



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



UNEP



Distr.
LIMITED

UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG. 26/5
23 April 2004

ENGLISH
Original: ENGLISH

Workshop on the draft Guidelines for the
listing of Protected Areas under the
SPAW Protocol

Gosier, Guadeloupe, 19-23 April 2004

REPORT OF THE MEETING

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Meeting	1
Agenda Item 2: Election of Officers	3
Agenda Item 3: Organisation of the Meeting.....	3
Agenda Item 4: Adoption of the Agenda.....	3
Agenda Item 5: Introduction on the Development of the Draft Guidelines.....	5
Agenda Item 6: Summary of Background Documents and Presentation of the Draft Guidelines Developed by the Working Group	6
Agenda Item 7: Discussion of the Draft Guidelines for the listing of protected areas under the SPAW Protocol	
Agenda Item 8: Presentation on the Nature Reserve of Petite Terre	12
Agenda Item 9: Adoption of the Draft Guidelines and Criteria, and Recommendations of the Meeting	12
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: List of Participants

Annex II: Agenda

Annex III: List of Documents

Annex IV: Recommendations of the Meeting

**Annex V: Revised Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected
Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol:**

Introduction

A. General Principles

B. Ecological, Cultural and Socio-Economic Criteria

Ecological Criteria

Cultural and Socio-Economic Criteria

C. Legal Criteria Framework

D. Protection, Planning and Management Measures

E. Annotated Format for Presentation Reports for the Areas Proposed
for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List

F. Preliminary Procedure Proposal (Procedures for Listing and De-
Listing)

REPORT OF THE MEETING

INTRODUCTION

1. In keeping with Recommendation No. IV of the Second Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC 2), to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW), (Curaçao, Netherlands Antilles, 3-6 June 2003) and Decisions of the Second Meeting of the Conference of Parties of SPAW (COP2) (Montego Bay, Jamaica, 6 May 2002), the Secretariat, in collaboration with the Government of France and the Regional Activity Centre for SPAW (SPAW/RAC), invited the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol and regional experts to attend the Workshop to review the draft Guidelines for the Listing of Protected Areas under the SPAW Protocol in Gosier, Guadeloupe, from 19 to 23 April 2004.
2. These draft Guidelines, coordinated and prepared by the SPAW/RAC through an electronic group of experts established as per the STAC 2 recommendation, will be subsequently presented to the Third Meeting of the Contracting Parties to SPAW (COP 3) later in 2004, for consideration and further action.
3. The Workshop had the following objectives:
 - a) to review and further develop the draft Guidelines for the Listing of Protected Areas under the SPAW Protocol prepared by the electronic Working Group pursuant to Article 7 of the SPAW Protocol, which will be presented to the COP3 of SPAW, in September 2004;
 - b) To review the draft Format for Presentation Reports for the areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List, and the draft Grid for the Objective Evaluation of Proposals for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List.
4. The twelve Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol, and members of the electronic Working Group were invited to nominate experts to participate in the Workshop. Annex IV includes the list of participants at the Workshop.

AGENDA ITEM 1: OPENING OF THE MEETING

5. The welcome address and Opening Ceremony took place at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, 19 April 2004, at the SNC Creole Beach Hotel, in Gosier, Guadeloupe. Words of welcome were extended by Mr. Maurice Anselme, Director of the SPAW/RAC, Mr. Nelson Andrade Colmenares, Coordinator of the Caribbean Environment Programme of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP-CAR/RCU), Ms. Borel-Lingertin, First Vice President of the Regional Council of Guadeloupe, and Mr. Dominique Vian, Prefect of Guadeloupe, who officially declared the Workshop opened.
6. The Director of the SPAW/RAC, Mr. Maurice Anselme, welcomed the participants and thanked the DIREN of Guadeloupe and in particular, Mr. Dominique Deviers, the

Government of France and the Ministry of Ecology and Sustainable Development for their support of the Workshop.

7. Mr. Anselme further highlighted the technical, material and logistical support given by Mr. Pierre Champagne, Regional Director of the Office of National Forestry; Mr. Yves Buggier, Director of the National Park of Guadeloupe; and Mr Jean Georges Mandon, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as well as the efforts of his team at the RAC. He gratefully acknowledged Mr. Nelson Andrade Colmenares, Coordinator of the CAR/RCU and expressed his appreciation for the trust Mr. Andrade had always placed in the SPAW/RAC.
8. He concluded by expressing the wish that the French Overseas Department which hosts the SPAW/RAC continue to cooperate with their Caribbean neighbours in the advancement of our common natural heritage through the protection and development of the marine environment and the implementation of the SPAW Protocol
9. In his opening remarks Mr. Nelson Andrade Colmenares, stressed the importance of the SPAW/RAC and recognized the dedication and commitment of Mr. Maurice Anselme and Mr. Stephane Defranoux. He acknowledged the continued support of the Government of France for the SPAW/RAC and noted that the Workshop would have not been possible without the financial support of this Government.
10. He further highlighted the dependency of the people on their natural environment for most of their economic and social well-being. Particularly, as the main economic activity of the region, tourism, is totally dependent on the quality of the coastal and marine environment. In this context, he noted the value and potential of protected areas to safeguard the very same resources on which the sustainable development of the region depend.
11. In closing, he urged the participants to recall the goals set out by WSSD in Johannesburg 2002, and at the World Park Congress in Durban 2003, and thus consider the development of national and regional networks of protected areas as important tools to address eco-regional priorities and gaps, and promote regional cooperation for conservation of the biodiversity of the region.
12. Ms. Borel-Lingertine, First Vice President of the Regional Council, noted with delight that this was the first official Meeting of the SPAW/RAC in Guadeloupe. She expressed the hope that it would lead to the creation of new networks and strengthen existing ones with their Caribbean neighbours. She stressed the importance of cooperation and networking in the sustainable development of shared resources and wished for the participants, a fruitful Workshop.
13. In his opening remarks, the Prefect of Guadeloupe highlighted the ecological and social richness of the Caribbean Region, and the total dependency on the natural resources of the two major economic activities of the region, tourism and fishing. He also noted the collective goods and services provided by the environment towards sustainable development; the difficulty in placing a monetary value on these goods and services; and the diminishing benefits from these natural resources, due to irreversible damage from natural and human causes to fragile ecosystems.

