significant or useful. Limited = Progress or delivery likely limited by location or member. Useful = likely to be useful to most (but not all) members. Full = all-member implementation across space & time.				
Outcomes / delivery elements (Annual funding to and through SPREP - estimates based on current PacPlan Resilience Project expenditure – see last slide.)	Status Quo (\$0)	Minimal (\$250K)	Nominal (\$500K)	Optimal (\$750K)
Staffing (1=Tech Adv.), (1.5= +0.25 Dir & 0.25 Admin), (2.3 = +1.0 Dir & 0.3 Admin)	None	1 FTE	1.5 FTE	2.3 FTE
Membership coverage increase push (Noumea Convention)	Limited	Useful	Full	Full
Governance (Members/Metro Steering & Operations)	V. Limited	Useful	Full	Full
Planning – Strategic (5-10yrs) and Annual Workplan	V. Limited	Limited	Useful	Full
Risk change & assessment support (environmental scanning)	None	V. Limited	Useful	Full
Regional strategic alignment (other strategic initiatives)	V. Limited	Limited	Useful	Full
SPREP PacPlan staff & admin support capacity to members or metros	None	V. Limited	Useful	Full
SPREP technical capacity to support members	None	V. Limited	Useful	Full
Regional technical/response services (intel, legal, observation, forensics, etc.)	None	V. Limited	Limited	Full
Regional commercial (OSRL) or metro response support coordination	None	Limited	Full	Full
National & regional training support	None	V. Limited	Useful	Full
Qualifications development and delivery	None	None	Full	Full
National & regional exercises support (e.g. IMO ITCP project?).	None	None	Limited	Full

Table 3. Detailed description and analysis of the relevance, impacts and delivery under the four funding and resourcing scenarios.

Issue	Detail	NO REGIONAL OR TECHNICAL CAPABILITY	MINIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	NOMINAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	OPTIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY
		within SPREP (No Technical Adviser/Trainer) to advise, coordinate or deliver. Members and Metros left to address things as they can. Very limited resources and capabilities, leveraging limited number of member national levy funds.	within SPREP (Part-time Technical Adviser/Trainer) to coordinate SPREP and partner (Metro) contributions, but not enough to cover future regional response capability, and member training and development.	within SPREP (Full-time Technical Adviser/Trainer part-time) to plan, coordinate and support SPREP and partner (Metro/Member) contributions. Enough funding to have limited regional capabilities to augment member and metro (direct) support.	within SPREP Full-time staffing (2) offering opportunities to support (capabilities, development, training) members, coordinate Metros and partner contributions, and seek further collaboration opportunities.
Solution looks like (all cost projects are 2024 estimates, based on PacPlan Resilience Project)					
Financial (Funding) needs	Annual funding availability for SPREP and regional capability and development costs (does not include any member national funds or expenditure.)	USD\$0	USD\$250,000	USD\$500,000	USD\$750,000
	Staff and resources: To support, coordinate and deliver leadership, technical and administrative needs. To build and maintain crucial relationships across Members, Metros, partners, etc.	FTE 0. No dedicated staff. No advantage of presence, expertise, relationship-building, leverage, etc.	FTE 1. One full-time Tech Adviser. Full salary and HR costs of one full-time expert technical adviser. No admin support. Some advantage of presence, expertise, credibility, relationship	FTE 1.5 One full-time Tech Adviser. One 20% SPREP Director, (SPREP Programme contribution) One 30% Admin/project support All salary and HR costs of staff included.	FTE (2.3) One full-time, dedicated, expert PacPlan Director One full-time Technical Adviser 1 30% Admin/project support. With fulltime staff and a dedicated workspace, staff technical leveraging

Table 3. Detailed description and analysis of the relevance, impacts and delivery under the four funding and resourcing scenarios.

Issue	Detail	NO REGIONAL OR TECHNICAL CAPABILITY	MINIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	NOMINAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	OPTIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY
			building etc. but all constrained by limited amounts of other resources and capabilities.	Some advantage of presence, expertise, credibility, relationship building etc. but all constrained by limited amounts of other resources and capabilities.	(secondments) becomes much more likely.
	<p>Planning (Corporate):</p> <p>To have the most basic and simple strategic, operational and business planning capabilities, so Members, Metros and Partners can support priorities, and plan their engagement and contributions.</p>	<p>\$0K</p> <p>V. limited</p> <p>To fill the gap, Metros or large members may be able to temporarily second (and pay all necessary expenses for) a staff member to coordinate some planning.</p>	<p>\$20K</p> <p>Limited.</p> <p>Tech Adviser needs the skills to do, or ability to buy in (or have donated) the necessary time and ability to develop basic planning arrangements and implement auditable business planning.</p>	<p>\$10K</p> <p>Useful.</p> <p>Tech Adviser needs the skills to do, or ability to buy in (or have donated) the necessary time and ability to develop basic planning arrangements and implement auditable business planning.</p>	<p>\$0K</p> <p>Full.</p> <p>Largely role of Director to oversee. So, zero external costs, as part of their function.</p>
	<p>Governance: establishment of an overall governance structure, with Members and Metros fully engaged in planning, monitoring and delivery, and open to partner and collaborator support.</p>	<p>\$0K</p> <p>V. limited and all on-line.</p> <p>Metros or large members may be able to temporarily second (and pay all necessary expenses for) a suitable staff member to assist with annual on-line governance meeting and process.</p> <p>Online meeting has low costs.</p>	<p>\$35K</p> <p>Useful.</p> <p>Likely one triennial (3 yearly) face-to-face meeting, for strategy and planning, of PacPlan members (21) and Metros (5) (associated with other events like Heads of Maritime or Noumea Convention or SPREP meeting) and other virtual bi-annual or quarterly meetings.</p>	<p>\$50K</p> <p>Full</p> <p>Assumes one biennial (2 yearly) face to face strategy and planning meeting of PacPlan members (21) and Metros (5) (associated with other events like Heads of Maritime or Noumea Convention or SPREP meeting) and other virtual bi-annual or quarterly meetings.</p>	<p>\$50K</p> <p>Full.</p> <p>Assumes one biennial (\$100K/2) face to face strategy and planning meeting of PacPlan members (21) and Metros (5) (associated with other events like Heads of Maritime or Noumea Convention or SPREP meeting) and other virtual bi-annual or quarterly meetings</p>

