



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



UNEP

Distr. Limited

UNEP(DEPI)/CAR WG.29/6
12 October 2005

Original: English

Third Meeting of the Scientific and
Technical Advisory Committee (STAC)
to the Protocol Concerning Specially
Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA
W) in
the Wider Caribbean Region

Caracas, Venezuela, 4-8 October 2005

REPORT OF THE MEETING



*Promoting regional co-operation for the protection and development
of the marine environment of the Wider Caribbean Region*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Agenda item 1: Opening of the Meeting..... | 1 |
| Agenda item 2: Election of Officers..... | 2 |
| Agenda item 3: Organization of the Meeting..... | 2 |
| (a) Rules of procedure..... | 2 |
| (b) Organization of the work..... | 2 |
| Agenda item 4: Adoption of the Agenda..... | 2 |
| Agenda item 5: Status of Implementation of the SPAW Programme Workplan and Budget for the 2004–2005 biennium..... | 2 |
| Agenda item 6: Activities of the Regional Activity Centre for SPAW (SPAW/RAC) in Guadeloupe..... | 5 |
| Agenda item 7: Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be Listed Under the SPAW Protocol..... | 5 |
| Agenda item 8: Report of the Regional Workshop of Experts on the Development of the Marine Mammal Action Plan (MMAP) and Draft MMAP for the Conservation of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region..... | 7 |
| Agenda item 9: Development of the Draft SPAW Programme Workplan and Budget for the 2006-2007 Biennium..... | 9 |
| Agenda item 10: Other Business..... | 13 |
| Agenda item 11: Adoption of the Report of the Meeting..... | 14 |
| Agenda item 12: Closure of the Meeting..... | 14 |
| | |
| Annex I: Agenda | |
| Annex II: Recommendations of the Meeting | |
| Annex III: Status of Ratification of the Cartagena Convention and of the SPAW Protocol | |
| Annex IV: List of Documents | |
| Annex V: List of Participants | |

ACRONYMS

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| ACS..... | Association of Caribbean States |
| AGRRA | Atlantic and Gulf Rapid Reef Assessment |
| AMEP | Assessment and Management of Environmental Pollution |
| CaMPAM..... | Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers Network and Forum |
| CMS | Centre for Marine Sciences |
| CANARI | Caribbean Natural Resources Institute |
| CAR/RCU..... | Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit |
| CARICOMP..... | Caribbean Coastal Marine Productivity Programme |
| CAST..... | Caribbean Alliance for Sustainable Tourism |
| CBD..... | Convention on Biological Diversity |
| CCA..... | Caribbean Conservation Association |
| CEP..... | Caribbean Environment Programme |
| CEPNET | Information Systems for the Management of Marine and Coastal Resources |
| CHM..... | Clearing House Mechanism |
| CI..... | Conservation International |
| CITES..... | Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora |
| CLME | Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem |
| COP | Contracting Parties |
| COFI..... | Committee on Fisheries |
| CREP | Caribbean Regional Environment Programme |
| CTO..... | Caribbean Tourist Organisation |
| CZMU..... | Coastal Zone Management Unit |
| ED | Environmental Defense |
| FAOWECAFC | Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GIS..... | Geographic information systems |
| GISP' | Global Invasive Species Programme |
| GCFI..... | Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute |
| ISTAC..... | Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee |
| IAC | Interamerican Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles |
| ICRAN | International Coral Reef Action Network |
| IFAW | International Fund for Animal Welfare |
| IMO | International Maritime Organization |
| IOC/ IOCARIBE | Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission |
| INVEMAR..... | Marine Research Institute of the Ministry of Environment of Colombia |
| IRF | Island Resources Foundation |
| MAR | Mesoamerican Reef Alliance |
| MEA | Multilateral Environmental Agreements |
| MMAP | Marine Mammal Action Plan |
| MoC..... | Memorandum of Cooperation |
| MPA | Marine Protected Areas |
| MTTRC..... | Marine Turtle Trauma Response Corps |
| NFWF | National Fish and Wildlife Foundation |
| NGA | National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency |
| NGO | Non Governmental Organization |
| NOAA..... | National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration |
| OECS-ESDU..... | Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States- Environmental Sustainable Development Unit |
| PALNeT | Protected Areas Learning Network |
| Ramsar | Convention on Wetlands of International Importance |
| SGF | Small Grants Fund |
| Sida..... | Swedish International Cooperation Development Agency |
| SPAW..... | Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife |
| SPAW/RAC..... | SPAW Regional Activity Centre |
| STAC..... | Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee |
| STRAPS..... | Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plans |
| TNC..... | The Nature Conservancy |
| TOI..... | Tour Operators Initiative |
| TOT | Training of Trainers |
| UNEP | United Nations Environment Programme |
| UNEP-DTIE..... | UNEP-Division of Technology, Industry and Economics |

UNF United Nations Foundation
USAID United States Agency for International Development
USGS U.S. Geological Survey
WCR Wider Caribbean Region
WDCS Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society
WHC/UNESCO World Heritage Convention of the United Nations Environmental and Scientific Committee
WIDECAST Wider Caribbean Sea Turtle Conservation Network
WRI World Resource Institute
WW2BW White Water to Blue Water

Introduction

1. The Conference of Plenipotentiaries on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW), held in Kingston, Jamaica, from 15 to 19 January 1990, adopted the SPAW Protocol to the Cartagena Convention, which came into force on 18 June 2000. Article 20 of the Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW Protocol) in the Wider Caribbean Region (WCR), establishes the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC). This Article provides that each Party shall appoint a scientific expert appropriately qualified in the field covered by the Protocol as its representative on the Committee, who may be accompanied by other experts and advisors appointed by that Party. Article 20 also provides that the Committee may also seek information from scientifically and technically qualified experts and organizations.
 2. In light of the above, and in keeping with Decision No. IV, of the Eleventh Intergovernmental Meeting on the Action Plan of the Caribbean Environment Programme (CEP) and Eighth Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Cartagena Convention (Montego Bay, 28 September to 2 October 2004), as well as Decisions Nos. 4 and 6, of the Third Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol (Montego Bay, Jamaica, 27 September 2004), this Meeting was convened by the UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme in Caracas, Venezuela, from 4 to 8 October 2005.
 3. Consistent with the Workplan and Budget of the CEP for 2004-2005, this Meeting was convened as the Third Meeting of the STAC with the following objectives:
 - to review the current status and activities of the SPAW Protocol and the 2004-2005 Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme;
 - to review and agree on further action on the revised draft of the guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of protected areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol;
 - to review activities of the Regional Activity Centre for SPAW (SPAW/RAC) in Guadeloupe;
 - to review the Report of the Regional Workshop of Experts on the Development of the Marine Mammal Action Plan (MMAP) and the draft MMAP for the Conservation of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region, and agree on further action;
 - to develop the 2006-2007 Workplan and Budget of the SPAW Programme and the SPAW Protocol for subsequent approval by the Fourth Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol and Twelfth Intergovernmental Meeting of CEP in 2006; and
 - to identify synergies and opportunities for collaboration with relevant partners to assist with further development and implementation of the SPAW Protocol and Programme.
 4. The representatives of the Contracting Parties invited to the Meeting were nominated by their respective Governments to be part of the STAC in keeping with Article 20 of the Protocol. Other member Governments of the Caribbean Environment Programme, United Nations agencies and non-governmental and intergovernmental organizations, were invited to participate as Observers.
6. In her opening remarks, Ms. Vanzella-Khoury welcomed the participants on behalf of the Coordinator of the Caribbean Environment Programme, Mr. Nelson Andrade Colmenares, who was unable to attend the opening of the Meeting due to the visit of the Executive Director of UNEP to Jamaica.
 7. She expressed her deepest gratitude to the Government of Venezuela for the generous support and assistance in making the Meeting possible. She noted that the SPAW Programme had achieved considerable progress since the last Meeting of STAC in Curaçao, Netherlands Antilles in 2003, both in the implementation of the Protocol and programmatic areas. In this context, she mentioned the adoption of the revised criteria for listing species under the Protocol by COP3, and the progress made with the Guidelines for listing protected areas. Regarding the programmatic areas, she mentioned the increased capacity-building provided to MPA managers throughout the region; the work undertaken through the Mesoamerican Reef Alliance of ICRAN with local communities and the private sector, in the areas of agricultural and tourism best practices; and the culmination of the comprehensive assessment "Reefs at Risk" on threats to coral reefs in the region. She noted that this study found that if the degradation of reefs continued, economic benefits could be lost to the tune of US\$870 million per year.
 8. She also highlighted the success with fundraising from donors and sources other than the Caribbean Trust Fund and thanked the Governments of France, Sweden, USA and Venezuela, as well as the MacArthur Foundation, the UN Foundation and International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) for their support. She noted the coordination efforts with other regional and international Conventions and initiatives, such as the Interamerican Convention for the Conservation of Sea Turtles at the regional level, and the Convention for Biological Diversity (CBD) at the global level, in particular to support the 2010 target to significantly reduce the loss of biodiversity. She noted that due to these many alliances and partnerships, the SPAW Programme had been able to achieve many of its objectives.
 9. She concluded by noting that unfortunately, in the last three years, no new Government had joined the SPAW Protocol and that this was of concern to the Secretariat. She encouraged the STAC to consider this issue during the Meeting and to assist to the extent possible, in the identification of possible causes and solutions within the context of their scientific and technical expertise.
 10. Dr. Jesus Ramos Oropeza, Director General of the National Office for Biological Diversity of Venezuela, welcomed the participants to the Meeting and expressed that, as a Contracting Party to the Protocol, the Government of Venezuela currently had before the Venezuelan Congress an environmental conservation law for the protection of wildlife, soils and waters, as well as certain resolutions, such as closed season for a list of animals in danger of extinction and other animals not covered by a permanent closed season. Moreover, along the Venezuelan seashore, there is a network of natural protected areas ranging from the Paria Peninsula, in the northeastern end of Venezuela all the way to western Venezuela in the State of Zulia. This network of protected areas includes National Parks, such as Peninsula de Paria and Mochima, the Cuare Wild Fauna Refuge, Morrocoy National Park, both located in the state of Falcon. The Cuare Fauna Refuge, close to Morrocoy National Park in the central coastal region of the country, protects very fragile areas with highly important landscapes

Agenda item 1: Opening of the Meeting

5. The Meeting was opened by the Secretariat and the Government of Venezuela, on Tuesday, 4 October 2005 at 10:00 a.m., in the Rio Ocamo Conference Room at the Gran Melia Sol Hotel in Caracas, Venezuela, by Ms. Alessandra Vanzella-Khoury, Programme Officer for

representative of Caribbean habitats, as well as vulnerable and threatened species.

11. The Ciénaga de los Olivitos fauna refuge in the State of Zulia, receives flamingos migrating from other regions. The Los Roques Archipelago National Park is the prime nesting site for the hawksbill turtle, and the Wild Fauna Refuge of Isla de Aves, located in Dependencias Federales, is the second most important green turtle nesting site in the Caribbean.
12. He concluded by mentioning that Venezuela has been classified as a country of mega-diversity and has always been concerned about the conservation of this mega-diversity, for which it feels responsible.

Agenda item 2: Election of Officers

13. The Meeting elected from among the experts the following officers of the Meeting:
 - Chairperson..... Mr. Jesús Ramos Oropeza, Venezuela
 - First Vice Chairperson..... Ms. Marisol Dimas, Panama
 - Second Vice Chairperson Mr. Amos Glasgow, St. Vincent & the Grenadines
 - Rapporteur Mr. Courtenay Park, Trinidad & Tobago

Agenda item 3: Organization of the Meeting

14. The Chairperson indicated that the Meeting would be conducted as follows:

(a) Rules of Procedure

15. The rules of procedure of the Governing Council for UNEP (UNEP/GC/3/Rev.3) were applied *mutatis mutandis*.

(b) Organization of the Work

16. English, French and Spanish were the working languages of the Meeting. Simultaneous interpretation in these languages was provided for the Meeting. The working documents of the Meeting were available in all the working languages.
17. The Secretariat convened the Meeting in plenary sessions, with the assistance of a working group. Simultaneous interpretation was not available for the working group.

Agenda item 4: Adoption of the Agenda

18. The Meeting was invited to adopt the Provisional Agenda of the Meeting as proposed by the Secretariat in document UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/1.
19. During the adoption of the Agenda, the delegate from the Netherlands Antilles requested that the following issues be addressed under the appropriate Agenda items of the Meeting:
 - To consider the development of a Memorandum of Cooperation between the Secretariat and the Interamerican Convention for the Conservation of Sea Turtles; and
 - To consider the establishment of thematic and specialized Regional Activity Centres (RACs) sponsored by appropriate organizations (academic or NGOs) to enhance the implementation of the SPAW Programme and to complement and support the existing SPAW/RAC.
20. The Secretariat clarified that with regard to the first issue, the development of the Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) with the Interamerican Sea Turtle Convention was already contemplated within

the draft Workplan for 2006-2007 to be addressed under Agenda item 9. The Meeting agreed that the second issue proposed be included under Agenda item 10.

21. The delegate from the Dominican Republic also expressed his wish that the Meeting consider making a statement on the serious threats faced by the protected areas in his country. The delegate from Colombia reminded the Meeting of the need to focus on the mandate of the STAC relating primarily to the scientific and technical aspects of the SPAW Protocol and Programme.
22. The Agenda was adopted as presented in Annex I to this Report.