14. He further noted that the establishment of common guidelines and criteria to evaluate protected areas, and the establishment of a Caribbean network of protected areas for monitoring the status of these areas, are areas of particular concern to the three French Overseas Departments, which are supported by the Government of France through its commitment to the Caribbean Environment Programme and SPAW Protocol, and in the creation of the Regional Activity Centre for the SPAW Protocol, in Guadeloupe. He stressed that the SPAW/RAC, in accordance with the responsibilities it was given by the Parties to the Cartagena Convention, is a cooperative tool at the disposal of the Caribbean States. The Prefect wished the participants a constructive and productive Workshop, and declared the Workshop formally opened.

AGENDA ITEM 2: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

15. The Meeting elected from among the participants the following officers of the Workshop:

Chairperson:	Mr. Tahar Ou-Rabah	France
First Vice-Chairperson:	Mr. Reinaldo Estrada Estrada	Cuba
Rapporteur:	Mr. Paul Hoetjes	Netherlands Antilles

AGENDA ITEM 3: ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING

a) Rules of Procedure

16. The Meeting agreed to apply *mutatis mutandis* the Rules of Procedure of the Governing Council of UNEP, as contained in document UNEP/GC/3/Rev.3.

b) Organisation of work

17. English, French and Spanish were the working languages of the Meeting. The Working Documents of the Meeting were available in all the working languages.
18. The Secretariat convened the Meeting in plenary sessions, with the assistance of a Drafting Group to discuss the draft Guidelines. Simultaneous interpretation in the working languages was available for the plenary sessions.

AGENDA ITEM 4: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

19. Participants were invited to review the Agenda of the Meeting as contained in document UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/1. The Agenda was adopted as reflected in Annex I to this Report.

AGENDA ITEM 5: INTRODUCTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DRAFT GUIDELINES

20. The Chairman invited the UNEP-CAR/RCU Secretariat and the SPAW/RAC to provide a brief overview on the decisions, recommendations and process leading to the development of the “Draft Guidelines and Criteria for Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/2). Ms. Alessandra Vanzella-Khouri, SPAW Programme Officer at UNEP-CAR/RCU, noted that Article 7 of the Protocol calls for the Parties to establish a list of protected areas, in accordance with the guidelines and criteria concerning the identification, selection, establishment, management, protection of the area, and any other matter agreed to by the Parties pursuant to Article 21. She reminded the Meeting that in 1993 at the Second Meeting of the Interim STAC in French Guiana (ISTAC2), the governments had agreed that in addition to the guidelines and criteria on protected areas specified in Article 21, it was important to develop guidelines to assist with the evaluation of the protected areas nominated for listing under Article 7.
21. In this context, and following the entry into force of the SPAW Protocol in 2000, the Parties recalled this decision at the First Meeting of the Parties in Havana, Cuba, in 2001. Subsequently, at the Second Meeting of the STAC (Curaçao, 2003), the Parties requested that the SPAW/RAC initiate as soon as possible, the process to develop the draft guidelines through the SPAW list serve. It was also requested that the SPAW/RAC convene a regional Workshop no later than the first quarter of 2004, to review the first draft of the document prior to the COP3 of SPAW, where it will be presented and further action recommended.
22. Mr. Stephane Defranoux of the SPAW/RAC, outlined the process of development of the draft Guidelines as per Recommendation No. IV of the STAC 2 in Curaçao in 2003, and as summarised in the “Report of the Working Group on the Development of Guidelines for the Listing of Protected Areas under the SPAW Protocol” (UNEP(DEC)CAR WG.26/INF.4). He noted that the Contracting Parties to SPAW, and other members of the list-serve were invited to nominate experts to participate in an electronic Working Group and to provide relevant documents and information to assist in the process. In the absence of a detailed mandate from the Parties for the Working Group, the experts agreed to develop Terms of Reference to focus their work as appropriate.
23. The Working Group agreed on the intrinsic linkages between the draft Guidelines and CEP Technical Report No. 37, developed under the SPAW programme in 1996, prior to the entry into force of the SPAW Protocol. It was recognised that given the evolution in the concepts relevant to protected areas, CEP Technical Report No. 37 will probably require updating and thus, other documents would also be used to complement the information. He noted that the Working Group agreed to focus its work of the draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol, and to also use the process to appropriately identify the necessary changes to CEP Technical Report No. 37.

24. The Chairman of the Meeting invited the members of the Working Group attending the Workshop, to provide any additional comments to complement the presentations on the work of the Working Group and the contents of the Report of the Working Group on the Development of Guidelines for the listing of Protected Areas under the SPAW Protocol (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/INF.4).