Table 3. Detailed description and analysis of the relevance, impacts and delivery under the four funding and resourcing scenarios.

Issue	Detail	NO REGIONAL OR TECHNICAL CAPABILITY	MINIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	NOMINAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	OPTIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY
		Using an additional half-day of an existing meeting (HOM, Noumea, etc.) could be used, but SPREP Focal Points and PacPlan operational agencies are often different).	(\$105K travel costs for members / 3)	(\$100K travel costs for members / 2)	
	<p>Technical Advice:</p> <p>to provide daily and routine direct support to members to augment their preparedness, planning response and recovery capabilities. And to address regional risk and threat assessment.</p>	<p>None. \$0K</p> <p>Metros, large members, or technical partners may be able to offer remote technical advice or support people or programmes on a pro bono basis. This raises issues of credibility, responsibility, accountability, availability, and liability.</p>	<p>V. limited. \$25K</p> <p>If SPREP technical expert is capable (very broad expertise required), then lower, but slightly higher if Members/Metros can support, and highest of commercial or academic support required.</p>	<p>Useful. \$20K</p> <p>If SPREP technical expert and/or Director able to leverage professional networks, then costs actually decrease, and more especially if Members / Metros can also support, and highest of commercial or academic support required.</p>	<p>Full. \$20K</p> <p>Across all of Preparedness, Planning, Response and Recovery</p> <p>Able to complete, review and revise regional policies, and doctrine, work on technical solutions, and contribute to other strategic and operationally relevant activities. SPREP technical expertise is very capable (using Director, Tech Adviser and others) to address and divert requests and deliver solutions.</p>

Table 3. Detailed description and analysis of the relevance, impacts and delivery under the four funding and resourcing scenarios.

Issue	Detail	NO REGIONAL OR TECHNICAL CAPABILITY	MINIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	NOMINAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	OPTIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY
	<p>Staff Travel:</p> <p>Simply a fact of life for PacPlan across the wide Pacific, to cover the members states to provide services and support directly – in-country missions for SPREP expert technical staff (and partner collaborators) is often more cost-effective than consultants, and regional workshops. The Pacific is the most expansive and expensive zone to cover.</p> <p>Would be for delivery of technical support programmes (covering advice, planning, training, exercising, etc.)</p> <p>Assuming average \$6k per one week mission, for 9 days (5 working. 4 travel, flights (\$3K))</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$0K</p> <p>None</p> <p>Simply no travel budget means everything delivered will have to be virtual. No successful programme could survive like this – relationships and face-to-face interactions are crucial and critical in emergency response, especially when there is a high expectation of low frequency (latency), high response costs and complex recovery processes, supplied by international response partners (Metros, etc.).</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$40K</p> <p>Limited</p> <p>One week in each country on a three-year rotation to support preparedness, technical, training or exercising work (or combination of).</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$65K</p> <p>Useful</p> <p>One to two weeks in each member country on a three-year rotation to support preparedness, technical, training or exercising work (or combination of).</p> <p>With admin and Director support, missions can be longer, and adjacent countries chained together for efficiency and consistency.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$110K</p> <p>Full</p> <p>Either, one week in each member and metro country each year,</p> <p>Or four metro visit per year, AND one two-three consecutive week visit to 14 members every two years.</p>

Table 3. Detailed description and analysis of the relevance, impacts and delivery under the four funding and resourcing scenarios.