Agenda item 5: Status of Implementation of the SPAW Programme Workplan and Budget for the 2004–2005 biennium

23. The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to present the "Revised Status of Implementation of the Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme for the 2004-2005 Biennium" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.3). The Secretariat outlined the process of development of the current Workplan. The Workplan was developed by the Second STAC in Curaçao in June 2003, revised and approved by the Third COP in September 2004, and adopted by the Eleventh Intergovernmental Meeting on the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme and Eighth Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region, held in Montego Bay in September 2004. The majority of the activities outlined in the Workplan have been implemented and others have been incorporated into the "Draft Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme for the 2006-2007 Biennium" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/5). Programme coordination is carried out by the SPAW Programme Officer with assistance from a Junior Professional Officer in Kingston, the Director of the SPAW Regional Activity Centre in Guadeloupe, and the ICRAN Mesoamerican Reef Alliance (MAR) Project Coordinator and Project Assistant, in Belize. The SPAW Programme is continuously promoted at different regional and global meetings where the secretariat is represented, and information on its activities disseminated through various means. Follow-up is underway on the UNEP pilot project on Harmonizing Reports on International Biodiversity-related Conventions; Pilot Project Panama, as outlined in document (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.9). Fundraising for the Programme has amounted to US\$ 4.3 million and includes: support from the Government of Venezuela for the Third STAC; USAID and United Nations Foundation, the Governments of France, Sweden and the United States of America.
24. The Programme Officer for SPAW mentioned that the many activities of the renewed Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers Network and Forum (CaMPAM), as well as those of the ICRAN MAR would be presented in more detail in separate presentations, given their extensive content.
25. Activities under the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN) other than those of MAR, included the production of the unique and comprehensive Reefs at Risk report for the Caribbean, which was launched at SPAW COP3. This Report is the first detailed assessment of the status and threats to Caribbean reefs including socioeconomic impacts. The most important findings of this study have been that an estimated 2/3 of Caribbean reefs are threatened by human activities and 80% of the reefs in the region are outside MPAs and hence not protected. Only 4% of the reefs are located in MPAs that are rated as effective, and of the approximately 300 MPAs in the region, only 6% are rated as effectively managed. It is estimated that by 2015, the loss in gross revenues from fisheries could be close to US\$300 million and from

- tourism, up to US\$600 million. Within the next 50 years there would also be a loss in gross revenue from shoreline protection provided by the reefs to the order of US\$140 to US\$420 million. Therefore, net benefits in total from reefs could be reduced by US\$350 to US\$870 million per year.
26. The secretariat further highlighted that the majority of funds for the SPAW Programme were from donors and not the Caribbean Trust Fund, due to the lack of payment from Governments, and that the assistance provided by the SPAW/RAC and the additional staff for SPAW, had greatly contributed to the achievements of the Programme. She concluded by highlighting that no additional Governments have joined the SPAW Protocol since 2003 despite the efforts of the secretariat, and that this should be a area of focus for the upcoming years.
 27. The delegation from the USA applauded the secretariat's success in working with partners to raise funds to support SPAW objectives. He also encouraged the secretariat to provide more detailed budgetary analyses of funding levels for the SPAW Programme over several biennia, generally and by individual Project theme, to help governments assess Programme development over a period of time.
 28. As part of the 2004-2005 Workplan presentation, the secretariat was also invited to present the main activities of the recently initiated Mesoamerican Reef Alliance (MAR) Project of ICRAN (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.11). The newly appointed ICRAN-MAR Coordinator informed the Meeting that the Partnership for the Mesoamerican Reef of the International Coral Reef Action Network is an initiative seeking to promote partnerships in the Mesoamerican Reef region to benefit the conservation and sustainable management of the coral ecosystem. Financing for this Project is provided by the United Nations Foundation (UNF) and the generous contribution of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).
 29. After approximately 14 months of implementation, the Project carries out activities in three principal components: watershed management, sustainable fishing and sustainable tourism. The partners of the Project have extensive experience working in the local milieu and focus their activities in capacity-building in the region. The Project seeks to collaborate with other initiatives in the region to minimize duplication of actions.
 30. She explained that in the past year, the Project had produced tangible results in the region such as the preliminary delimitation of the watersheds draining into the Caribbean, the Belize Coastal Atlas, and preliminary agreements with regional agro-industries for the implementation of best practices. Similarly, the fishing component had tried to increase the ability of fishers' associations by facilitating the exchange of experiences and developing guidelines for best practices for fishing. The focus of the sustainable tourism component had been maritime recreation through training and distribution of "good practices" guidelines for diving, and facilitating the creation of codes of conduct standards that will be implemented voluntarily by the players in the region in the coming months, capitalizing on the results achieved to date. The Project expects to continue yielding tangible outcomes and to accelerate implementation.
 31. With regard to the ICRAN MAR Project, the delegate from Colombia raised the concern that major projects are funded and implemented in countries which are not Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol, and that this issue could be affecting the slow rate of ratification by non-Parties. The secretariat explained that the philosophy of the Regional Seas Programme was to not make a distinction between Parties and non-Parties to fully participate in the Programme, in view of the fact that it is the management of a common resource which is being addressed.
- In the case of the activities under the Mesoamerican Reef Alliance of ICRAN, it was noted that this Project was a good example of an activity of great regional interest due to the ecological importance not only for the region but for the world, given that the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef is seriously threatened by agricultural practices and tourism development. It was also noted that this important project should be used by other countries as an example to engage the necessary political will and commitment to develop similar subregional initiatives, as well as by the secretariat, to encourage ratification of the SPAW Protocol by the Central American countries involved in the Project.
32. In this context, it was noted that the Guidelines used for listing protected areas, could also be an incentive for joining the Protocol if the goals were practical and sufficiently attainable by the countries of the region.
 33. Other delegates recommended that for future reports on the implemented Workplan, more information on scientific aspects could be provided. The importance of fisheries management and the need to continue coordination with the Food and Agriculture Organization - Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission (FAO/WECAFC) Programme, was also mentioned as a very important activity to help meet the objectives of the SPAW Protocol.
 34. The representative of The Nature Conservancy (TNC) expressed his interest to cooperate with SPAW on scientific activities, with the ICRAN MAR Project, and to promote the ratification and accession to the Cartagena Convention and its Protocols.
 35. As part of the presentation by the Secretariat, Ms. Heidi Savelli Söderberg, Junior Professional Officer, presented the "New Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers Network and Forum (CaMPAM) and its Major Activities" as outlined in UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.10. CaMPAM was formed in 1997 as a network of Marine Protected Area (MPA) managers. Its mission was "Enhancement of Marine and Coastal Area Management in the Wider Caribbean Region through exchange and collaboration", in order to strengthen national and regional systems of existing and future marine and coastal protected areas. Initially, a lack of resources and support limited the number of activities implemented by CaMPAM and it was mainly UNEP-CEP which was the driving force. The new CaMPAM Network and Forum was launched during the White Water to Blue Water (WW2BW) Partnership in Miami, in March 2004, with the aim of expanding CaMPAM and making it more effective. Organizations in the new partnership include the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute (GCFI), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Environmental Defense (ED), the World Resource Institute (WRI) and others. The CaMPAM Network and Forum partnership aims to build synergy from existing efforts (local, national and regional programmes); to be cost-effective; to strengthen and empower the existing networks (e.g. GCFI, etc.); to better utilize expertise, and to coordinate activities and provide a forum for emerging issues bringing together fishers, managers and scientists.
 36. The Programme Officer highlighted several CaMPAM activities such as the Small Grants Fund (SGF), which supports MPA improvement and staff training, as well as the SGF for Sustainable Fisheries and Alternative Livelihoods for Fishers, provided by UNEP-CEP with funding from the Swedish Agency for International Development Cooperation (Sida), for on-the-ground activities on best practices for fisheries and promoting sustainable livelihoods. A number of exchanges between sites in the WCR have taken place and CaMPAM activities are expected to increase with funding from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) and Sida. Capacity-building activities implemented within the CaMPAM framework include: 1) the Training of Trainers (ToT) programme comprising 4 regional courses and 40 local follow-up training

- courses, resulting in a total of over 400 trained MPA practitioners and 2) Training in socioeconomic monitoring provided at a Regional Training Workshop for English-speaking countries convened 9-13 May 2005, in Soufriere, St. Lucia, with assistance from the Soufriere Marine Management Area (SMMA) and the Fisheries Department. Participants were trained in using Socioeconomic Monitoring Guidelines for Coastal Managers in the Caribbean, in theoretical as well as field studies. A total of 18 trainees from 8 countries were trained and 8 follow-up proposals for local funding have been submitted and are being implemented. Additionally, she informed the Meeting that technical sessions will be held during the 58th Conference of the GCFI, 7-12 November 2005, and that a number of MPA managers and fishers will be sponsored to attend. The Conference will provide a forum for managers, researchers, educators and planners to meet in formal and informal technical sessions and workshops. The presenter briefly mentioned that a separate presentation would be made on the development of a comprehensive database for MPAs and their effectiveness.
37. Upcoming activities of CaMPAM are: the database roll-out, the update of the ToT MPA Manual, the next ToT MPA training course, expanded exchange programme with funding from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and Sida, and to continue assisting governments to create effective national MPA networks for 2012 (committed at COP3).
 38. The delegates commended the secretariat on the progress of CaMPAM, which since its formation in 1997, has evolved from barely more than an electronic group to a network with an impressive number of activities. Information was presented by the U.S. delegate on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) grant opportunities, and it was highlighted that last year 19 of the 31 grants from NFWF had gone to the Caribbean.
 39. In keeping with the agreed Agenda, the Chairperson invited the Executive Director of the Wider Caribbean Sea Turtle Conservation Network (WIDECAST), Dr. Karen Eckert, to make a presentation on WIDECAST highlights and support given to the SPAW Protocol in meeting its objectives. In her presentation, she informed the Meeting that WIDECAST has been an integral partner of the Caribbean Environment Programme (CEP) for 25 years. With national coordinators in more than 40 States and Territories, WIDECAST is the largest network of sea turtle research and conservation projects in the world. In partnership with the CEP, and with specific regard for the mandates of the SPAW Protocol, WIDECAST is dedicated to reversing declining trends in Caribbean sea turtle populations by promoting region-wide capacity to design and implement scientifically sound conservation measures at the local level, and by assisting governments in the discharge of their obligations under relevant international treaties.
 40. She emphasized that WIDECAST experts respond to requests from governments to assist in modernizing the sea turtles regulatory and management framework, and have specific projects in place that reduce the illegal trade in turtle products, helps fishers to reduce the incidental capture of sea turtles, and promote "sea turtle friendly lighting" and other best practices for hotels, situated on nesting beaches.
 41. She also highlighted the fact that network members are heavily involved in field research, including habitat surveys and population monitoring and during the 2006-2007 biennium, they will be assisting SPAW Parties to initiate several new population monitoring sites. Leadership training for these and other regional projects is provided through courses convened annually in Bermuda and Venezuela, as well as a variety of workshops for stakeholders, held each year for the benefit of fishers, divers, hoteliers, database managers, marine park staff, community leaders and other sectors. A regional Marine Turtle Tagging Center is maintained at the University of the West Indies in Barbados. Public awareness programmes include public exhibitions, signage in international airports and near nesting beaches, poetry and art contests.
 42. In addition to working to increase the number of actively monitored sea turtle populations, specific activities planned for the 2006-2007 biennium include developing a regional Marine Turtle Trauma Response Corps (MTTRC); piloting programmes to reduce sea turtle bycatch in gillnets; designing a "Sea Turtle Ecotourism Certification Program"; hosting beachfront lighting workshops in Aruba, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, and Trinidad and Tobago; creating curriculum tools for Caribbean educators; developing www.widecast.org as a clearinghouse for tools available to Parties in implementing the SPAW Protocol as it relates to sea turtles, and relevant coastal conservation issues.
 43. In closing, she highlighted that the Caribbean region is the only one in the world showing signs of recovery of sea turtle populations. She noted that the significant progress made in the region with regard to sea turtle conservation, can in large measure be attributed to the number of States and Territories which have national sea turtle management plans. These nations include WIDECAST/CEP/STRAPs for Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Barbados, Belize, British Virgin Islands, Netherlands Antilles, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Suriname and Venezuela. STRAPs will soon be completed for Anguilla, Costa Rica, Grenada, Jamaica, Panama and Trinidad and Tobago. In addition, national management plans have been developed and published in Colombia, the French West Indies and the USA. The leadership these nations have shown is clearly reflected in rising national and regional capacity and in the increasing number of sea turtle populations. She emphasized the importance of the US contribution to the SPAW Programme to enable implementation of priority recommendations within STRAPs (Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plans) for SPAW Parties such as Barbados, St. Lucia and St. Vincent & the Grenadines.
 44. The WIDECAST National Coordinator from Venezuela, Hedelvy Guada, was invited to provide information on the work of WIDECAST in her country. She informed the Meeting that since 1991 in Venezuela, WIDECAST had promoted various activities related to sea turtles. The thrust provided was important in promoting research and conservation, training, strengthening of local capabilities and sensitisation on the issue of sea turtles and their marine and coastal habitats.
 45. One of the most important outputs of WIDECAST support has been the preparation of an action plan for the recovery of sea turtles in Venezuela, published in 2000. The review process of this plan of action begins now with the participation of the different governmental and non-governmental players integrating the work group for sea turtles of Venezuela (GTTM).
 46. The delegation from the United States of America congratulated WIDECAST on their long history of work in the area of conservation of sea turtles in the Wider Caribbean Region. They pointed out that some of the work described the guidelines for monitoring of index nesting and feeding sites in the Caribbean, and were developed by a Workshop of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES). However, the guidelines remained an exercise on paper until SPAW through WIDECAST, puts them into practise. It is this kind of concrete, on-the-ground activity, undertaken in partnership with other organizations, that the USA believes should be one of the main areas of focus of SPAW and which has to date, made the SPAW Protocol and Programme a very useful mechanism for the region.
 47. The secretariat was commended for the work undertaken during the biennium and for the progress achieved on many fronts, including but

not limited to, fundraising and strategic alliances for the implementation of activities.

Agenda item 6: Activities of the Regional Activity Centre for SPAW (SPAW/RAC) in Guadeloupe

48. The Director of the Regional Activity Centre, Mr. Maurice Anselme, presented the "Report on the Activities of the Regional Activity Centre for SPAW (SPAW/RAC) in Guadeloupe for the period 2004-2005" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.4).
49. Regarding the 2004–2005 activities of the SPAW/RAC, the legal structure for its independent operation should become effective before the end of 2005. Several grant agreements were signed with UNEP-CEP to support the development of the Marine Mammal Action Plan (MMAP); the Training of Trainers programme in marine protected areas; publication of best practices within the ICRAN framework; to update the existing management plan for manatees; and with Island Resources Foundation (IRF), HSUS Wildlife Land Trust and Monitor Caribbean, for the Guidelines to prevent species from being endangered and threatened. The RAC, in collaboration with the working group developed the "Final Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/3), and the "Revised Draft Annotated Format for the Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAW List" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/4). Together with its partners, the SPAW/RAC organized the 15th Meeting of the Society for the Conservation and Study of Caribbean Birds (SCSCB), and while attending various meetings in the Caribbean, was able to promote the SPAW Protocol. Overall, the SPAW/RAC provided support to the Secretariat and the SPAW Protocol, as required.
50. The delegate from the Netherlands Antilles commended the RAC for the impressive amount of work done, and also highlighted the excellent work done by the RAC and the secretariat in the region, which has aided the progress of the SPAW Protocol. The delegate expressed the opinion that collaboration among different entities such as governments, NGOs, the RAC and the secretariat, was indeed the way forward for the SPAW Protocol in the region.

Agenda item 7: Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be Listed Under the SPAW Protocol

51. The Chairperson invited the Coordinator of the Ad Hoc Working Group, the SPAW/RAC, to make a presentation on the document "Report of the Working Group on the Development of Guidelines for the Listing of Protected Areas under the SPAW Protocol" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.12), as well as on the general aspects of the "Final Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/3), and "Revised Draft Annotated Format for the Presentation Reports for the Areas Proposed for the inclusion in the SPAW List" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/4).
52. During the Second Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee of the SPAW Protocol held in Curaçao, Netherlands Antilles, 3 - 6 June 2003, the secretariat and the SPAW/RAC were entrusted with initiating the preparation of the draft Guidelines and criteria for the listing of protected areas under the SPAW Protocol. Consultations carried out through the SPAW list serve in September 2003, established an informal electronic Working Group consisting of experts, which was coordinated by the SPAW/RAC.