**AGENDA ITEM 6: SUMMARY OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS AND
PRESENTATION OF THE DRAFT GUIDELINES DEVELOPED
BY THE WORKING GROUP**

25. The Chairman invited the SPAW/RAC which coordinated the Working Group, to present the “Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/2). In his presentation, Mr. Stephane Defranoux noted that the draft Guidelines were developed taking into consideration a number of general principles, which aim at the conservation of natural resources. He further noted, that the areas to be included in the SPAW Protected Areas List are intended to provide examples and models for the protection of natural resources in the Region, and should be representative of the Wider Caribbean Region.
26. The importance of developing cooperative agreements on a bilateral and multilateral basis for the conservation and management of natural sites; the establishment of transboundary protected areas; and the development of a regional representative network of protected areas; were also highlighted as important principles of the Guidelines. Mr. Defranoux also introduced the documents: “Draft Annotated Format for Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/3), and “Draft Grid for the Objective Evaluation of Proposals for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List” (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/4). He pointed out that although not specifically requested by the Parties, these two documents were developed by the Working Group in an effort to assist the Contracting Parties and the STAC with the reporting and evaluation of the areas nominated. The SPAW/RAC representative closed by welcoming the input, guidance, and comments from the participants in particular the members of the Working Group present at the Workshop.
27. In the discussion that followed, the need for clarity in the scope and purpose of the Guidelines was raised. In regard to the introduction of the Guidelines, the Meeting agreed to make specific reference to the relevant Articles of SPAW, (namely Articles 4, 7 and 21), and the historical and background references of the process should be noted in the Report of the Working Group (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/INF.4). In this context, the definition of “protected area” as per Articles 1 and 4 of the Protocol, was included in the Introduction to the Guidelines document.

AGENDA ITEM 7: DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE LISTING OF PROTECTED AREAS UNDER THE SPAW PROTOCOL

28. The Meeting proceeded to discuss the draft Guidelines following the main sections of the document. The Chairman established the drafting group, which was made up of representatives from the Governments of the United States of America (Chairman), and Cuba, as well as representatives from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), The World Conservation Union (IUCN), and The Nature Conservancy (TNC). The drafting group was charged with the responsibility of proposing alternative text on the more difficult issues. During the discussion of the general principles of the Guidelines, it was noted that the scope, general philosophy, and level of detail of the criteria, required clarification. The participants also stressed that the Guidelines should include the notion of stakeholder participation, and that the economic and social dimensions be valued, without jeopardizing the conservation of natural resources.
29. Overall, the agreed criteria to be used for the selection of protected areas for inclusion in the SPAW List were: Ecological, (i.e. Uniqueness, Representativeness: Size, Species, Naturalness, Critical Habitats, Diversity, Connectivity, Coherence and Resilience); Cultural and Socio-economic; Legal; and Protection, Planning and Management measures.
30. Several experts suggested that care be taken in defining the scope of the criteria. In this context, discussions were held to assess the need to have both a “general” and a “sub-list” of protected areas, as well as to define the types of areas (of regional and/or national interest) that should be part of these lists. The general consensus was that the Parties should aim to develop only one list of protected areas under Article 7 of the Protocol. The notion of listing protected areas of national interest and/or areas of regional importance was also taken into consideration and discussed. It was agreed, that while areas of national interest will be listed, these should also meet one or more criteria to support their regional importance.
31. There was also discussion on the geographical definition of the areas, whether purely marine, partly marine/terrestrial, or purely terrestrial parks, were to be included in the list. It was clarified that this is already taken into account in the text of the Protocol, in particular, under the definition in Article 1 of the “Wider Caribbean Region”, and under Article 4.
32. With regard to transboundary sites, there were discussions on the possibility of including not only transboundary areas but also cluster areas, to promote co-operation between areas not necessarily in geographical proximity. It was also proposed that while it is preferable for an area to have a management plan, areas which meet other listing criteria, should not be excluded if they do not have a management plan. However, most participants did not share this view.
33. During discussions on the general features, it was asked whether or not the criteria should be mandatory, alternative, or cumulative. The criteria on the general features,

were grouped as ecological, cultural and socio-economic, highlighting these values, within the regional context. With regard to the criteria dealing with the aesthetic value of an area, it was agreed that the concepts of landscapes and seascapes also be incorporated.

34. Therefore, in keeping with Article 4(2), the Meeting agreed that an area is also considered to be of high value, when conserving and maintaining the existence of natural resources required for sustainable traditional or cultural activities, that provide economic or social benefits, and upon which the welfare of local inhabitants is dependent. A proposal was made to further define the notion of local inhabitants, to include minorities such as indigenous communities and others.
35. The Meeting elaborated on the “uniqueness” of an area to include e.g. spawning areas, or areas with natural resources or species that have been seriously depleted in a country or the region. “Natural representativeness” and “naturalness” were considered to be included under “ecological criteria”.
36. The notion of ecological resilience of an area (the degree to which an area has shown itself to be more resistant to deterioration than others), was introduced in the Guidelines and there was consensus to include it in the revised draft, as the connectivity between resilient areas may help fragile ecosystems.
37. It was agreed that the concept of genetic diversity will be added to these criteria, as well as the notion to include all endangered, threatened and endemic species, and not only those listed in the SPAW Protocol.
38. When defining critical habitats for the criteria, it was agreed to refer to those that could contain fragile or threatened species, or those, which would need to be protected to avoid species from becoming threatened or endangered. It was agreed that species of economic importance to the region should also be highlighted.
39. It was agreed that other attributes dealing with legal and managerial matters, would be transferred to the corresponding section as appropriate. The Drafting Group was requested to incorporate comments and present a revised draft document for the points covered.
40. The Chairman of the Meeting invited the Drafting Group to present the revised draft Guidelines document and clarified that in view of the long process of reviewing and developing the Guidelines, the participants be asked to intervene only if they were not in agreement with the text presented. The adoption of documents: Draft Annotated Format for Presentation Reports for the Areas Proposed for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/3), and Draft Grid for the Objective Evaluation of Proposals for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/4), would follow the review of the revised draft Guidelines.
41. The Chairman of the Drafting Group proceeded to explain the revised draft Guidelines section by section, and to clarify the intent for the reformulation of the original when incorporating the comments and recommendations of the Meeting.