Issue	Detail	NO REGIONAL OR TECHNICAL CAPABILITY	MINIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	NOMINAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	OPTIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY
	<p>Training Delivery:</p> <p>All members require constant training, professional development and stakeholder awareness. Local trainers can provide some coverage, but regular expert (regional and in-country) programmes are required due to turnover.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$0K</p> <p>None</p> <p>All training would have to be funded by members and metros and support partners, and would likely be primarily in-country, with low regional participation, and provided by local trainers and donors.</p> <p>It would also likely be ad hoc, uncoordinated and inconsistent.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$0K</p> <p>V. limited</p> <p>All training would be delivered by \$0 cost options to SPREP, either through Technical Adviser travel or through metros support or member direct funding</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$65K</p> <p>Useful</p> <p>Technical training would be a mix on-line, in-country and regional F2F activities, using SPREP and specialist (Metro, partner or commercial) trainers (IMT and others), delivering a mix of competency-based qualifications and certification.</p> <p>Costs are venue, participant (14) travel and consultant costs.</p> <p>SPREP’s primary role would be coordination and entry-level in-country events.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$90K</p> <p>Full</p> <p>Technical training would be a mix on-line, in-country and regional F2F activities, using SPREP and specialist (Metro, partner or commercial) trainers (IMT and others), delivering a mix of competency-based qualifications and certification.</p> <p>Costs are venue, participant (21) travel and consultant costs.</p> <p>SPREP’s primary role would be coordination and entry-level in-country events.</p>
	<p>Regional Capabilities:</p> <p>Not all members can deliver (provide internally or afford to purchase) technical capabilities. Significant efficiencies and cost savings can be made at regional level, especially if commercial services shared or supplied collaboratively by members,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$0K</p> <p>None</p> <p>Unless metros or members or partners offer regional capabilities, and follow up with infrastructure, training and delivery, then each member will be left to organise and fund their own. This will lead to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$30K</p> <p>V. limited.</p> <p>Very limited access to commercial response capabilities (i.e. unable to deliver the OSR Regional Contract at \$75K) augmented by gifted or low technical support from metros or other partners.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$100K</p> <p>Useful.</p> <p>Includes: OSR regional contract @\$75K, Regional retainer contracts for trajectory modelling, and/or legal advice, and/or forensic evidence analysis.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$150K</p> <p>Full.</p> <p>Includes all others and forensic evidence analysis. (\$25K)</p>

Table 3. Detailed description and analysis of the relevance, impacts and delivery under the four funding and resourcing scenarios.

Issue	Detail	NO REGIONAL OR TECHNICAL CAPABILITY	MINIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	NOMINAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	OPTIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY
	metros, partners or commercial suppliers.	inconsistencies, different qualities of capabilities and likely members with no capability at all, leading to response and recovery challenges (delays, inappropriate or inexpert use, or inability to recover).		Depending on costs.	
	Exercising: Practice is essential, for response and recovery capability, using the agreed NatPlans. Practice takes time and resources Small countries won't have the depth to both practice and manage the practice, so external assistance is invaluable.	None \$0K No exercising unless gifted by donors. Members often do not have the funding or capability to plan and deliver exercises as their response is whole of country.	None \$0K Some limited exercising could be delivered by \$0 cost options to SPREP, either through Technical Adviser travel or through metros support or member direct funding.	\$20K Limited Suitable national (member) exercises and occasional regional (multi-member) exercising could be delivered with SPREP, Metro, and partner support. Tech Adviser can use travel and training budgets and leverage coordination of metro support or member direct funding	\$20K Full Suitable national (member) exercises and occasional regional (multi-member) exercising could be delivered with SPREP, Metro, and partner support. Tech Adviser can use travel and training budgets and leverage coordination of metro support or member direct funding
	Leveraging and Innovation: Being able to seek support, collaboration, and innovation, in a changing world, as the Pacific members are often not well connected.	None \$0K No or very limited capacity to leverage or coordinate Member, Metro or p partner capability, at any level. This takes both SPREP presence and intent. No, if no SPREP personnel, no leveraging.	\$0K V Limited Very limited capacity relying on the network of the Technical Adviser, members staff and metro agencies seek and/or capture extra regional or member	\$10K limited Some capacity relying on the network of the Director and Technical Adviser, to leverage, provide for and support funding, technical support, secondments, etc. into SPREP at PacPlan level	\$15K Full Full capacity relying on the network of the Director and Technical Adviser, to leverage, provide for and support funding, technical support, secondments, etc. into SPREP at PacPlanlevel

Table 3. Detailed description and analysis of the relevance, impacts and delivery under the four funding and resourcing scenarios.

Issue	Detail	NO REGIONAL OR TECHNICAL CAPABILITY	MINIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	NOMINAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY	OPTIMAL REGIONAL CAPABILITY
			technical support or offers through or by donors.	and into Members at NatPlan level.	and into Members at NatPlan level.
	<p><i>Pacific Regional Response Team (PRRT) capability</i></p> <p>Likely 10-20 IMT or Tech expert members, able to deploy 3-6 on urgent mission, drawn from larger members, in support of any national response (T2 or T3) for immediate support.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$0K</p> <p>No capacity to identify and manage a regional list of responders.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$0K</p> <p>Very limited capacity (through Tech Adviser) to identify, assess and train for regional deployment, member responders. Unlikely to be a viable, credible or effective capability</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$10K</p> <p>Full capacity (through Tech Adviser, training and exercising) to identify, assess and train for regional deployment, member responders. Has every likelihood of success.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">\$15K</p> <p>Full capacity (through Tech Adviser, training and exercising) to identify, assess and train for regional deployment, member responders. Has every likelihood of success.</p>