53. The SPAW/RAC and the UNEP-CAR/RCU organized a Workshop of government-nominated experts in Gosier, Guadeloupe, 19-23 April 2004, to review and further develop the documents prepared by the electronic Working Group. The Workshop was fully funded by the Government of France. While progress was made, it was agreed that the work on the development of the Guidelines would continue through the electronic Working Group and the revised draft was submitted to the COP3 of SPAW in Montego Bay, Jamaica, 27 September 2004. The COP3 decided to extend the mandate of the Working Group and requested that the Group continue its work toward finalizing the Guidelines for presentation to the Third Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of the SPAW Protocol. It was also agreed by the COP3, that the protected areas would be selected not only on ecological and scientific value, but also on socio-economic and cultural interest. There was consensus that it would be mandatory to fulfil two specific ecological criteria and conform to at least one of the cultural and socioeconomic criteria. The Group also developed the Revised Draft Annotated Format for the Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAW List (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/4), to ensure that Contracting Parties provide comparable information necessary to evaluate the proposed areas in compliance with the Guidelines established. Workshop participants in Guadeloupe and the COP3 further requested that the Working Group update the existing common protected area criteria and guidelines developed under Article 21 (Technical Report No° 37) and submit it to the Third STAC for review. Due to time constraints, this was not done.
54. The delegate from the Dominican Republic requested clarification on the reason why MPAs in "high seas" were not included in the criteria. The secretariat clarified that "high seas" are not within the geographic coverage of the Cartagena Convention.
55. A number of delegations expressed concern over the text of the Guidelines. They considered it a very useful document and congratulated the RAC and the Working Group on the work done. However, it was their opinion that the ecological criteria were very general and that priorities should be clarified to focus efforts and funding, in order to be able to objectively evaluate the proposed nominations.
56. The delegate from the Netherlands Antilles informed the Meeting on the outcome of discussions in the Working Group on whether the criteria should be restrictive or open. The Group indicated that restrictive criteria might only serve exclusive parks which were already well established and might not need assistance. Regarding open criteria, more parks that were in need of assistance could be listed and assistance provided. He noted that the Working Group did not receive guidance from the COP3 on this issue, and so made the decision which opted for the more open approach based on extensive discussion of this issue at the Experts' Workshop.
57. The U.S. delegation, addressing the restrictiveness issue, highlighted that the criteria for listing should provide countries with an incentive to improve their sites. Additional points raised were the diversity of sites which should be listed in keeping with aesthetic, cultural and archaeological aspects, per Article 4, as well as the notion of adaptive management.
58. The delegate from Barbados pointed out that Article 4 of the SPAW Protocol provided the general criteria for the establishment of protected areas and thus the listing Guidelines should not be too restrictive as they could contradict the text of the Protocol. The delegate from Panama proposed to include afro-Caribbean coastal communities and indigenous populations in the criteria. It was pointed out, however, that various

indigenous groups had been listed before in the Guidelines and been removed, to avoid having to list all groups in the region.

59. The representative from Humane Society International suggested that these Guidelines, if not overly demanding, could also help to make the SPAW Protocol more attractive to potential Contracting Parties and inquired whether the Guidelines referred to management that can be implemented progressively, in accordance with Article 5, Paragraph 1, of the Protocol.
60. Responding to the concerns expressed by some delegations on the need to make the ecological criteria more detailed to include scientific aspects, measure ecological aspects, and increase the level of demand to make the list more selective, the CaMPAM representative reminded the Meeting that the government representatives attending the Workshop of Experts in Guadeloupe in 2004 had expressed the opposite opinion, and agreed to be less restrictive for fear of not being able to have their protected areas qualify for listing.
61. She also recalled that the Workshop of Experts agreed that the criteria for determining whether or not a protected area was ecologically effective, required data which often was not available for most Caribbean protected areas. She also noted that subjectivity in the evaluation process could not be fully eliminated. As in the procedure used by the UNESCO World Heritage Center for approving nominations of World Heritage Sites, evaluation of a protected area for nomination is done by a group of experts who have the knowledge to assess aspects such as representativeness, size, rareness, replication, and biological connectivity.
62. The representative from the Caribbean Conservation Association (CCA) inquired about the degree of exclusivity aimed for in the Guidelines, or if there could be opportunities for creative and collaborative approaches to support areas that are not listed.
63. With regard to issues raised by the delegates, the secretariat clarified that some of these had also been addressed and discussed extensively by the government experts at the Workshop in Guadeloupe. For example, whether or not to identify in the socio-economic criteria, the local communities as an entire group, or to be more specific (e.g. naming indigenous people, afro Caribbean, fisheries communities, etc.), as well as the issue of how restrictive the Guidelines needed to be and which ones were mandatory. In this context, the secretariat noted that only two of the ecological criteria were agreed on by the experts as mandatory. The Meeting was also reminded that the procedure for the nomination and evaluation of the areas had also been addressed by the Workshop of Experts and their proposal was included in section E of the Final Draft Guidelines. In this regard, the secretariat reminded the Meeting that the "Revised Draft Annotated Format for the Presentation Reports for the Areas Proposed for inclusion in the SPAW List" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/4), was intrinsically linked to the nomination and evaluation procedure and hence it was one of the documents which should be considered and reviewed when reviewing the criteria.
64. With regard to the purpose and use of the protected area List, the secretariat reminded the Meeting that as per Article 7, the objective of the List was to establish a cooperation programme. This, however, did not necessarily exclude protected areas not on the List, from receiving other types of assistance or support.
65. The Chairperson invited the representative from the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance (Ramsar), Margarita Astrálaga, Senior Advisor for the Americas at the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, to give a presentation on the Ramsar criteria for site designation. She referred to the eight criteria related to habitats and species, and made reference to the specific guidelines to assist countries to apply the criteria. She stated that it is enough to meet one of the eight criteria to be able to designate a site. Additionally, she described in detail, Ramsar's designation procedure and the form that has to be completed (the "Ramsar Information Sheet"), and reviewed. Ms. Astralaga stressed that countries are obliged to prepare a management plan for the site, if this had not been done prior to the designation. In preparing the management plan, Parties are encouraged to use the Ramsar Guidelines on Management Planning for sites, and that developing countries have access to Ramsar's funding mechanisms to assist them in the preparation of such a plan. To conclude, she mentioned the special guidelines for designation of mangrove ecosystems and coral reefs, which are included in the CD of the Ramsar handbooks that were distributed to all participants.
66. Several questions were posed by the Meeting on procedures and requirements for the listing of sites under Ramsar, the degree of pre-fulfillment of criteria, as well as on the notion of exclusive or open inclusion of areas.
67. The representative from Ramsar informed the Meeting that the Convention encourages countries to have as many sites as they consider necessary. Assistance is provided to countries to prepare national inventories which provide the basis for the selection of priority sites that are richest in biodiversity. She further clarified, that Ramsar sites do not have to be legally declared by the country in question as, when a country ratifies the Convention, countries adopt legislation to accord Ramsar sites the status of 'international protected areas'. All countries must also submit a questionnaire on the specifics of the sites such as management responsibility, research and monitoring, existence of a management plan and if so, attach this plan to the questionnaire. This information, including the management plan, is readily available in the Ramsar sites database to persons interested in the specifics, and can be useful for comparisons of areas. Sites under Ramsar cannot be rejected, and the number of sites per Contracting Party is not limited. Ramsar has provided technical and financial assistance to many countries that are not members, when the country wishes to create a site, thereby furthering the process of fulfilling one or several criteria, if it is part of its accession process.
68. The Meeting welcomed the presentation as it provided useful examples and approaches for the Guidelines. In this regard, the Meeting agreed on the need to develop a glossary for terminology, and to provide elements to further clarify the Guidelines.
69. It was agreed that there would be only one List of protected areas under SPAW, in response to Article 7 of the Protocol.
70. It was also mentioned that in the format for evaluation of listings, countries could indicate specific needs or obstacles to fulfilling the criteria, and outline specific issues for which external assistance is required, and issues that the countries can take care of themselves, with existing technical and financial resources. This would give a clear indication of how SPAW could assist the area in question, with technical or financial assistance. It was also suggested that a two-tiered system be explored, with areas that are of regional importance for biodiversity protection (to be identified by e.g. STAC), as well as areas indicated by Governments as sites of national importance. The "regional" sites would be given priority and receive assistance to improve management. It was further proposed that areas considered for listing could enter a programme to assist the area to meet the requirements as outlined in the Guidelines.
71. The French delegation was concerned about the possibility of excluding some areas from listing according to the sole procedure described in the

- guidelines and asked for an explanation in this regard. They requested that this section be specific in order to avoid exclusion without thorough review. They proposed the prompt establishment of a scientific and technical committee capable of making alternate proposals to the State wishing to exclude an area. Too often, exclusions could go against the objectives of the Protocol and its international image. Additionally, France expressed its desire to see the terms for ecological corridors integrated in the connectivity criteria, recalling that the designation of a protected area should also take into account the existence of corridors between two adjacent areas, as this is how the Protocol would be able to better respond to the objectives assigned by the Action Plan of the Johannesburg Summit, which will hold a follow-up meeting in 2010.
72. Following the general comments on the criteria, the Meeting discussed the introductory paragraphs and proposed modifications to clarify aspects such as: the meaning of "national obligations"; nomination mechanisms; clarification of the scope of the objective of the Guidelines; and the characteristics of the List. It was highlighted that as each country is sovereign in deciding what protected areas are to be designated and subsequently submitted for inclusion in the List, the listing of areas under the SPAW Protocol should be considered as a tool for facilitating cooperation mechanisms in the region, and should assist Governments to strengthen the effectiveness of their protected areas, toward achieving the goal of having a regional network of protected areas by 2012.
 73. The delegate from Barbados insisted that the list should be open so as to be representative of the areas that the Contracting Parties consider to be priority, and avoid any terminology that would make it exclusive. It was noted that, Article 4 provides definitions and the mandate for the establishment of protected areas. Remarks were made vis-à-vis the need to include or not include, relevant language of the Protocol in the text of the Guidelines, or as Annexes to the document. The US delegation requested that the document clarify that these Guidelines are those common guidelines established pursuant to Article 21 that are referenced in Article 7(3).
 74. With regard to the "Introduction", the Meeting agreed to delete the first paragraph of UNEP(DEC)/CAR W.G.29/3.
 75. With regard to "General Principles", the Meeting agreed to change sections I and II, to include ecological, socio-economic and cultural values.
 76. Following extensive discussions on how many criteria an area should meet to qualify for listing, it was agreed by the Meeting that the listed areas must meet at least one of the ecological, and where applicable, one of the socioeconomic and cultural criteria.
 77. With regard to "resilience", it was noted that the best term in Spanish was "elasticidad", and that a footnote (resilience) should be inserted. Following the suggestion of the delegate from Colombia, it was agreed that the ecological criteria on "size" of an area be removed, since it was difficult to determine the appropriate size of a marine protected area and whether it would meet its conservation objectives.
 78. The criteria on "Species" was considered inadequate and the Meeting agreed that a Drafting Group should be formed to further discuss definitions, and rewrite the criteria.
 79. The notion of transboundary areas, corridors and connectivity as discussed at length, as well as the text of the criteria was changed to reflect the fact that protected areas could also be included within a biological or ecological corridor.
 80. The Cuban delegation proposed that additional work be done on the scope and concept of the Guidelines, to clarify the evaluation procedure. This could be an Annex to the Guidelines, and be reflected accordingly in the Annotated Format.
 81. The Meeting agreed that the electronic Working Group should continue its work based on the inputs of the Meeting and that a glossary be developed for the Guidelines, in order to better define each criterion, taking into account existing glossaries for Ramsar, CBD and other relevant treaties. The Guidelines and glossary are to be presented at the COP4. Elements of these definitions should also be included in the Annotated Format in order to facilitate the work of the evaluators. The outcome of this work will be submitted to the COP.
 82. The Meeting further recognized that the "Guidelines" is an evolving document which will change over time, and will require updating as emerging issues or threats affect the protected areas of the region.
 83. The Chairman convened a Drafting Group to work on the criterion of "Species," which was redrafted and renamed "Species Viability" retaining the important SPAW obligation of preventing species from becoming endangered. This change was accepted by the Meeting. With regard to cultural and socioeconomic criteria, the Meeting agreed to remove the regional emphasis from section c) "Socioeconomic Benefits", as they are indigenous characteristics. The delegations from Colombia and Cuba, requested that the regional emphasis be kept in "b".
 84. With regard to including areas with "Heritage Values", and after discussing the types of areas that these could be, the Meeting noted that an area would still have to fulfill at least one ecological criterion, and any area with only heritage value, would not qualify for listing. The Meeting did not reach a consensus on how to incorporate this stipulation, so the Working Group was asked to discuss and add a criterion addressing this issue, under "cultural and socio-economic criteria".
 85. The representative from Humane Society International, expressed concern that criterion (a) under "cultural and socioeconomic criteria", could be interpreted to support management of resources used by humans, to the detriment of the overall ecological balance of the ecosystem. This comment was supported by the delegation from the Netherlands Antilles. The representative from Humane Society International proposed adding language at the end of the criterion to indicate that such measures should not "jeopardize the ecological balance of ecosystems in the area". The Meeting agreed to this wording.
 86. During discussion of the section on the "Legal Framework", it was mentioned that an area can be created under national law, presidential decree, or a long-term contract given to a management organization such as an NGO, (though not national legislation). However, the area can still fulfil the objectives of "effective, long-term" biodiversity protection. Each country creates its own areas under its own legal framework, hence the name change of this criterion to "Legal Status". The delegation from Colombia highlighted that this not only includes laws, but national regulations as well.
 87. During the discussion of the section on the "Legal Framework", the Haitian delegation maintained that the creation of a protected area should be possible either under law or ruling be it presidential, governmental, ministerial or municipal decree, or a long-term contract granted to a management organization (such as a non-governmental organization).
 88. Regarding reference to local communities, the word "indigenous" was added throughout the criteria. Reference was also made to the afro-Caribbean population. The delegation from France expressed the wish

that stakeholders participate in the process to identify an area, insisting that local communities and their users need to be associated with the national designation process and management of the protected areas. The delegation further expressed the hope that this stipulation would become a necessary condition when designating areas for the List.