43.42. The Meeting discussed the need to avoid making the general principles too specific, as the respective criteria are more elaborate. The Drafting Group raised the question whether the operative goal for the whole section on General Principles, should in principle reflect Article 10 of the Cartagena Convention, or Article 3 of the SPAW Protocol. Comments on promoting the social and economic aspects of education and the participation of various stakeholders so that the general principles remain coherent and consistent were noted. Additional discussions on General Principles took into account the need for generality of the sub-paragraphs and adjusted them accordingly. The addition of specific criteria on preservation and protection of areas with special value; preventing species from becoming endangered or extinct; and providing for special needs of threatened species; as well as of the species in the Annexes to the SPAW Protocol, were agreed upon.

44.43. The Meeting discussed the “Introduction” and the “General Principles” of the document. The concept of “protected areas constituting a network aimed at the effective conservation of the Caribbean natural heritage” was discussed, and it was agreed that although this is an operational statement, it could be included under “General Principles”. The pursuit of other aims such as the conservation of cultural heritage, and the promotion of scientific research, education, participation, collaboration, are also highly desirable and will be favourable factors for inclusion in the List, to the extent that which they remain compatible with the ultimate conservation goals.

45.44. In this context, the need to have a clear notion of the aim of the “Guidelines” was highlighted, as this will be the base of the pre-requisites to be set. Discussion indicated that further guidance from the Parties might be useful to clarify the goals of the network established under Article 7.

45. Main changes in the Introduction reflected the wish of the Meeting to focus on an introduction to the actual guidelines and criteria, providing a careful description of the outline of, and links with, the SPAW Protocol. Portions deleted related specifically to the process of the Working Group. Further discussions on the principal changes in the Introduction focused on the contributions of the regional network established in accordance with Article 7, in achieving the targets of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), on representative networks of protected areas in line with other relevant international treaties. Specific international treaties were not elaborated upon as the Meeting agreed it would not be useful to list numerous international treaties and programmes, as all the Parties to the SPAW Protocol might not necessarily be Parties to the treaties mentioned.

46. Managerial aspects were discussed and it was indicated that the management notion should be promoted in view of the aim to have effective protected areas. However, since some of the most effective protected areas in the region lack management plans they would be excluded from listing should it be considered a mandatory pre-requisite. In the Mediterranean Protocol, protected areas have a requirement to develop a management plan within three years of listing and the Meeting discussed this approach

as well. This would however be discussed in more detail under “Protection, Planning and Management Measures”.

47. The question arose as to whether listed sites should be widely recognized, at least at the national level, as exemplary models of good governance and management, or demonstrate effectiveness in management, or simply have a management plan that defines institutional and legal frameworks.
48. It was agreed that some sort of framework or management scheme must be present. It was pointed out that although there are some effective areas without management plans, they might be dependent on high performing individuals, making the effective management of these areas at risk in the long-term. It was also considered important to have management plans so that local communities can follow the process and understand the aims and results of the protected area in question. Under “General Principles”, a legal and institutional framework was considered necessary, and a general management framework and a management plan were considered desirable.
49. It was agreed that with regard to the effectiveness of the network of protected areas, it should be promoted through the development of cooperative agreements. Further, there would be no limit to the number of areas included in the list or the number of areas any individual Party can nominate. The question was raised whether this would be a list that considers management needs as criteria for listing, or if it is the characterization of the sites that should be taken into account, according to the conformity of the criteria indicated.
50. The concept of “representativeness” was considered to be single criteria for eligibility with the inclusion of “eco-regions”. The evaluation of “effective management” was discussed and some concern was raised with regard to this evaluation. It was however pointed out to the Meeting that at COP7 of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), 188 governments adopted a Global Programme of Action on Protected Areas, to improve the effectiveness of protected areas, and that the listing process should support this initiative.
51. The Meeting agreed with the aim of the network of protected areas to facilitate the creation of networks across a range of ecosystems within bioregions. It was further agreed that the network should contribute to the adaptation and mitigation of impacts of global changes to the extent possible. Opportunities for recreation, sustainable livelihoods and conservation of the aesthetic and cultural values, taking into account the needs of users, is also provided for in the “General Principles”.
52. With regard to the introduction under “Ecological, Cultural and Socio-economic Criteria”, there was consensus that it would be mandatory to fulfil at least one of the criteria mentioned. So as to prevent possible misunderstanding, “the view to sustainable development” was added with regard to all criteria, activities and use of areas and resources, and reference was made to Article 4.
53. The “Ecological Criteria” were further specified to take into account key ecological processes of regional significance. Areas with migratory species were also incorporated under areas of high diversity.

54. The Meeting accepted the criteria of “Uniqueness” and proceeded to discuss the notion of “Representativeness”. Reference was made to ecological process, as well as adequate size of an area. Concerns were raised as to whether the reference to areas of adequate size should be incorporated into the “Principles” or the criteria, as well as whether it should be listed as its own criteria. The Meeting noted that when integrated with the Draft Grid (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG. 26/4), which is to further define each of the criteria, further clarification would be given on these criteria on size.
55. The wording on “Naturalness” was maintained with comments on the translation into Spanish, which need to be adjusted. “Critical habitats”, now reflect that presence in a protected area of one threatened, endangered or endemic species, or species listed in Annex I, II and III of the SPAW Protocol, can be sufficient for the listing process of that area.
56. In an attempt to address the debate on “high diversity”, it was considered that the wording “variety or richness of species” would be more appropriate. A future-oriented view was highlighted when the words “ongoing for their viability and integrity”, were added. The notions of landscape and seascape diversity and migratory species, were also added to the text. It was considered that due to the vastness of the notion of biodiversity, the general text was sufficient. “High number of species”, and “large populations” were also mentioned, but not incorporated.
57. The concepts of “reasonable timeframe” and “naturally induced changes”, e.g. climate change were incorporated under “Resilience”. Extensive discussion on the notion of “vulnerability” was introduced to facilitate the addition of a vulnerable area to the list, as it is susceptible to degradation, and therefore needs to be included. Opinions of the Meeting differed on this subject, as “vulnerability” or “threat” suggest urgency of action, but not necessarily the need for listing. However, the notion of “vulnerability”, was kept in the Guidelines for future reference in the process to come.
58. The question of “transboundary areas” is not addressed by the Protocol, but adjacent areas are. Under this point, “transboundary”, as well as “ecologically connected” or “adjacent areas”, were considered valued components and were incorporated together with fragmentation under “Connectivity/Coherence”.
59. The Drafting Group had added the new concept of “Productivity”, as it was used in the Protocol, and considers areas that increase the abundance of natural resources. The Meeting agreed to the formulation but felt it was better suited under the “cultural and socio-economic criteria”, to which it was moved.
60. Due to time constraints and the very detailed discussions on wording, the Chairman proposed that the Meeting focus on the main ideas of the “Criteria” and entrusted the Drafting Group to formalize the document when in a smaller group.
61. Following the comments made by the representative of UNESCO, it was agreed that under “Cultural and Socio-economic Criteria”, a distinction be made between “productivity” and “biological integrity”, and that the Drafting Group should further elaborate on this according to the discussions. The comment was made that production

should conserve, maintain, and restore natural resources used by humans, as a contribution to regional sustainable development.

62. Further, the Meeting agreed to remove “economy value” from “Cultural and Socio-Economic Criteria”, and introduced a new addition on the characters and factors that should also be considered as favourable attributes for the inclusion of the site on the List. However, this is to be finalized by the Drafting Group. The issue of whether these additions are favourable or mandatory, also needs to be addressed.
63. With regard to the section on the “Legal Framework”, there was discussion to include the concept of formal arrangements between the Parties and any private owners, where appropriate. Although a number of participants positively outlined the reasons behind this proposal, the Meeting did not agree to include this concept, as it would be contrary to the legal systems in some countries. It was also noted that any criteria provided in this regard, and for that matter in this section, had to be carefully worded to ensure it did not go beyond the provisions of the Protocol on the sovereignty or jurisdiction of a Party. In this context, the Meeting was reminded by the Secretariat that Articles 3, 4 and 5 of the Protocol provided the specific references in this regard, so it might not be necessary to repeat those provisions in the criteria.
64. It was noted that the proposed criteria under “legal status” reaffirm the fact that Articles 4, 5, and 6 of the Protocol constantly refer to “national legislation framework” and summarize the approach in the Protocol. The Meeting discussed the issue of listing private areas, lands or private reserves, for which Parties had not yet developed a legal status, but where the need to ensure the sustainability of the area in question merits inclusion under SPAW
65. The Meeting had discussion on whether the criteria on legal aspects should also make reference to protected areas on the high seas in accordance with UNCLOS. It was agreed that given the definitions specified in the Protocol, and the fact that legal experts were not present at the Meeting, it was better to leave this section in brackets, to be discussed at a later date, in the finalization process of the Guidelines.
66. With regard to the “Planning and Management Measures”, the Meeting discussed at length the various aspects and implications of the criteria. The Meeting provided several modifications to the original proposal, highlighting the importance of the participatory processes in planning and management, as well as the empowerment of stakeholders. The Meeting also discussed at length the key elements of the Management Plan and recognized the fact that management plans alone, without an implementation mechanism, and the appropriate resources for its implementation were not sufficient and thus, this aspect had to be stressed in the criteria. The importance of including public awareness and education programmes, as well as research and monitoring programmes as part of the implementation of the management plan was stressed, and further developed in the criteria.
67. The possibility to maintain the dimension of a management plan even though not defined, was raised (e.g.: show planning or assessment of the area, of at least a couple

- of pages). The need for a plan with certain infrastructure and out-fitting was expressed, and the suggestion made that this should be mandatory.
68. The areas should demonstrate efficient management either by presenting a management plan or by demonstrating a history of effective management of the area. The effectiveness and actualisation of the plans should be taken into account as many areas work with plans that have not been updated on a regular basis. The Meeting also discussed the significance of the List on management effectiveness, and the criteria by which areas would be listed/de-listed, and by whom. The linkages between management effectiveness and indicators to assess this effectiveness were discussed. It was agreed to incorporate indicators on “management effectiveness”.
69. While discussing the management aspects, questions were raised concerning which of the management elements should be considered requirements for listing. One of the elements considered mandatory by the Meeting was the existence of a management plan. In this context, it was agreed that a brief section in the Guidelines would have to be added at a later date to summarize all the mandatory criteria.

AGENDA ITEM 8: PRESENTATION ON THE NATURE RESERVE OF PETITE TERRE

70. The Chairman invited Mr. Rene Dupont, Curator of the Nature Reserve of Petite Terre, to begin his presentation. The Curator gave a general presentation of the Nature Reserve, which consists of two islands (148 ha); Terre-de-Haut and Terre-de-Basse, as well as a marine area of 842 ha. The Reserve is owned by the State and was declared a protected area in 1976. However, it was not until 3 September 1998, that it was declared a Nature Reserve. Mr. Dupont outlined the ecological aspects and physical environment, as well as the flora and fauna of the reserve and its regulations. The Reserve is co-managed by the Association of Desirade “Ti-tè” and the National Forest Office (ONF), through a Curator (ONF), three rangers (Ti-tè) and a technical aid volunteer. Financial assistance is provided by the Overseas Territories of the Government of France and Europe, as well as maritime taxes imposed on visitors to Petite Terre. Ongoing activities for 2004 include validation of the management plan 2004-2008; conservation of heritage; and communication and education. The Chairman thanked the Curator for his presentation.