89. Extensive discussions were held on the existence and quality of a management framework, as well as the administrative requirements for listing an area, such as the minimum personnel required to manage this area, and meet the objectives of the protected area in question. It was suggested that the Annotated Format, in which each country provides data, could provide the expert evaluators with sufficient information to evaluate the existing administrative structures in keeping with the characteristics of the area, and indicate whether these structures were sufficient. However, concerns were raised about leaving too much of the subjective evaluation to the evaluators. It was also noted, that specifying information on administrative requirements, could assist countries in fundraising for the necessary resources to fill the required posts. Humane Society International was concerned that the "minimum" number of people specified in the Guidelines could also quickly become the "maximum" number of people allocated to an area. The notion of "minimum threshold" was touched upon, and it was emphasized that an area must have a management team.
90. The Meeting agreed that "there should be a management framework", as this could minimize details required. It was also agreed that the area should have a functioning management team. To further clarify this section, the electronic Working Group was given the mandate to include specifics on this topic in the Annotated Format and Glossary. They were further requested to clearly separate in the criteria document, which were the "conditions" or "pre-requisites" from the "principles", in particular under "D. Planning and Management Measures". The delegation from the Dominican Republic was not in agreement with the proposal that the existence of sufficient or minimum staff should be a condition for a protected area to be listed under SPAW, nor with the need to have qualified personnel.
91. The Meeting agreed that the section on "Management Effectiveness" needed further discussion and should be sent to the Working Group due to the risk of subjectivity of the evaluating committee when determining if the area was efficiently managed. Given the modifications of the Guidelines, and since there was no consensus on the matter, it was agreed that the electronic Working Group review section E, "Preliminary Procedure Proposal" in light of the preceding discussions. The revised draft text of the Guidelines and criteria was adopted as contained in UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/3.

Agenda item 8: Report of the Regional Workshop of Experts on the Development of the Marine Mammal Action Plan (MMAP) and Draft MMAP for the Conservation of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region

92. The delegate from the Netherlands Antilles, and former Chairperson of the STAC, Mr. Paul Hoetjes, was invited by the Chairperson to make the presentation on the "Draft Action Plan for the Conservation of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/2.Rev.3). He informed the Meeting that the objectives of the Marine Mammal Action Plan (MMAP) are to: assist Governments with marine mammal conservation practices and policies; provide a framework for activities at national and regional levels; conservation and recovery of all marine mammal species and their habitats; and establishment of regional cooperation programmes to increase scientific, technical and educational exchanges. He provided a brief background

on the development of the Draft MMAP and mentioned a number of documents used, including the UNEP Conservation Status document (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.22/INF.7), the MMAP Elements document (UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF.3), and the Manatee Management Plan for the Wider Caribbean Region (CEP TR No.35), as well as Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plans (SPAW/WIDECAS) and a number of other documents from other Regional Seas Programmes and conservation organizations. The SPAW/RAC organized an informal consultation of experts in 2003, and an electronic Steering Committee was formed to review and provide input to the document throughout the course of its development. Mr. Hoetjes further informed the Meeting that the areas being targeted in the Draft MMAP are: increased scientific knowledge; greater public awareness; development of protective measures; policies; and updated laws and their application. The broad aims include management of human interactions and use; assessing and mitigating threats; addressing strandings, taking and captivity; habitat degradation; and species protection (improved scientific knowledge, maintained or restored abundance, protected habitats); and using the precautionary approach within the context and principles of sustainable development.

93. A delegation requested that reference be made to climate change in the document.
94. The draft MMAP (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/3) was presented to a Regional Workshop of Experts in Barbados, 18-21 July 2005, for review and further development. A number of papers on: Distribution and Status of Marine Mammals the WCR (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/INF.3); Major Threats to Marine Mammals in the WCR (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/INF.4); Socio-Economic Assessment: Captivity, Viewing and Hunting; and Insights on Marine Mammals of the WCR (including the Gulf of Mexico) from Whaling History documents, as well as the review of a number of reference documents were made available to the Workshop. The draft MMAP was revised and discussed in Working Groups as reflected in the Report of the Workshop (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/3) and the revised MMAP (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/2 Rev.3).
95. Mr. Hoetjes made reference to some of the Recommendations of the Workshop (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/3, Annex IV), and in particular, to the priority activities identified by the experts, as issues to be addressed as soon as possible, and prior to the finalization of the MMAP. Some of the general recommendations included presenting the draft MMAP to the STAC 3 for consideration and finalization, and to extend the electronic Working Group to include interested experts. Priority actions include the compilation of a bibliography on marine mammals; education and public awareness materials; guidelines and criteria associated with captivity; protocols and techniques for responding to strandings; research protocols; and country capacities/capabilities and institutional support. Additional priority activities were to strengthen national capacities to address marine mammal issues such as strandings, and research, through the development of a training programme building on the concept of the existing ToT Programme for MPAs. A review of the existing Manatee Management Plan should be undertaken, and stronger linkages sought with relevant institutions to develop a comprehensive database in the WCR on marine mammal status and impact, and the development and/or support of regional and national stranding networks. Additional topics to be addressed as the MMAP is developed are: the need for a dedicated officer for the implementation of the MMAP, either contracted or seconded, at the secretariat or the RAC; that the implementation structure of the MMAP be modelled after successful examples such as the WIDECAS network; and that the lack of data on the impacts of increasing cruise ship traffic be addressed. The secretariat should continue to seek cooperation and synergies with existing MMAPs elsewhere, as well as explore and actively develop different funding mechanisms.

96. The Meeting thanked Mr. Hoetjes for his presentation and invited comments from the participants, in particular on the Recommendations highlighted by the presenter.
97. The Meeting commended the Working Group on their efficient handling of such a complex issue and the production of an excellent document. The US delegation commented that the document could not be considered an action plan per se. A plan would need to identify specific actions that could be achieved in a particular time frame. They suggested the ACCOBAMS plan as an appropriate model. They further highlighted that SPAW Parties could choose the main priorities and shape them into national action plans. In their view, priority should be given to work on marine mammal strandings, and in this regard, they informed the Meeting that a workshop on stranding techniques was being convened in Trinidad and Tobago in November 2005, as a result of the White Water to Blue Water Initiative.
98. The delegates agreed on the importance of working at national levels to develop action plans for each country, and on the excellent quality of the draft MMAP presented.
99. The Government of France congratulated the secretariat on the work accomplished in the implementation of the MMAP and recommended adding a summary table of proposed activities in order of priority, at the end of the document. This table, in providing relevant information on the actions already taken by the States, would also encourage the development of cooperative action. An example of immediate application could be the follow-up on strandings. Finally, the delegation suggested that the amended version of the Action Plan table might be presented at COP4.
100. The delegates from Colombia and Cuba supported the idea that the electronic Working Group should continue to work on refining the MMAP. As participants in the Working Group, Colombia and Cuba will remain involved in this task. The delegates from Venezuela and Panama expressed their interest in participating in the Working Group.
101. The representative of SEA Vida, expressed their commitment to continue participating in the Working Group and further highlighted their interest in convening a workshop of experts in Venezuela to develop a national action plan. This could be done within a year to take advantage of the momentum the country has gained with the National Biodiversity Plan spearheaded by the Venezuelan Ministry of the Environment.
102. The ECCEA representative made specific observations on the MMAP regarding orca hunts, fisheries interactions, marine mammals in captivity, and humpback whales, and presented them to the Working Group to be considered when the document is reviewed. The representative from Humane Society International, though supportive of the document, raised concerns about some of the wording of the MMAP, specifically, the definition of "sustainable population" in paragraph 22, and the reference to mitigating damage to fisheries by marine mammals in paragraph 31, which was contrary to the spirit and letter of the SPAW Protocol, and could be used out of context to support negative attitudes towards the protection of marine mammals. He offered to make these observations available to the electronic Working Group.
103. The Meeting agreed that the draft MMAP was a helpful and comprehensive document and could be taken into account by countries to develop national action plans. The document will benefit from additional inputs from the electronic Working Group, and suggestions were made regarding the clarification of terminology, and the addition of an Executive Summary.
104. With regard to the Report of the Workshop of Experts, the Meeting took note of the Recommendations of the Report and welcomed the

documents produced at the Workshop. The Meeting also agreed that the work of the electronic Working Group should continue following the proposal of the expanding the Group as per the procedure agreed at STAC1 for the species Working Group. A revised version of the MMAP will be presented to COP4, for contributions from other countries as needed. It also agreed that Recommendation No. 3 should be given priority, and that the remaining recommendations should be considered by the Working Group and the secretariat for implementation as appropriate, and in the context of previous comments on the draft MMAP.

105. The representative from Association Evasion Tropicale (AET) indicated that the MMAP document issued at the experts workshop was a thorough report on the regional situation, even though some points could be revised. AET also informed the Meeting that studies had been carried out in Guadeloupe 6 years ago, which had provided significant information on marine mammals conservation in our region. In this sense, AET proposed collaboration with other Caribbean States to extend research, notably on the movement of animals between the islands. Finally, AET regretted that the Meeting had not addressed and reworked the document in its entirety.

Agenda item 9: Development of the Draft SPAW Programme Workplan and Budget for the 2006-2007 Biennium

106. The secretariat was invited to present the "Draft Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme for the 2006-2007 Biennium" as outlined in UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/5, and UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.6. Reference was also made to documents UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.4, UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.5, UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.6, and UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.7 as supporting documents for the issues to be discussed.
107. The secretariat informed the Meeting that the Workplan was developed following the Recommendations of the First, Second, Third and Fourth Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) Meetings of the SPAW Protocol, and the two previous STAC Meetings, as well as the Decisions of the First, Second and Third COP Meetings. Programme coordination will be carried out by SPAW staff: a Programme Officer, a Junior Programme Officer, supported by the Swedish Government, and a Bilingual Secretary, based in Kingston; the Director, Programme Officer and documentalist at the SPAW/RAC in Guadeloupe; and the Project Coordinator and Project Assistant for the ICRAN Mesoamerican Reef Alliance (MAR), in Belize. Efforts will be on-going to develop strategic alliances and to coordinate/collaborate with relevant existing and emerging global and regional initiatives and programmes through: a Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) with the Convention of Migratory Species (CMS) and the Interamerican Convention on Sea Turtle Conservation (IAC). During the 2006-2007 biennium, the secretariat will convene the COP4 (2006) and STAC4 (2007). The Meeting was reminded to conduct an assessment of national capabilities for monitoring and reporting on listed species (Decision 4 of COP3). The secretariat will also explore reporting requirements under SPAW, harmonising with requirements of other MEAs, as well as continue to promote and fundraise for SPAW as appropriate, and feasible.
108. Activities envisaged under the component "Strengthening of Protected Areas" include activities of the CaMPAM Network and Forum: annual meetings for MPA managers at GCFI; socioeconomic monitoring, training courses in Spanish and English; small grants for at least 3 MPAs; sustainable fishing practices, alternative livelihoods and exchanges around MPAs with funding from Sida; sustainable tourism practices within MPAs (SGF); Training of Trainers programme

(evaluation in 2006, course in Spanish, and local training 2006-07) with funding provided by the MacArthur Foundation. Additional activities are: improvement of the MPA database and "Invasive species management in MPAs" in collaboration with relevant organizations such as the Global Invasive Species Programme of IUCN, Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and Conservation International (CI).

109. The secretariat will continue to work towards developing a network of MPAs and in so doing, support the 2010 and 2012 targets of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). Additionally, partnerships and synergies will be explored with the Caribbean Conservation Association (CCA), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI), World Heritage Convention of the United Nations Environmental and Scientific Committee (WHC/UNESCO), Ramsar and the Protected Areas Learning Network (PALNet), and FAO/WECAFC.
110. With regard to the component on guidelines for protected areas and species, the secretariat, in collaboration with the SPAW/RAC, will continue working on the Guidelines for the listing of protected areas under SPAW, and the Guidelines for preventing species from becoming threatened or endangered. The secretariat proposed a pilot activity to apply the Guidelines for listing of protected areas, to develop networks, and initiate a cooperation programme. The socioeconomic guidelines for coastal resources management from the University of the West Indies (UWI), will be integrated into the work of SPAW. An electronic Working Group will be formed to work further on the Guidelines to prevent species from becoming threatened or endangered, organized by the SPAW/RAC and Island Resource Foundation, and assisted by HSUS Wildlife Land Trust and Monitor Caribbean, as indicated in UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.4. Another Working Group is being considered to review the criteria for assessment of exemptions to Article 11 using the preliminary legal review "Exemptions to the SPAW Protocol under Article 11 (2): A Legal Review" (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.5), as a starting point, as recommended by COP2 and 3. A proposal was also made to start applying the adopted criteria for listing species to include threatened and endangered species, which are not yet listed.
111. Within the Workplan component "Conservation of threatened and endangered species", the Secretariat proposed to continue working toward finalizing the draft MMAP and subsequently, to present it to the COP4, and also initiate implementation of the priority recommendations of the MMAP Workshop (Recommendation No.3), with funding from the Regional Seas Programme (RSP).
112. Evaluation of the existing Regional Manatee Management Plan will be carried out with funding from the Government of France, through the SPAW/RAC. Support from the U.S. Government will allow for the finalization of STRAPs, the development of new ones, and the establishment of new Index Monitoring Sites for hawksbills turtles in collaboration with WIDECAS. Support will also be given to the conservation of the West Indian Whistling Duck, through education and capacity-building and integrated wetlands management. Synergies will further be explored with BirdLife to support management of important bird areas (IBAs), documenting case studies of innovative approaches, and with "Waterbird Conservation of the Americas". Updating the SPAW species database was presented as a recurring need which should be addressed and funds raised for this purpose.
113. Collaboration with FAO/WECAFC will be developed with funding from Sida on: implementation of queen conch and lobster fishery management through capacity building; and sustainable fishing practices and alternative livelihoods. The secretariat will initiate the development of a marine alien invasive species programme with the GISP, the International Maritime Organization (IMO), and The Nature Conservancy (TNC), as well as facilitate regional implementation of the UNEP/IMO Ballast Water Project in collaboration with the Programme on Assessment and Management of Environmental Pollution (AMEP) of CEP. Capacity-building in the area of marine alien invasive species will also be implemented using the existing GISP/UNEP manual. Additional capacity-building for wildlife conservation will be explored in collaboration with United States Fish and Wildlife Service (US/FWS). The SPAW Programme will become involved with the new Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative, to ensure coordination, and explore opportunities for collaboration.
114. ICRAN/MAR Project activities will continue in Belize, Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico, on: 1) integrated watershed management and best agricultural practices, 2) sustainable fisheries, 3) sustainable tourism. Provided that funding is available, continued support will be given to the Global Coral Reef Monitoring nodes: Southern (Invemar, Colombia); Eastern Caribbean (CZMU, Barbados); Netherlands Antilles Coral Reef Initiative; Northern Caribbean (CMS, University of the West Indies). Collaboration will continue with the Atlantic & Gulf Rapid Reef Assessment (AGRA), to assist in identifying management measures for the conservation of major ecosystems.
115. In order to further improve the conservation of major ecosystems, lessons learnt and best practices from ICRAN Caribbean activities will be presented in a toolkit. A review on the status of seagrass beds in the region will be explored with UNEP-WCMC to increase knowledge on these threatened habitats. Coordination and synergies will further be explored with the GEF/OCARIBE/UNDP CLME Project, UNEP-CEP AMEP Projects, and FAO Projects on managing pelagic fisheries and by-catch reduction in shrimp trawling, as well as UNEP/UNF/ICRAN for Buccoo Reef Center in Trinidad & Tobago.
116. The component "Sustainable Tourism", outlines collaboration/coordination with the Caribbean Tourist Organisation (CTO), Caribbean Alliance for Sustainable Tourism (CAST), and the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS-ESDU) initiatives, and continues to support the Blue Flag Campaign, including participation in the Regional Jury. Utilization of resource materials of the CEN Project (Coastal Zone Management, Siting and Design, Waste Management) will be promoted and partnerships with relevant private businesses and initiatives explored in collaboration with UNEP's DTIE, which also includes the Tour Operators Initiative (TOI).
117. In presenting the budget for the biennium, the secretariat noted that, although it raised considerable funding for a number of activities outlined in the budget, the majority of the funding was already earmarked. And additional funding must be identified to allow for implementation of the ambitious Workplan. The Parties were reminded that in order for the Workplan to meet the objectives of the SPAW Protocol, they should ensure that any arrears be paid to the Caribbean Trust Fund.
118. The presenter highlighted the key issues for the STAC to be considered, and made reference to the relevant documents. The key issues were: to examine the capacities and mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on listed species (Decision 4 of COP3), (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.6); reporting under SPAW harmonised with requirements of other MEAs, (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.9 and CRP.2); criteria for assessment of exemptions to Article 11(2) through working groups using the preliminary legal review (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.5), (Decisions of COP2 and 3); and follow-up to revised criteria for listing species by updating of the Annexes to include threatened and endangered species not yet listed.