AGENDA ITEM 9: ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MEETING

71. The revised draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/2/Rev.1), with the agreed amendments as well as issues requiring further discussion and incorporated with the assistance of the Drafting Group, were presented to the Meeting for final review and

adoption. The revised Guidelines as agreed by the Meeting are appended as Annex V to this Report.

72. The Meeting also provided Recommendations on the follow-up actions required for the process of development of the revised draft Guidelines. These Recommendations are appended as Annex IV to this Report. It was agreed that the Working Group would continue working on the issues requiring further discussion, and that participants of the Meeting not already included in the Working Group, could contact the SPAW/RAC and be included in the electronic Working Group.

AGENDA ITEM 10: OTHER BUSINESS

73. The participants of the Meeting were invited to raise any other issues not previously covered during the deliberations, which were relevant to the objectives of the Meeting.
74. The representative from The Nature Conservancy (TNC) requested that her Organization be given an opportunity to briefly present the work of TNC on the Greater Caribbean Basin Eco-regional Assessment. In her presentation, Ms. Bustamante informed the Meeting that TNC has undertaken an intensive two-year study of the Greater Caribbean Basin. This study includes detailed examination and mapping of the Region's Biological Diversity as well as its social, and economic climate. The Nature Conservancy's strategic science-based planning process "conservation by design", assists in identifying the highest priority places that if conserved, promise to ensure biodiversity over the long-term.
75. The biological and socio-economic information will be assembled in an open architecture data design, which will be made freely available to interested stakeholders via the Internet, and will be organized in a manner where new information can be easily incorporated. Components of the Greater Caribbean assessment will include mapping bio-diversity; analysing target viability and human-induced impacts; identifying gaps and setting conservation goals; mapping portfolio solutions with Marxam software; and measuring site irreplaceability and landscape connectivity.
76. National Implementation Support Programmes (NISPs) are the formalized agreements between governments and NGOs that will outline the main areas of work in order to achieve the objectives of the Global Programme of Work. NISPs will outline areas of collaboration related to the implementation of the PoW, and specify financial and technical contributions by NGOs, government agencies, and public donors. The first NISPs has been signed with Jamaica, and The Nature Conservancy is also supporting NISPs in Ecuador, Indonesia, and Palau, and in the coming years hope to sign with many of the countries with which it works.
77. The representative of the ECCEA, Ms. Lesley Sully, made a brief presentation on the proposal of the marine mammal sanctuary for the French Overseas Departments in the Caribbean, informing the Meeting of the efforts being made to bring this proposal to fruition.

AGENDA ITEM 11: ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

78. The Rapporteur of the Meeting presented the draft Report of the Meeting (UNEP(DEC)CAR WG.26/5), and invited the participants to review and adopt it with the necessary modifications.
79. During the adoption of the Report, it was agreed that in the interest of time, Annexes IV and V of the Report should be reviewed first and modifications made at that moment. The remainder of the Report was to be reviewed in detail by the participants after the Meeting. The participants agreed to provide any additional comments to the secretariat within two weeks after the Meeting, in order to finalize the Report. All comments received from the participants are reflected in the text of this Report.

AGENDA ITEM 12: CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

80. In his closing remarks, the Chairman of the Meeting commented that the Government France was ready to support the activities to be undertaken by the SPAW/RAC. He further thanked the participants, as well as the Drafting Group headed by the delegation of the United States, for their proficiency, which resulted in the progress achieved with the revised draft Guidelines. He also thanked the Secretariat and particularly the SPAW/RAC that took on the challenge to organize the Meeting and working hard for one year to host a successful Meeting despite the heavy workload. The interpreters were also thanked for their assistance in helping to fulfil the goals of the Meeting.
81. On behalf of the Coordinator of UNEP-CAR/RCU, the Secretariat thanked the Government of France for their financial and logistical support. The efficiency of the SPAW/RAC was especially highlighted, and they were thanked for coordinating the preparation of the draft Guidelines document as well as for the organization of the Meeting. The Secretariat further thanked the Chairman for his effectiveness and clarity, the Rapporteur, and all the participants; and encouraged them to continue to be active in the process to complete the Guidelines and assist the SPAW/RAC in finalizing the process.
82. Mr. Maurice Anselme, on behalf of the SPAW/RAC, thanked the regional team which provided support to the RAC, the experts, and organisations participating in the Meeting as well as the interpreters.
83. The Meeting was closed at 5.30 p.m., on Thursday 23 April 2004, by the Chairman.

ANNEX I/ANEXO I/ANNEXE I
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS /LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS/LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES
CONTRACTING PARTIES/ PARTIES CONTRACTANTES/PARTES CONTRACTANTES

<i>Participants/Participants/ Participantes</i>	<i>Title/Titre/Titulo</i>	<i>Address/Adresse/Direction</i>	<i>Tel/Fax/E-mail</i>
CUBA/CUBA/CUBA			
Reynaldo Estrada Estrada	Director del Centro Nacional de Areas Protegidas	Centro National de Areas Protegidas Calle 18 A, n°4114 E/41 Y 47 Playa Cuidad de la Habana CP. 11300	Tel: (537) 202 7970 Fax: (537) 204 0798 Rey@snap.cu
FRANCE/FRANCE/FRANCIA			
Tahar Ou-Rabah	Chargé de mission	Ministère de l'écologie et du développement durable 20 Avenue de Segur 75302 Paris 07 SP	Tel: 01 42 19 20 90 Fax: 01 42 19 19 06 tahar.ou-rabah@environnement.gouv.fr
Philippe Robert	Responsable scientifique	Castel Sre Claire Parc National de Port Cros 83418 Hyeres, Cedex F	Tel 0494 12 8230 Fax 0494 12 8231 p.robert@pnpc.com.fr
Dominique Deviers	Directeur Régional de l'Environnement	Direction régionale de l'Environnement Cité Guillard, Rue des bougainvilliers 97100 Basse-Terre	Tel : 0590 99 35 60 Fax : 0590 99 35 65 DIREN@guadeloupe.environment.gouv.fr
Yves Brugière	Directeur	Parc national de la Guadeloupe Habitation Beausoleil, Montéran 97 120 St. Claude	Tel : 0590 80 86 00 Fax : 0590 80 05 46
Mylène Valentin	Chef du service protection de la Nature et Protection des Paysages	Direction régionale de l'Environnement Cité Guillard, Rue des bougainvilliers 97100 Basse-Terre	Tel : 0590 99 35 60 Fax : 0590 99 35 65 Mylene.valentin@guadeloupe.environment.gouv.fr