119. The Coordinator of CEP reminded the countries that the CEP belongs to them and invited greater participation of the Parties in furthering the work of the Programme. He welcomed offers from Parties interested in hosting CEP meetings.
120. The Meeting commended the secretariat on the draft Workplan which they found to be comprehensive and very ambitious, but necessary. The delegate from Colombia expressed concern on the need to review the Workplan and Budget, as she did not consider this to be the responsibility of the STAC.
121. With regard to Programme Coordination, the Meeting agreed on the importance of developing technical coordination and collaboration as appropriate, with the Interamerican Convention for the Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC) and encouraged the secretariat to present a draft of the proposed MoC to the upcoming meeting of the Consultative Committee Meeting of the IAC to be held in Costa Rica, at the end of October 2005.
122. While recognising the need and benefits of forging collaborative arrangements with relevant MEAs, the delegation from the U.S.A. proposed to specify that these would be undertaken with agreements addressing regional priorities, in particular in section 6.c of the draft Workplan. The delegation from Colombia said this should be forwarded to COP4. It was also agreed that, in section 6c, the World Heritage Programme be added as one of the important global initiatives with which to explore collaboration.
123. On the issue of invasive species, it was clarified that these included flora as well as fauna. Additional comments on the Workplan included supporting MPA sites through the SGF; applying for the Blue Flag certification; and strengthening the capacity of regional networks such as WIDECAST, to contribute to biodiversity conservation.
124. With regard to updating the 1991 Species Annexes of SPAW through a consultative review by experts nominated by the Parties, and taking into account the IUCN red list, the Delegation from the U.S. expressed concern on the massive amount of work and funding that this review would entail, and considered it inappropriate at this point in time, to endorse this particular activity of the draft Workplan. The representative from Humane Society International, agreed with these comments, and noted, that in CITES such a review takes many years, has difficulty in finding parties to conduct the reviews, and that usually, these reviews were not conducted until long after the convention had entered into force. He noted that, no proposals relying on the criteria had been submitted to the STAC thus far, and that there was therefore no need for such a review at this time. The delegation from Cuba suggested that this be the first activity of section 2.3 which would also include the listing of species. He expressed concern regarding species that are on the List and do not fulfil the revised criteria.
125. The delegation from France, in support of the intervention made by the U.S.A., recommended that priority be given to identifying new, threatened species, or species in danger of extinction, rather than a revision of the Annexes which is very complex, and which the STAC has been dealing with for some time. This would hinder the inclusion of threatened species, which is often an indispensable prerequisite for conservation planning by the concerned States, and for procuring national or international funding (i.e. GEF), for projects aimed at restoring populations of these species. The delegation from the Netherlands Antilles agreed that the priority activity should be identification of threatened species not already included in the Annexes. Another delegation proposed that in the case of Parties having concerns about species being in the Annexes, and not in accordance with the revised criteria, the Party in question, should present its concerns, accompanied by the relevant arguments and information, to the STAC for consideration.
126. The delegation from the U.S.A. requested that the Secretariat develop a programme to provide support to protected areas that wished to be listed under the SPAW Protocol. Given the status of development of the Guidelines for listing protected areas and the ambitious Workplan, they proposed that it be developed and included in the next biennium. The delegation from the Netherlands Antilles supported the request of the U.S.A., however, they proposed that it be incorporated in the 2006-2007 Workplan, as the Guidelines for listing should also be considered and adopted at the COP4. The delegate from the Netherlands Antilles further requested that the development of a Memorandum of Cooperation between the secretariat and the Interamerican Convention for the Conservation of Sea Turtles be considered, as well as the establishment of thematic and specialized Regional Activity Centres (RACs) sponsored by appropriate organizations (Government, academic or NGOs) to enhance the implementation of the SPAW Programme and to complement and support, the existing SPAW/RAC.
127. The representative of CCA suggested that a proposal be jointly developed with SPAW and CCA for an assessment or survey of protected areas in the WCR, to support the evaluation of protected areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol. CCA offered to be responsible for initiating this process and identifying appropriate funding mechanisms. It was agreed that the area of collaboration be included in the Workplan and that the secretariat and CCA, work together to further develop this proposal.
128. The Observer from FAO informed the Meeting of two Decisions of the Twenty-sixth Session of the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI), with respect to sea turtle conservation, and fisheries and marine protected areas and fisheries. He noted that, COFI had called on FAO to provide assistance to member countries in implementing the Guidelines to reduce sea turtle mortality from fishing operations and in the use of MAPs, one of a number of effective management tools used in combination with other appropriate measures, such as capacity control. With respect to MAPs, the representative from COFI stressed that FAO should collaborate with other IGOs to liaise with and benefit from, the experiences of member countries, IGOs and NGOs, in developing technical guidelines for the design, implementation and testing of MPAs as fisheries management tools. In this regard, UNEP-CEP was invited to present its work and experiences with MPAs in the Wider Caribbean Region, at the Twelfth Session of the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC), 25 - 28 October 2005, in Trinidad and Tobago, for the purpose of improving inter-agency collaboration on MPAs in the WECAFE region. The STAC welcomed these opportunities for collaboration and requested that the secretariat analyse the FAO proposal and explore options for collaboration in the areas of MPAs and fisheries.
129. Extensive discussions were held on the formation of the Working Group to discuss the development of criteria for assessing exemptions, as requested by COP2 and COP3. The delegates from Cuba and Colombia were of the opinion that the COP had not provided specific terms of reference for the formation of this Working Group, and proposed that the question be returned to the COP4 for clarification. The delegation from Colombia proposed to include that the process be regulated by the same principles agreed to in STAC1. The Secretariat, and a number of Parties indicated that the COP2 had mandated that this issue be considered at the Third Meeting of the Parties where it was subsequently included in the Workplan and Budget of the SPAW Regional Programme for the 2004-2005 biennium. that a Working Group be created to initiate discussion of this issue. In this context, the secretariat collaborated with

- WDCS to develop a preliminary legal review to assist the Working Group with a background document. The Meeting agreed to establish the Working Group and to use the same Guidelines for membership of the Group established by STAC1 on the revision of the criteria for listing species.
130. With regard to Decision No. 4 of the COP3, the Meeting agreed that the secretariat, in cooperation with the Parties, initiate a survey on national capabilities and mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on species listed in the Protocol
 131. A number of additional presentations were made to complement and/or to expand on the proposed draft 2006-2007 Workplan and Budget.
 132. The representative of the Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers Network (CaMPAM) and UNEP-CAR/RCU, gave a presentation on the project aimed at updating and redesigning the existing CaMPAM MPA database. The presentation included the following aspects: the need to renovate the design; the use of expert consultation to create a new structure and new fields; the need to update data on a regular and periodic basis; the potential impact of this renovation on the improvement of individual MPA web pages by the park authorities; the capacity to link with existing databases with other scope and geographic coverage (national, subregional, international and global); the procedure designed to input new data (by specialists and managers with privileged access, ensuring accuracy of the dataset) and facilitated selective query. The standardized information will also allow for a regional analysis. The database includes a wealth of information divided into 4 general areas: identity, legal status, physical description and management. A pilot project is in progress to test the structure and access.
 133. The CEPNET Programme Officer at the secretariat added that the database was being developed with the Application Server Zope which allows for the design and development of a large number of tools, either taken or modified from existing public applications. It is hoped that this environment will be able not only to provide a good database but also to serve the activities of the CaMPAM Network. The system also has security features, approvals, reviews and others. It will also be possible to add reporting and search tools for the managers and general users.
 134. Questions were raised by some delegations on the connectivity of the database to other initiatives in the region, and on the possibility of data exchange with global databases such as the one existing for Ramsar sites. The secretariat confirmed that these mechanisms can be developed and should be encouraged.
 135. Mr. Juan Carlos Fernández, of the Caribe Sur Foundation, made a brief presentation on the biological and ecological characteristics of the National Park Archipelago Los Roques, showing the aspects of biodiversity and ecological importance.
 136. In his presentation, Mr. Fernández informed about a proposal before the UNESCO World Heritage Centre, on the transboundary nomination of the archipelagos of Los Roques and Las Aves (Venezuela) as well as with Bonaire and Curaçao (Netherlands Antilles), as areas of natural world heritage. Mr. Fernández presented the arguments in compliance with the criteria of the World Heritage Centre.
 137. The delegation from Venezuela indicated that this was an excellent proposal, which they would present to the relevant authorities for consideration.
 138. The representative from the Netherlands Antilles explained that his country fully supported the proposal and offered to cooperate with the Venezuelan government in this regard. He mentioned that Conservation International was interested in conducting baseline studies.
 139. The representatives from Venezuela explained that the first step was to declare the Las Aves archipelago a national protected area, subsequent to conducting the prerequisite studies.
 140. The Meeting requested technical and scientific assistance from the secretariat in developing the technical proposal.
 141. The Chairperson invited Dr. Juan M. Posada, the representative from The Atlantic and Gulf Rapid Reef Assessment Programme (AGRRA), to give the presentation "AGRRA: Its Accomplishments and New Direction". He highlighted that the coral reefs of the inter-American region are connected and that research and management must recognize this regional unity. He mentioned some of the implications of this interconnectivity: larvae, juveniles, pollutants and pathogens which spread throughout the region over time, and that reefs upstream in the Caribbean can provide managers with early warnings of impacts such as coral diseases on reefs downstream, for example in Belize, Mexico, Florida. AGRRA assessment focuses on coral reefs, fish and macroalgae of the ecosystem.
 142. AGRRA can be used as a tool to establish norms on reef community condition to be used on a regional scale, and spatial patterns of reef condition, which will assist and aid in identifying reefs for monitoring programmes, or marine protected areas. Dr. Posada outlined some of the initial results of the assessment and training in the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and the Bahamas during 1998-2005. Eight hundred reefs were monitored during this period and the outcomes were: quantification of declines in corals and fishes; norms of reef condition for multi-scale comparisons; the distinction between regional and local impacts; identification of candidate areas for protection; as well as regional baseline for evaluating change and capacity-building delivered through five workshops. The main accomplishment of AGRRA is the first-ever regional snapshot of reef community condition in the Wider Caribbean which is a baseline against which to measure future changes. AGGRAs challenge for the future will be to organize international collaboration to evaluate regional declines and/or recovery of reef communities. He concluded by noting that AGRRA plans to proceed with continuing synoptic regional revisits to representative reef communities at five-year intervals.
 143. The Chairperson thanked the presenter and opened the floor for questions. Clarifications were requested on the possibility of identifying causes of coral reef degradation and the presenter responded that the AGRRA methodology can indicate if the cause is anthropogenic or natural, however, very specific causes cannot be identified. The presenter also clarified how AGRRA works in the countries, providing training to local teams on monitoring protocols, for them to implement the methodology at the national level. AGRRA members also participate in local monitoring exercises as trainers and assist in the evaluation of local monitoring programmes and incorporation of analyses in existing monitoring protocols.
 144. Regarding regional monitoring mechanisms to evaluate changes in coral reefs, the representative from the Caribbean Conservation Association mentioned the Caribbean Coastal Marine Productivity (CARICOMP) Programme, with its regional database at the Centre for Marine Sciences (CMS) in Jamaica, which evaluates mangrove communities, coral reefs and seagrass beds. CARICOMP looks at changes in productivity and collaborates with the AGRRA Programme. The ReefCheck method was also mentioned as being complementary to AGRRA and CARICOMP. A number of delegations commended the AGRRA initiative as it gives a detailed view of the status of the reef at any given point. It was further highlighted that the general vision, as well as the monitoring by AGRRA, have been very beneficial to the region as