NETHERLANDS ANTILLES/ANTILLES NEERLANDAISES/ANTILLAS NEERLANDESAS

Paul Hoetjes	Senior Policy Advisor	Directorate of Public Health Department Of Environment and Nature Conservation Santa Rosaweg 122 Curaçao	Tel: (5999) 736-3530 Fax: (5999) 736-3505 paul@mina.vomil.an
--------------	-----------------------	---	--

ST. LUCIA/STE. LUCIE/STA.LUCIA

Susanna Scott	Fisheries Biologist	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries Point Seraphine, Castries	Tel: (758) 468 4138 Fax: (758) 4523853 deptfish@slumaffe.org
---------------	---------------------	--	---

TRINIDAD & TOBAGO/TRINIDAD ET TOBAGO/TRINIDAD Y TOBAGO

Robyn Cross	Technical Coordinator	Environmental Management Authority (EMA) 8 Elizabeth Street St Clair, Port-of-Spain	Tel: 868 (628) 8042 Fax: 868 (628) 9122 rcross@ema.co.tt
-------------	-----------------------	---	--

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA/LES ETATS UNIS/ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA

Arthur Paterson	International Affairs Specialist	National Ocean Service (NOAA) Department of commerce Room 5627, SSMC 3 1315 East West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910	Tel: (301) 713 3078 Fax: (301) 713 4263 Arthur.E.Paterson@noaa.gov
-----------------	----------------------------------	---	--

VENEZUELA/VENEZUELA/VENEZUELA

Luz Amelia Sanchez Arguello	Directora	Oficina de areas protegidas (ANAPRO) Oficina Nacional de Diversidad Biologica Torre Sur, Piso 6 Oficina 615 Centro Simon Bolivar El Silencio, Caracas	Tel: (58) 212 4082154 Fax: (58) 212 4082150 lsanchez@marn.gov.ve
-----------------------------	-----------	--	--

WORKING GROUP PARTICIPANTS/MEMBRES DU GROUPE DE TRAVAIL/MIEMBROS DEL GRUPO DE TRABAJO

<i>Participants/Participants/ Participantes</i>	<i>Title/Titre/Titulo</i>	Address/Adresse/Direction	<i>Tel/Fax/E-mail</i>
---	---------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------

CARIBBEAN NATURAL RESOURCES INSTITUTE (CANARI)

Lyndon John	Associate Director	Fernandes Industrial Center Administration Building Eastern Main Road Laventille, Trinidad W.I.	Tel: (868) 626 6062 Fax: (868) 626 1788 lyndon@canari.org
-------------	--------------------	--	--

ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT SERVICES (ESS)

Lloyd Gardner	Environmental Planner	Environmental Support Services,LLC. PO box 305031 St. Thomas, VI 00803-5031	Tel: (340) 693 1209 Fax: (340) 693 1210 lgardne@uvi.edu lsg_jr@hotmail.com
---------------	-----------------------	---	--

THE NATURE CONSERVANCY (TNC)

Georgina Bustamante	Marine Science and Policy Advisor	The Nature Conservancy 2455 E Sunrise Boulevard	Tel: (954) 564-6144 Fax: (954) 564-6184
---------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--

Penthouse South
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33304 USA

gbustamante@tnc.org

EASTERN CARIBBEAN COALITION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS (ECCEA)

Lesley Suttty	CEO and Head of Operation	Museum of Natural History BP 4030 Terre sainte 97 254 Fort de France Cedex Martinique, FWI	Tel: (596) 596 656725 Fax: (596) 596 656725 lsuttty@wanadoo.fr
---------------	------------------------------	--	--

ASSOCIATION POUR L'ETUDE DES VERTEBRES DES ANTILLES

Claudie Pavis		Association pour l'étude des vertébrés des Antilles Hauteur lézarde 97 170 Petit-Bourg	Tel : 0590 25 59 02 Fax : 0590 94 11 72 pavis@antilles.inra.fr
---------------	--	---	--

UNITE NATONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

UNESCO-MAB FRANCE

Catherine Cibien	Secrétaire Scientifique	BP 34 31321 Castanet Tolojsan Cedex	Tel: 05 61 73 57 02 Fax : 05 61 28 55 00 catherine.cibien@toulouse.inra.fr
------------------	----------------------------	---	---

UNIVERSITE ANTILLES GUYANE

Jacques Portecop	Professeur de biologie	Université Antilles Guyane Campus de Fouillole BP 250 97157 Pointe-à-Pitre Cedex	Tel 590 950015 Fax 590 938720 Jacques.portecop@univ-ag.fr
------------------	------------------------	---	--

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (UNDP)

Antonio Perera	Programme Officer	Calle 18 No. 110 Miramar 11300 Ciudad Habana	Tel: (537) 204 1513 Fax: (537) 204 1516 tony.perera@undp.org
----------------	-------------------	--	--