- it has filled gaps in the region on reef status in many countries. Additionally, the recently published Reefs at Risk report used a lot of the AGRRA results to undertake the reef threat analysis in this very comprehensive document. The Meeting agreed on the need for SPAW to continue collaborating and supporting to the extent possible, those regional coral reef assessment programmes.
145. The representative from The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Mr. Nestor Windervoxhel, was invited to make a presentation on their activities in the region, in particular those in the Mesoamerican sub-region. The Mesoamerican Reef Programme has developed a working Agenda which comprises: (1) the inclusion of science; (2) management and effective support; (3) support for capacity building; (4) support for the development of economic alternatives for local communities and (5) support for policies. These are all areas of action aimed at identifying and promoting the protection of a network of protected areas, which are resilient to the effects of climatic change, and which provide goods and services for protected areas.
 146. The programme will be working extensively on the inclusion of the sciences for defining the network of Resilient Protected Areas, by updating the Eco-regional Plan of the Mesoamerican Reef Programme and by including more up-to-date and detailed information, as well as the coral reef resilience model. Once these resilient areas are identified, work will start on the sites promoting them as platforms, directly supporting their conservation, and fostering the thematic work in key biological processes, such as spawning aggregations.
 147. This information, and the social, economic and scientific processes will help in the development of self-teaching training programmes by means of a virtual learning centre, which will place the tools developed by the partners, initiatives and organizations wishing to include them, in the Learning Centres, thus granting access to as many beneficiaries as possible. By developing these capacity-building opportunities in the communities, the programme will also assist in the development of community support programmes with a view to expanding their production systems and, if possible, to fostering sustainable use and conservation of protected areas in the region.
 148. This TNC Programme will seek to offer information and innovation to facilitate the decision-making process in the region through the inclusion of the sciences and community know-how. The programme has been proposed for a period of 10 years and seeks to achieve synergies with as many organizations, projects and initiatives as possible, in order to achieve the ambitious objective of conserving the second largest barrier reef in the world. In this respect, he expressed interest in working with the secretariat of the SPAW Protocol, with its signatories in the Caribbean, as well as with the MAR-ICRAN Project, specifically in the Mesoamerican Reef region.
 149. The Venezuelan delegation commended the presentation and the support TNC is giving to the region. They asked about the models TNC uses for predicting changes and recommending actions in protected areas, in particular incorporating socio-economic data. TNC informed that they are currently evaluating some methods, such as the STELLA modelling software. TNC also emphasized their interest in developing synergies with the CEP and SPAW and informed that they are currently in discussion with the Secretariat with a view to developing a Memorandum of Cooperation between the two organizations.
 150. The participants of the Meeting were invited to raise other issues not covered by the preceding Agenda items, but relevant to the scope of the Meeting.
 151. The delegation from the Netherlands Antilles presented the document "Proposed Review and Development of Possible STAC3 Revision – Recommendations to Draft Paper titled 'Guidelines for Establishment and Operation of Regional Activity Centres and Regional Activity Networks for the Caribbean Environment Programme'" UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.4. The document highlights the role of NGOs in the conservation efforts of the CEP, and proposes that partnerships be formed with successful national or regional NGOs as well as government institutions to function as RACs. WIDECAST was mentioned as a prominent example, however, the Director, Dr. Eckert, respectfully declined to be considered as a RAC, but rather as a RAN, and emphasized the support WIDECAST will continue to give to the SPAW/RAC. Comments from the Meeting were positive regarding the ideas of the document, and the NGOs acknowledged that their partnerships could greatly reduce the workload of the secretariat. However, due to the late submission of the document for consideration of the Meeting, the Parties lacked the mandates from their respective governments to review it. The delegation from France supported the other Parties in their comments regarding NGO partners and requested additional information on the relevant procedures. It was recommended that the secretariat be given the mandate to refer the paper and the summary report of this STAC to the appropriate working group.
 152. The delegate from the Dominican Republic informed the Meeting of the threats to his country's system of protected areas, particularly the coastal-marine protected areas, given the attempts to take away their protection and devote the areas to the construction of hotels. Special mention was made of the pressure applied by real estate interests to exclude the coastal parts of the national park of Jaragua and Parque Nacional del Este. He highlighted that these are the two major protected areas on the Caribbean coast of the Dominican Republic given their location in the Caribbean, the ecosystems they preserve and the marine and terrestrial flora and fauna species that use these parks, or parts thereof, as their habitat, are very important to the goals of the Cartagena Convention and particularly, the SPAW Protocol. Additionally, the Jaragua National Park is one of the core areas of the only Biosphere Reserve in the country, and the Parque Nacional del Este is being analysed by UNESCO to be declared a World Heritage Site. He called upon the delegates and their countries, as well as observers, to consider these evolving matters and asked the secretariats and the STAC, to provide his country all the assistance possible to gather and analyse technical and scientific information that may support their conservation efforts.
 153. The Chairperson welcomed Mr. Eric van Praag, Technical Director of the IABIN-DGF Project. Mr. van Praag presented the IABIN-DGF Project, an initiative funded by the World Bank and implemented in collaboration with several agencies such as: the City of Knowledge, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), NASA, CATHALAC, the Central American Commission for Environment and Development, and the Interamerican Biodiversity Information Network Secretariat. The Project is assisting Ministries of Environment and similar agencies in Mesoamerica and the Caribbean, to implement environmental internet map servers (IMS). To date, more than 14 IMS systems have been implemented in the region in eight countries and they contain more than 200 spatial layers and associated tabular data, and all data is available to the public.
 154. The Project obtained a 30-meter resolution digital elevation model from the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA), taken by the Space Shuttle. From this dataset, the USGS National Center for EROS has

Agenda item 10: Other Business

produced seamless derived maps of streamlines, watersheds, slope, aspect, hill shade, water direction, and flow accumulation for all of Central America. The Project will complete the same data sets for the Caribbean by December 2005. All data will be available for download from <http://edcintl.cr.usgs.gov/iabin> and from the CATHALAC Servir Project website. In general, the data offers better resolution, geographic coverage, and precision, than equivalent data previously available in the participating countries. New agencies are invited to participate in the Project, either by implementing their own IMS systems, by cataloguing their spatial and environmental datasets, or by providing spatial data for staging in existing IMS systems. For more information please contact Dr. van Praag at evan@cantv.net.

Agenda item 11: Adoption of the Report of the Meeting

155. The Rapporteur of the Meeting presented the Draft Report of the Meeting. The Meeting adopted the Report, with amendments and corrections to be introduced in the draft by the secretariat, as appropriate. Comments are to be forwarded to the secretariat within 2 weeks after the Meeting.

Agenda item 12: Closure of the Meeting

156. Mr. Lucas González Milla, Director of Fronteras Terrestres y Marítimas, Dirección General de Soberanía, Límites y Asuntos Fronterizos, of the Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores, extended congratulations on behalf of the Government of Venezuela, on the work accomplished by the Meeting. He wished the participants a safe journey home and hoped to continue working with them for the protection of the Wider Caribbean Region. The Chair of the Meeting, Mr. Jesús Ramos Oropeza, thanked the participants, technical staff and assistants, for all their support and assistance during the Meeting. The secretariat agreed, and further thanked the translators, interpreters and Government of Venezuela for hosting the Meeting and all their support. The Meeting was closed on Saturday, 8 October 2005 at 12:00 a.m. by the Chairperson of the Meeting and the secretariat.

Annex I: Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Election of Officers
3. Organisation of the Meeting
 - a. Rules of Procedure
 - b. Organisation of work
4. Adoption of the Agenda
5. Status of implementation of the SPAW Programme Workplan and Budget for the 2004–2005 biennium
6. Activities of the Regional Activity Centre for SPAW (SPAW/RAC) in Guadeloupe
7. Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol
8. Report of the Regional Workshop of Experts on the Development of the Marine Mammal Action Plan (MMAP) and Draft MMAP for the Conservation of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region
9. Development of the draft SPAW Programme Workplan and Budget for the 2006-2007 biennium
10. Other Business
11. Adoption of the Report of the Meeting
12. Closure of the Meeting

Annex II: Recommendations of the Meeting

Having convened the Third Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA) in the Wider Caribbean Region;

Having reviewed the current status of activities of the SPA Protocol and the 2004-2005 Workplan and Budget for the SPA Regional Programme (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.3) and its supporting documents (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.10 and (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.11);

Taking note of the “Report on the Activities of the Regional Activity Centre for SPA (SPA/RAC) in Guadeloupe for the period 2004 – 2005” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.4);

Having reviewed the “Final Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPA Protocol” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/3) and the “Revised Draft Annotated Format for the Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPA List” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG. 29/4);

Taking note of the “Report of the Working Group on the Development of Guidelines for the Listing of Protected Areas under the SPA Protocol” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.12);

Having reviewed the Recommendations in the “Report of the Regional Workshop of Experts on the Development of the Action Plan for the Wider Caribbean Region” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/3);

Taking note of the Draft Action Plan for the Conservation of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region (MMA) (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/2.Rev.3);

Having reviewed the “Draft Workplan and Budget for the SPA Regional Programme for the 2006-2007 biennium” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/5);

Taking note of the document “Exemptions to the SPA Protocol under Article 11 (2): A Legal Review” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.5); and

Taking note of “Proposed Review and Development of Possible STAC3 Revision Recommendations to Draft Paper titled ‘Guidelines for Establishment and Operation of Regional Activity Centres and Regional Activity Networks for the Caribbean Environment Programme, UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.24/CRP.9’” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.4), and of its related document (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/4) “Revised Draft Annotated format for the Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPA List”;

The Meeting,

RECOMMENDATION I

Recognizing that since 2002 no new Governments have become Contracting Parties to the SPA Protocol; and

Recognizing that the developing and growing work programme of the SPA Protocol necessitates the setting of priorities;

Recommends that:

1. The secretariat, in coordination with the Regional Activity Centre (SPA/RAC), continues to encourage the Governments of the region to become Contracting Parties to the Protocol;
2. SPA-COP4 should give guidance to the secretariat regarding the priority actions for the work programme; and
3. SPA-COP4 should consider giving priority to Contracting Parties to the SPA Protocol, unless there is an urgent conservation need of concern to the region in a country that is not a Party.

RECOMMENDATION II

Having reviewed the “Final Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/3) and the “Revised Draft Annotated Format for the Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAW List” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG. 29/4); and

Recognizing that the interpretation of the various criteria is an evolving process,

Recommends that:

1. The mandate of the Working Group be extended to continue work on the revised “Final Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/3.Rev.1), with a view to:
 - a) further clarify the definition of the criteria as needed;
 - b) develop a glossary; and
 - c) clearly separate in the criteria document the conditions or pre-requisites from the “principles” for listing in particular under “D. Planning and Management Measures”;
2. The secretariat prepare a bibliographic review on the use of these concepts by other Multilateral Environmental Agreements, to be used as input by the Working Group in the development of the glossary;
3. The Working Group revise the draft annotated format for the nomination reports, in order to make changes that can lead to more precise information based on the definitions adopted in the glossary;
4. The Working Group and the secretariat present the results of this Meeting to the COP4 for review and adoption;
5. The Working Group ensures that all agreed texts and modifications made to the revised draft by the Meeting have been incorporated as appropriate to the document; and
6. In the future, these criteria be reviewed periodically and adapted if necessary.

RECOMMENDATION III

Taking note of the “Draft Action Plan for the Conservation of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/2.Rev.3); and

Having reviewed the Recommendations of the “Report of the Regional Workshop of Experts on the Development of the Marine Mammal Action Plan (MMAP) for the Wider Caribbean Region”, Bridgetown, Barbados, 18-21 July 2005 (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/3).

Recommends that:

- Article I. According to the Terms of Reference agreed by STAC1, the electronic Working Group be expanded to include other interested Parties and organizations and continue working with a view to present a progress report with a revised draft of the MMAP to COP4 and request guidelines to continue the work in this regard, taking into account the comments provided at the Meeting and as reflected in this Report;
- Article II. In the revised draft MMAP a table be developed with specific actions and timetable for implementation, both at the national and regional levels;
- Article III. In the interest of progress, and with regard to marine mammal conservation, countries begin developing national action plans to the extent possible;
- Article IV. The secretariat and the SPAW/RAC work toward implementing Recommendation No. 3 of the Report of the Workshop of Experts as a priority action; and
- Article V. Additional recommendations of the Regional Workshop of Experts be considered by the secretariat, the Working Group and the countries for implementation as appropriate,

RECOMMENDATION IV

Having reviewed the “Draft Workplan and Budget of the SPAW Programme for the 2006-2007 biennium” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/5); and

Taking note of UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.4, UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF. 5, UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.6, UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.9, and UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP 5,

Recommends that:

1. The proposed Workplan and Budget for the 2006-2007 biennium be revised by the secretariat according to the scientific and technical comments and recommendations provided at this Meeting, and forwarded to the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to SPAW (COP4) and Twelfth Intergovernmental Meeting of the Action Plan and Ninth Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Cartagena Convention;
2. With regard to national assessment of monitoring and reporting capabilities and mechanisms for species listed under the Protocol, as per Decision 4 of COP3, the secretariat, in collaboration with the STAC, should begin to compile information with a view to presenting a progress report to COP4;
3. With regard to Activity 2.2, the activities be adjusted as appropriate to reflect the status of development of the revised draft Guidelines for the listing of protected areas under SPAW and the inputs provided as reflected in UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/3 Rev.1, and in the Report of this Meeting;
4. The COP4 considers giving the mandate to the STAC to initiate the process of identifying those threatened and endangered species of the region that are not yet included in the Annexes of the Protocol;
5. With regard to Activity 2.3(3), that an Ad Hoc Working Group to address the issues of exemptions under Article 11(2) be formed, using the same Terms of Reference for membership agreed at STAC1, for the guidelines to review the species criteria. The Working Group is to use as a starting point for discussions, the preliminary legal review “Exemptions to the SPAW Protocol” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.5), and to begin its work immediately thereafter with a view to presenting a progress report to COP4;
6. With regard to Activity 2.4(1), that the activities be adjusted to reflect as appropriate, the status of development of the MMAP and the inputs provided as reflected in the report of this Meeting;
7. The collaboration with FAO/WECAFC and the Caribbean Conservation Association (CCA) continue and that the secretariat explore the development of synergies and activities supportive of the objectives of the SPAW Protocol and Workplan as reflected in paragraphs 126 and 127 of this Report; and
8. The secretariat and the SPAW/RAC continue with their fundraising efforts to secure funding for activities outlined in the 2006-2007 Workplan, in collaboration with Governments.

RECOMMENDATION V

Taking note of UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.4 and the relationship to the agenda item on RANs and RACs of the Twelfth Intergovernmental Meeting on the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme and Eighth Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region to be convened in 2006;

Recommends that:

The secretariat refers the paper and the Report of this STAC to the appropriate group for consideration.

Annex III: Status of Ratification of the Cartagena Convention and of the SPAW Protocol

Cartagena Convention

| State | Date of Signature | Ratified / Acceeded |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Antigua and Barbuda | | 11-Sep-86 |
| Bahamas | | |
| Barbados | 05-Mar-84 | 28-May-85 |
| Belize | | 22-Sep-99 |
| Colombia | 24-Mar-83 | 03-Mar-88 |
| Costa Rica | | 01-Aug-91 |
| Cuba | | 15-Sep-88 |
| Dominica | | 05-Oct-90 |
| Dominican Republic | | 24-Nov-98 |
| France | 24-Mar-83 | 13-Nov-85 |
| Grenada | 24-Mar-83 | 17-Aug-87 |
| Guatemala | 05-Jul-83 | 18-Dec-89 |
| Guyana | | |
| Haiti | | |
| Honduras | 24-Mar-83 | |
| Jamaica | 24-Mar-83 | 01-Apr-87 |
| Mexico | 24-Mar-83 | 11-Apr-85 |
| Netherlands | 24-Mar-83 | 16-Apr-84 |
| Nicaragua | 24-Mar-83 | |
| Panama | 24-Mar-83 | 07-Nov-87 |
| St. Kitts and Nevis | | |
| Saint Lucia | 24-Mar-83 | 20-Nov-84 |
| St. Vincent and the Grenadines | | 11-Jul-90 |
| Suriname | | |
| Trinidad and Tobago | | 24-Jan-86 |
| United Kingdom | 24-Mar-83 | 28-Feb-86 |
| United States of America | 24-Mar-83 | 31-Oct-84 |
| Venezuela | 24-Mar-83 | 18-Dec-86 |
| European Economic Commission | 24-Mar-83 | |

SPAW Protocol

| State | Date of Signature | Ratified / Acceeded |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Antigua and Barbuda | 18-Jan-90 | |
| Bahamas | | |
| Barbados | | Nov-02 |
| Belize | | |
| Colombia | 18-Jan-90 | 05-Jan-98 |
| Costa Rica | | |
| Cuba | 18-Jan-90 | 04-Aug-98 |
| Dominica | | |
| Dominican Republic | | 24-Nov-98 |
| France | 18-Jan-90 | 05-Apr-02 |
| Grenada | | |
| Guatemala | 18-Jan-90 | |
| Guyana | | |
| Haiti | | |
| Honduras | | |
| Jamaica | 18-Jan-90 | |
| Mexico | 18-Jan-90 | |
| Netherlands | 18-Jan-90 | 02-Mar-92 |
| Nicaragua | | |
| Panama | 16-Jan-91 | 27-Sep-96 |
| St. Kitts and Nevis | | |
| Saint Lucia | 18-Jan-90 | 25-Apr-00 |
| St. Vincent and the Grenadines | 26-Jul-91 | 26-Jul-91 |
| Suriname | | |
| Trinidad and Tobago | 18-Jan-90 | 10-Aug-99 |
| United Kingdom | 18-Jan-90 | |
| United States of America | 18-Jan-90 | 16-Apr-03 |
| Venezuela | 18-Jan-90 | 28-Jan-97 |
| European Economic Commission | | |

Annex IV: List of Documents

Working Documents

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/1 | Provisional Agenda |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/2 | Provisional Annotated Agenda |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/3 | Final Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/4 | Revised Draft Annotated format for the Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAW List |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/2.Rev.3 | Draft Action Plan for the Conservation of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/5 | Draft Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme for the 2006-2007 Biennium |
| UNEP(DEPI)/CAR WG.29/7 | Report of the Third Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean Region |

Information Documents

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.1 | Provisional list of documents |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.2 | Provisional list of participants |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.3 | Revised Status of Implementation of the Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme for the 2004 – 2005 Biennium |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.4 | Report on the Activities of the Regional Activity Centre for SPAW (SPAW/RAC) in Guadeloupe for the period 2004-2005 |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.5 | Exemptions to the SPAW Protocol under Article 11 (2): A Legal Review |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.6 | Monitoring and Reporting on Species listed in relevant Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.7 | Implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Strategic Plan and Progress towards the 2010 Target |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.8 | Directory of Members of SPAW Protocol list serve (English only) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.9 | Harmonizing Reports on International Biodiversity related Conventions: Pilot Project, Panama (English only) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.10 | The new Caribbean Marine Protected Areas Managers Network and Forum (CaMPAM) and its major activities |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.11 | The Mesoamerican Reef Alliance (MAR) of the International Coral Reef Activities Network (ICRAN): Status and Planned Activities |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.12 | Report of the Working Group on the Development of Guidelines for the Listing of Protected Areas under the SPAW Protocol |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.23/4 | Report of the Third Meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean Region (Montego Bay, Jamaica, 27 September 2004) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/3 | Report of the Regional Workshop of Experts on the Development of the Marine Mammal Action Plan for the Wider Caribbean Region (Bridgetown, Barbados, 18-21 July 2005) |

Conference Room Paper

| | |
|---------------------------|--|
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.1 | Annex III to UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.3. Status of Ratification of the Cartagena Convention and its Protocols |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.2 | Addendum 1 to UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.9. Harmonizing Reports on International Biodiversity Related Conventions: Pilot Project, Panama |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.3 | Annex II Revised of UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/INF.3. Budget for the SPAW Programme 2004-2005 |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.4 | Proposed Review and Development of Possible STAC3 Revision. Recommendations to Draft Paper Titled "Guidelines for the Establishment and Operation of Regional Activity Centres and Regional Activity Networks for the Caribbean Environment Programme, UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.24/CRP.9 |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.5 | CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas and the SPAW Protocol |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/CRP.6 | Annex I Revised of UENP(DEC)/CAR WG.29/5. Budget for the SPAW Programme 2006-2007 |

Reference Documents

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| UNEP-WCMC, Sept. 2005 | Towards the harmonization of national reporting to biodiversity-related treaties: Workshop Report (English only) |
| UNEP-WCMC | Feasibility Study for a Harmonized Information Management Infrastructure for Biodiversity-related Treaties (English only) |
| CITES | Guidelines for National Reports |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/INF.3 | Distribution and Status of Marine Mammals of the Wider Caribbean Region: An Update of UNEP Documents (English only) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/INF.4 | Major Threats to Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region: A Summary Report (English only) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/INF.5 | A Review of Fisheries By-Catch of Marine Mammals in the Wider Caribbean Region (English only) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/INF.6 | Socio-Economic Assessment of Marine Mammal Utilization in the Wider Caribbean Region: Captivity, Viewing and Hunting (English and Spanish) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.27/INF.8 | Insights on Marine Mammals of the Wider Caribbean Sea Region (including the Gulf of Mexico). Derived from Whaling History Documents (English only) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.24/5 | Report of the Eleventh Intergovernmental Meeting on the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme and Seventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region. (Montego Bay, Jamaica, 28 September -2 October 2004) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.23/INF.3 | Decisions of the SPAW COP2 and Recommendations of the First and Second Meetings of STAC and Status of their Implementation (English and Spanish) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.25/6 | Report of the Second Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean Region (Curaçao, Netherlands Antilles, 3-6 June 2003) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.21/INF.3 | Report of the Second Meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean Region. (Montego Bay, Jamaica, 6 May 2002) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.22/8 | Report of the Tenth Intergovernmental Meeting on the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme and Seventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region. (Montego Bay, Jamaica, 7-11 May 2002) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.22/5 | Strategy for the Development of the Caribbean Environment Programme 2002-2006 |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.22/9 Rev.1 | Concept Paper for Establishing and Coordinating Regional Activity Centres and Regional Activity Networks of the Caribbean Environment Programme |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/6 | Report of the First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean Region, (Havana, Cuba, 27-29 September 2001) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/7 | Report of the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean Region. (Havana, Cuba, 25-24 September 2001) |
| UNEP/Ramsar, 2005 | Memorandum of Cooperation between the Secretariat of the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean (Cartagena, 1983) and the Bureau of the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, 1971) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/6.Rev.1 | Priorities for Implementation following the entry into force of the Protocol: responsibilities for the Contracting Parties, for the STAC and for the Secretariat (as revised by the First Meeting of the SPAW Contracting Parties (COP), (Havana, 24-25 September 2001) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.22/INF.7 | International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN): a global partnership for coral reefs – a Summary (English only) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF.3 | Elements for the Development of a Marine Mammal Action Plan for the Wider Caribbean: A Review of Marine Mammal Distribution |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF.4 | Report to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) from the Secretariat of the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena 1983) and its Protocols, including the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) (February 2001) |
| UNEP(WATER)/CAR WG.22/5 | Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean Region. (Havana, Cuba, 3-6 August 1999) |
| UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.19/6 | Report of the Third Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean, Region. (Kingston, Jamaica, 11-13 October 1995) |
| UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.11/7 | Report of the Second Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean, Region. (French Guiana, 3-5 May 1993) |
| UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.5/1 | Report of the First Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) in the Wider Caribbean, Region. (Kingston, Jamaica, 4-8 May 1992) |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/3 | Evaluation of the Work of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) since its inception (1992-2000) |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/4 | Structure and Scope of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of the SPAW Protocol |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/5 | Relationship between the SPAW Protocol, the STAC and the work undertaken by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) |
| UNEP, 2005 | Directory of Focal Points of the Caribbean Environment Programme. CEP Information Paper, (September 2005) (English only) |
| UNEP(OCA)/CAR IG.11/7 | Proposal legal framework for the administrative, technical and financial operations of RACs and RANs |
| UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.17/INF.6 | International Trade in Species Listed in Both the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) (English only) |
| IUCN Species Survival Commission, | CITES: A Conservation Tool – A Guide to Amending the Appendices to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. 6th Edition, April 1999 |
| UNEP/GC/3/Rev.3, 1988 | Rules of Procedure of the Governing Council of UNEP |
| UNEP(WATER)/CAR WG.11/INF.6 | Memorandum of Cooperation between the Secretariat of the Convention of the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena, 1983) and its Protocols, including the protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (Nairobi, 1992) |
| UNEP, 1991 | Conference of Plenipotentiaries for the Adoption of the Annexes to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region. Final Act |
| UNEP, 1990 | Conference of Plenipotentiaries Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region. Final Act |
| UNEP, 1983 | Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena Convention) and Protocols |
| UNEP/CEPAL/IG.27/3 | Report of the International Meeting on the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme, Montego Bay, Jamaica, 6-8 April 1981 |

Annex V: List of Participants

| SPA W CONTRACTING PARTIES / PARTIES CONTRACTANTE DE SPA W / PARTES CONTRATANTES DE SPA W | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <i>Participants / Participants / Participantes/</i> | <i>Title / Titre / Título</i> | <i>Address / Adresse / Dirección</i> | <i>Tel./Fax/E-mail /Website</i> |
| BARBADOS / BARBADE / BARBADOS | | | |
| Kim Downes Agard | Environmental Officer | Environment Unit Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment 1st Floor, S.P. Musson Building Hincks Street, Bridgetown St. Michael | Tel.: (246) 467-5700 / 5725 Fax: (246) 437-8859 E-mail: downesk@gob.bb |
| COLOMBIA / COLOMBIE / COLOMBIA | | | |
| Ana María Hernández Salgar | Asesora | Oficina de Asuntos Internacionales Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial Calle 37 No. 8/40 Piso 4 Bogotá, D.C. | Tel.: (57-1) 288-9860 / 332-3434 ext.124/182 Fax: (57-1) 288-6954 E-mail: amhernandez@minambiente.gov.co |
| CUBA / CUBA / CUBA | | | |
| Pedro Julio Ruiz Hernández | Especialista | Centro Nacional de Areas Protegidas Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente 18-A No. 4114, E/ 41 y 47 Miramar, Playa Ciudad Habana | Tel.: (53-7) 206-8226 Fax: (53-7) 204-7970 E-mail: pruiz@snap.co.cu |
| José Gerhartz | Especialista | Centro Nacional de Areas Protegidas Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente 18-A No. 4114, E/ 41 y 47 Miramar, Playa Ciudad Habana c/o UWI Centre for Environment & Development 43 Gibraltar Camp Way, Mona Kingston, Jamaica | Tel.: (53-7) 206-8226 Fax: (53-7) 204-7970 UWICED Tel. (876) 394-5922 Fax: (876) 927-0329 iose.gerhartz@uwimona.edu.jm |
| Maida Asela Montolio Fernández | Vice Director, Científico | Acuario Nacional de Cuba Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente Primera y Avenida 60 Miramar, Playa Ciudad Habana | Tel.: (53-7) 203 6401-6 ext.214 / 215 Fax: (53-7) 209 2737 E-mail: maidam@acuaronacional.cu |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC / REPUBLIQUE DOMINICAINE / REPUBLICA DOMINICANA | | | |
| Angel Roberto Sanchez Percinal | Director de Areas Protegidas | Secretaría de Estado de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales Sub-Secretaría de Areas Protegidas Avenida Tiradentes Esquina Presidente Gonzalez Piso 10, Plaa Naco Santo Domingo, Distrito Nacional | Tel.: (809) 616-1444 / 501-2727 Fax: (809) 540-2667 E-mail: robertosanche@gmail.com |
| FRANCE / FRANCE / FRANCIA | | | |
| Veronique Herrenschildt Point Focal CAR/SPA W | Chargé de la Mission Internationale | Ministère de l'Ecologie et du Développement Durable Direction de la nature et des Paysages 20 Avenue de Ségur 75 007 Paris | Tel.: (33-1) 4219-1948 Fax: (33-1) 4219-1906 E-mail: veronique.herrenschildt@ecologie.gouv.fr |
| Louis Redaud | Chef du Service Protection de la Nature, Sites et Paysages | DIREN Guadeloupe Cite Guillard Chemin des Bougainvilliers F-97100 Basse-Terre Guadeloupe | Tel.: (590) 590 41 04 60 Fax: (590) 590 99 35 65 E-mail: louis.redaud@guadeloupe.ecologie.gouv.fr |
| NETHERLANDS ANTILLES / ANTILLES NEERLANDAISES / ANTILLAS NEERLANDESAS | | | |
| Paul Hoetjes | Senior Policy Advisor | Dept. of Environment and Nature Directorate of Public Health Schouwburgweg 26 (APNA Building) Willemstad, Curaçao | Tel.: (5999) 466-9307 Fax: (5999) 461-0254 E-mail: paul@mina.vomil.an Website: http://mina.vomil.an |
| Anouk Swakhoven | Legal Advisor | Ministry of General Affairs and Foreign Relations of the Netherlands Antilles Fort Amsterdam 4 Willemstad, Curaçao | Tel.: (5999) 461-3933 Fax: (5999) 461-7123 E-mail: anouk.swakhoven@gov.an |

| PANAMA / PANAMA / PANAMA | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Marisol Emelda Dimas Acosta (Focal Point) | Bióloga | Depto. de Áreas Protegidas y Biodiversidad Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente Albrook, Edificio 804 Ciudad de Panamá | Tel.: (507) 315-0855 ext.3177 Fax: (507) 315-0573 E-mail: m.dimas@anam.gob.pa / biodiversidad@anam.gob.pa / m_dimas13@hotmail.com |
| ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES / SAN VICENT ET LES GRENADINES / SAN VICENTE Y LAS GRENADINAS | | | |
| Amos Glasgow | Forestry Supervisor | Forestry Department Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Kingstown | Tel.: (784) 457-8594 / 458-2937 /532-0919 Fax: (784) 457-8502 E-mail: amoz@vincysurf.com / forestrysvg@vincysurf.com |
| TRINIDAD & TOBAGO / TRINITE et TOBAGO / TRINIDAD y TABAGO | | | |
| Courtenay Park | Assistant Conservator of Forests | Ministry of Public Utilities and the Environment Forestry Division Long Circular Road St. James | Tel.: (868) 668-3825 Fax: (868) 668-3825 E-mail: cpark24@yahoo.com |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA / ETATS UNIS D'AMERIQUE / ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA | | | |
| Anne Chick | Foreign Affairs Officer | Office of Ocean Affairs U.S. Department of State 2201 C Street, NW, Room 5805 Washington, DC 20520 | Tel.: (202) 647-3879 Fax: (202) 647-9099 E-mail: chickal@state.gov |
| Arthur Elliott Paterson, III | International Affairs Specialist | International Program Office, National Ocean Service NOAA SSMC 3, Room 5627 1315 East West Highway Washington, DC 20910 | Tel.: (301) 713 3078 ext.217 Fax.: (301) 713-4263 E-mail: arthur.e.paterson@noaa.gov |
| Nancy Daves | CITES Coordinator | International Affairs Office NOAA-Fisheries 1315 East West Highway Washington, DC 20910 | Tel.: (301) 713-9090 Fax: (301) 713-0376 E-mail: nancy.daves@noaa.gov |
| VENEZUELA / VENEZUELA / VENEZUELA | | | |
| Lisla Coromoto Pico Berbesí | Primer Secretario | Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores Dirección General de Economía y Cooperación Internacionales Dirección de Asuntos Económicos Internacionales Conde a Carmelitas Torre MRE, piso 16 ala A Caracas | Tel.: (58-212) 806-4325 ext. 4325 / 4326 Fax: (58-212) 806-4359 E-mail: lpico@hotmail.com |
| Biomar F. Blanco | Jefe de División Fronteras Marítima | Dirección General de Soberanía Límites y Asuntos Fronterizos Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores Esq. Carmelita, Av. Urdaneta Torre MRE, Piso 13 Caracas | Tel.: (58-212) 806-9385 Fax: (58-212) 806-4385 E-mail: biomarb@yahoo.com |
| Jesús Roberto Ramos Oropeza | Director General | Oficina Nacional de Diversidad Biológica Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Centro Simón Bolívar Torre Sur, Piso 6 Caracas | Tel. (58-212) 408-4737 Fax: (58-212) 408-4756 E-mail: jramos@marn.gob.ve |
| Ana María Rivero Linero | Guardafauna II | Oficina Nacional de Diversidad Biológica Dirección de Áreas Protegidas Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Centro Simón Bolívar Torre Sur, Entrada Este, Piso 6 El Silencio Caracas | Tel.: (58-212) 408-2151 / 2153 Fax: (58-212) E-mail: arivero@marn.gob.ve |
| Sergio García Castro | Director de Áreas Naturales Protegidas | Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Centro Simón Bolívar Torre Sur, Piso 6 Caracas | Tel.: (58-212) 408-2150 E-mail: sgarcia@marn.gob.ve |
| Aleidi Beatriz Sangronis Delgado | Directora de Gestión Internacional | Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Torre Sur, Piso 18 Oficina 5 | Tel.: (58-212) 4081501-2 Fax: (58-212) 408-1503 E-mail: asangroni@marn.gob.ve |
| Víctor Alfonso García Gutiérrez | Ingeniero Agrónomo | Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales CSB Torre Sur, Piso 10 El Silencio, Caracas | Tel.: (58-212) 408-1966 Fax: (58-212) 408-4875 E-mail: garciavict@yahoo.com |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Luz Amelia Sánchez | Jefe de División Anapro | Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Torre Sur Piso 6, Oficina 615 Centro Simón Bolívar, El Silencio Caracas | Tel.: (58-212) 408-2156 Fax: (58-212) 408-2148 E-mail: lsanchez@marn.gob.ve |
| Sara Isabel Gálvez Figueroa | Jefe de la División Áreas Naturales Protegidas | Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Dirección General de Diversidad Biológica Centro Simón Bolívar Torre Sur Piso 6 El Silencio, Caracas | Te.: (58-212) 408-2152 al 56 Fax: (58-212) 408-2109 E-mail: sgalvez@marn.gob.ve |
| Abigail O. Castillo Carmona | Director Técnico (E) de las Zonas Costeras | Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales de Planificación y Ord. Amb. Torre Sur del CSB, Piso 10 Caracas | Tel.: (58-212) 408-1962 Fax: (58-212) 408-4875 E-mail: acastillo@marn.gob.ve |
| Begoña Mora | Jefe de División Conservación de Fauna Acuática | Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Oficina Nacional de Diversidad Biológica Centro Simón Bolívar, Torre Sur Piso 6 El Silencio Caracas | Tel.: (58-212) 408-2123 Fax: (58-212) 408-2109 E-mail: bmora@marn.gob.ve |
| Vicente Vera | Geógrafo | Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales Oficina Nacional de Diversidad Biológica Centro Simón Bolívar, Torre Sur Sur Piso 6 El Silencio Caracas | Tel.: (58-212) 408-2155 Fax: E-mail: vvera@marn.gob.ve |
| Roberto Alejandro Egañez Marcano | Especialista | Dirección General de Ambiente Ministerio Público Edif. Sede del Fiscal General de la República 2 piso, Dir. Gen. Amb. Av. Mexico Coordinación Técnico Científica Ambiental | Tel.: (58-212) 509-8035 Fax: (58-212) E-mail: reganez@fiscalia.gov.ve |
| Ulandia Milagros Ravago Alamo | Jefe de División | Instituto Nacional de Parques INPARQUES Av. Rómulo Gallegos, entre 2do y 3ª Transversal Santa Eduvigis Caracas | Tel. (58-212) 273-2862 Fax: (58-212) 273-2163 E-mail: uravago@inparques.gov.ve |

OTHER CEP GOVERNMENTS / AUTRES GOUVERNEMENT DU PEC / OTROS GOBIERNOS DEL PAC

| HAITI / HAITI / HAITI | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| Exil Lucienna | Chef de Service | Ministère de l'Environnement 181 Haut Turgeau Ave. Jean Paul II, B.P. 19260 Port-au-Prince, Haiti | Tel: (509) 245-7585 / 7572 Cell: (509) 417-4880 Fax: (509) 245-7360 E-mail: exillucienna@yahoo.fr / ellucienna@hotmail.com |
| MONTSERRAT / MONTSERRAT / MONTSERRAT | | | |
| Gerard Gray | Environment and Conservation Advisor | Ministry of Agriculture, Land, Housing and the Environment P.O. Box 272 Brades | Tel.: (664) 491-2075 Fax: ((664) 491-9275 E-mail: grayg@candw.ms |
| UNITED KINGDOM / ROYAUME UNI / REINO UNIDO | | | |
| Emma Doyle | Coordinadora del Fondo de Cooperación | Embajada Británica en Caracas Torre La Castellana, Piso 11 Avenida Principal, La Castellana Caracas | Tel. : (58-212) 263-8411 ext.4326 Fax : (58-212) 267-1275 E-mail: emma.doyle@fco.gov.uk http:// www.britain.org.ve |

| UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATIONS / ORGANIZATION DES NATIONS UNIES / ORGANIZACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION (FAO) | | | |
| Bisessar Chakalall | Senior Fishery Officer / Secretary of Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) | Sub-Regional Office UN House, Marine Gardens Christ Church P. O. Box 631-C Bridgetown, Barbados | Tel.: (246) 426-7110 ext.249 Fax: (246) 427-6075 E-mail: bisessar.chakalall@fao.org |
| Alberto José Berrizbeitia Russian | Asistente de Programa | FAO Venezuela Torre Bellas Artes Piso 4 Urb. La Candelaria Caracas, Venezuela | Tel.: (58-212) 577-5680 / 0146 Fax: (58-212) 577-5680 / 0146 E-mail fao-ve@fao.org |

| EXPERTS / EXPERTES / EXPERTOS | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|---|
| NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS / ORGANIZATION NON GOUVERNEMENTALES / ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES (NGOs) | | | |
| ATLANTIC AND GULF RAPID REEF ASSESSMENT (AGRRA) | | | |
| Juan M. Posada | Investigador | Dept. Biología de Organismos Universidad Simón Bolívar Apartado 89000 Caracas 1080-A, Venezuela | Tel.: (58-212) 906-3417 Fax: (58-212) 906-3416 E-mail: jposada@usb.ve |
| ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE | | | |
| Milton M. Kaufmann | Consultant | 10007 Queen Street Alexandria, Virginia 22314 United States of America | Tel.: (703) 836-4300 Fax: (703) 836-0400 E-mail: awi@awionline.org |
| ASSOCIATION EVASION TROPICALE (MARINE TURTLES AND CETACEANS PRESERVATION) | | | |
| Caroline Rinaldi Gendreaud | Marine Mammal Expert | Rue des Paletuiviers 97125 Bouillante Guadeloupe, FWI | Tel.: (590) 690 338-124 (590) 590 927-424 E-mail: evastropic@wanadoo.fr |
| CARIBBEAN MARINE PROTECTED AREAS MANAGERS NETWORK (CaMPAM) | | | |
| Georgina Bustamante | Consultant | 2800 N Hills Dr. -216 Hollywood, FL 33021 U.S.A. | Tel.: (954) 963-3626 Fax: (954) 963-3626 E-mail: gbustamante@bellsouth.net |
| CARIBBEAN CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION (CCA) | | | |
| Leslie Walling | Executive Director | Chelford, Bush Hill The Garrison St. Michael | Tel.: (246) 426 5373 Fax: (246) 429 8483 E-mail: execdirector@ccanet.net cca@ccanet.net |
| CENTRO DE INVESTIGACION Y CONSERVACION DE TORTUGAS MARINAS (CICTMAR) | | | |
| Hedely J. Guada | Directora | Apdo. 50-789 Caracas 1050-A Edificio Inca, Piso 5 No.54 Venezuela | Tel.: (58-212) 761-6355 / (58-414) 249-6326 (cell) E-mail: 95-79050@usb.ve / hjguada@cantv.net |
| EASTERN CARIBBEAN COALITION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS (ECCEA) | | | |
| Lesley Sully | Head of Operations – CEO | Museum d'Histoire Naturelle BP 4030 Terres Sainville 97254 Fort de France cedex Martinique | Tel.: (596) 596 656-725 Fax: (596) 596 656-725 E-mail: lsully@wanadoo.fr |
| FUNDACION AGUACLARA | | | |
| María Eugenia Gil Beroes | Directora de Comunicaciones | Av. Universitaria Edif. Las Cumbres 410 Piso Letra B los Chaguaramos 1040 Venezuela | Tel.: (58-212) 662-4061 / 690-3066 Fax: (58-212) 662-4061 E-mail: fundacionaguaclara@cantv.net |
| FUNDACION CARIBE SUR | | | |
| Juan Carlos Fernández Doldan | Director Ejecutivo | C/ La Guairita Residencias Jardín Tiuna, Apto. A-46 Chuao-Caracas 1060 Venezuela | Tel.: (58-414) 303-0847 Fax: (58-212) 991-9071 E-mail: juancferman@cantv.net |
| HUMANE SOCIETY INTERNATIONAL | | | |
| Ronald Orenstein | Consultant | 1825 Shady Creek Court Mississauga, Ontario L5L 3W2, Canada | Tel.: (905) 820-7886 Fax: (925) 569-0116 E-mail: ron.orenstein@rogers.com |
| MONITOR CARIBBEAN (MC) | | | |
| Milton M. Kaufmann | President | 19102 Roman Way Montgomery Village Maryland 20886 USA | Tel.: (301) 948-1831 Fax: (301) 8948-1831 |
| PANOS | | | |
| Indi McLymont | Programme Officer/Journalist | Panos Institute 21 Highland Close Kingston 19 Jamaica | Tel.: (876) 924 7913 E-mail: indidk@yahoo.com |
| RAMSAR CONVENTION SECRETARIAT | | | |
| Margarita Astrálaga | Senior Advisor for the Americas | 28 Rue mauverney 1196 Gland Switzerland | Tel.: (4122) 999-0175 /45 Fax: (4122) 999-0169 E-mail: astralaga@ramsar.org |

| SEA VIDA | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| Jaime Bolamos | Director Ejecutivo | A.P. 162 Cagua Edo. Aragua Venezuela | Tel.: (58-244) 396-0393 Fax: (58-244) 396-1699 E-mail: sea_vida@yahoo.es |
| THE NATURE CONSERVANCY (TNC) | | | |
| Nestor Windevoxhel | TNC-MAR Program Director | 12 Av. 14-41 Zona 10 Oakland Guatemala City Guatemala | Tel.: (502) 2367-0480 Fax: (502) 2367-0481 E-mail: nwindevoxhel@tnc.org |
| WHALE AND DOLPHIN CONSERVATION SOCIETY (WDCS) | | | |
| Alice Stroud | Legal Advocate | 421 Jefferson Street Klamath Falls, Oregon 97601 U.S.A. | Tel.: (541) 205-4405 Fax: (541) 205-4405 E-mail: alice_stroud@wdcs.org |
| Courtney S. Vail | USA Representative | 5615 E. Lafayette Blvd. Phoenix, Arizona 85018 U.S.A. | Tel.: (480) 949-2649 / (703) 517-0411 E-mail: courtney@wdcs.org |
| Vanesa Patricia Tossenberger | Argentina Representative | P.O. Box 126 (9310) Puerto San Julián, Santa Cruz Argentina | Tel.: (54-296) 245-2292 Fax: (54-296) 245-2292 E-mail: vanesa.tossenberger@wdcs.org |
| WIDER CARIBBEAN SEA TURTLE CONSERVATION NETWORK (WIDECAST) | | | |
| Karen Eckert | Executive Director | Duke University Marine Laboratory 135 Duke Marine Lab Road Beaufort, North Carolina 28516 U.S.A. | Tel.: (252) 504 7597 Fax.: (252) 504 7648 E-mail: keckert@widecast.org |
| WORLD WILDLIFE FUND CANADA | | | |
| Michael Bliemsrieder | WWF-Canada Regional Director (Cuba/greater Antilles) | Calle 11 #33807 E/ 6 y 8 Tarará, Habana del Este Cuidad Habana Cuba | Tel.: (535) 270-4222 (Cuba) / (416) 303-0993 (Canada) Fax: (535) 866-4475 E-mail: mbliemsrieder@wwfcanada.org |
| INTERNATIONAL CORAL REEF ACTION NETWORK / MESOAMERICAN REEF ALLIANCE (ICRAN/MAR) | | | |
| Liza Karina Agudelo | Coordinadora del Proyecto | Alianza para el Arrecife Mesoamericano Fisheries Compound Princess Margaret Drive Belize City, Belize | Tel.: (501) 223-4673 Fax: (501) 223-4684-0116 E-mail: lagudelo@icran.org |
| REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR THE SPAW PROTOCOL (SPAW/RAC) | | | |
| Maurice Anselme | Director | Immeuble DIREN Rue des Bougainvilliers Cité Guillard 97-100 Basse-Terre Guadeloupe, FWI | Tel.: (590) 590 41 04 51 Fax: (590) 590 99 35 65 E-mail: maurice.anselme@quadeloupe.ecologie.gouv.fr |

| SECRETARIAT OF THE CARIBBEAN ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME / SECRETARIAT DU PROGRAMME POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT DES CARAIRES É SECRETARIA DEL PROGRAMA AMBIENTAL DEL CARIBE | | |
|---|--|--|
| United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) | | |
| 14-20 Port Royal Street, Kingston, Jamaica. Tel: (876) 922-9267, Fax: (876) 922-9292, www.cep.unep.org | | |
| Nelson Andrade Colmenares | Coordinator | nac.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com |
| Alessandra Vanzella-Khoury | SPAW Programme Officer | avk.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com |
| Luc St-Pierre | CEPNET Programme Officer | lp.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com |
| Heidi Savelli Soderberg | Junior Professional Officer – SPAW | hss.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com |
| Brenda Dewdney | Bilingual Secretary (SPAW) | bd.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com |
| Lesma Levy | Administrative Assistant | ll.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com |
| Donna Henry-Hernández | Bilingual Secretary (CEPNET) | dhh.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com |
| Ingrid Lee-Smart | Computer Information Systems Assistant | uneprcuja1@cwjamaica.com |