WORLD CONSERVATION UNION (IUCN)

Kristin Sherwood	Marine Programme Officer, Global Marine Programme	1630 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 300 Washington, DC 20009-1053	Tel: (202) 518 2062 Fax: (202) 387 4823 KSherwood@iucnus.org
------------------	---	--	--

CONSEIL REGIONAL DE LA GUADELOUPE

André Bon	Chef de service Recherche	Direction de l'Environnement de la recherche des technologies innovantes et du tourisme Avenue Paul Lacavé-Petit-Paris 97100 Basse-Terre	Tel 590 804040 4026 Ext. 4244 Fax 590 804035 A.bon@cr-guadeloupe.fr
-----------	---------------------------	--	--

Jean-Sébastien Nicolas Responsable Ecotourisme Direction de l'Environnement de la
recherche des technologies innovantes
et du tourisme Tel: (590) 804026
Avenue Paul Lacavé Fax: (590) 804035
97100 Basse-Terre Jsnicolas@hotmail.com

**SECRETARIAT OF THE CARIBBEAN ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME/
SECRETARIAT DU PROGRAMME POUR L'ENVIRONNEMENT DES CARAIBES/
SECRETARIA DEL PROGRAMA AMBIENTAL DEL CARIBE
UNEP-CAR/RCU**

United Nations Environment Programme/
Programme des Nations Unies pour l'Environnement/
Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente
14-20 Port Royal Street, Kingston, Jamaica
Tel: (876) 922-9267, Fax: (876) 922-9292
Website: www.cep.unep.org

<i>Participants/participants/Participantes</i>	<i>Title/Titre/Titulo</i>	<i>E-mail</i>
Nelson Andrade Colmenares	Coordinator, UNEP-CAR/RCU	nac.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com
Heidi Savelli	Junior Professional Officer	hss.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com
Alessandra Vanzella-Khoury	Programme Officer, SPAW	avk.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com
Brenda L.Dewdney	Bilingual Secretary (SPAW)	bld.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com
Donna Henry-Hernandez	Bilingual Secretary (CEPNET)	dhh.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com

**REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE FOR THE PROTOCOL SPAW
CENTRE D'ACTIVITES REGIONAL POUR LE PROTOCOL SPAW
CENTRO REGIONAL DE ACTIVIDADES POR EL SPAW PROTOCOL
(SPAW/RAC)**

SPAW/RAC
Cité Guillard, Rue des bougainvilliers
97100 BASSE TERRE
Guadeloupe, F.W.I
Tel : 590 99 35 60, Fax : 590 99 35 65

<i>Participants/participants/Participantes</i>	<i>Title/Titre/Titulo</i>	<i>E-mail</i>
Maurice Anselme	Directeur	maurice.anselme@guadeloupe.environnement.gouv.fr
Stephane Defranoux	Chargé de mission	stephane.defranoux@guadeloupe.environnement.gouv.fr

ANNEX II

1. Opening Ceremony
2. Election of Officers
3. Organization of the Meeting
4. Adoption of the Agenda
5. Introduction on the Development of the Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol
6. Summary of Background Documents and Presentation of the Draft Guidelines and Criteria Developed by the Working Group
7. Discussion of the Draft Guidelines and Criteria to be listed under the SPAW Protocol
8. Presentation on the National Park of Guadeloupe
9. Adoption of the Draft Guidelines and Criteria, and the Recommendations of the Meeting
10. Other Business
11. Adoption of the Report of the Meeting
12. Closure of the Meeting

ANNEX III
LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Working Documents

UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/1	Provisional Agenda
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/2	Draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/3	Draft Annotated Format for Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/4	Draft Grid for the Objective Evaluation of Proposals for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/5	Report of the Workshop on the draft Guidelines for the Listing of Protected Areas under the SPAW Protocol <i>(to be prepared during the Meeting)</i>

Information Documents

UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/INF.1	Provisional list of documents
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/INF.1/Add.1	Provisional list of documents (Addendum)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/INF.2	Provisional list of participants <i>(to be prepared during the Meeting)</i>
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/INF.3	Directory of Members of SPAW Protocol listserve. (English only)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/INF.4	Report of the Working Group on the Development of Guidelines for the listing of Protected Areas under the SPAW Protocol. (Guadeloupe, November 2003)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/INF.5	The Outcomes of the Seventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Relating to guidance on Establishment of Protected Areas. (Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 9 – 20 and 27 February 2004). (English only)

OSPAR, 2003-17	Guidelines for the Identification and Selection of Marine Protected Areas in the OSPAR Maritime Area. (English only)
IUCN	Guidelines for Protected Area Management Categories. (English and French)
UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.172/INF.3	Criteria for the Choice of Areas and Designation Procedures in other International Frameworks applicable to the Mediterranean Region. (English only)
CEPTR No. 37, 1996	Common Guidelines and Criteria for the Protected Areas in the Wider Caribbean Region: Identification, Selection, Establishment and Management. (English and Spanish)
UNEP, 2000	Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW Protocol)
UNEP/MAP, 1996	Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean. (English and French)

Reference Documents

UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.25/5	Draft Workplan and Budget of the SPAW Programme for the 2004-2005 biennium
UNEP, 2004	Directory of Focal Points of the Caribbean Environment Programme. CEP Information Paper, 2004. (English only)
CBDTR No. 13, 2004	Technical Advice on the Establishment and Management of a National System of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas. (English only)
CBDTR No. 15, 2004	Biodiversity Issues for Consideration in the Planning, Establishment and Management of Protected Area Sites and Networks. (English only)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.25/6	Report of the Second Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC2) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW). (Curaçao, Netherlands Antilles, 3-6 June 2003)

- UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.25/3 Final Report of the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Review of the Criteria for the Listing of Species in the Annexes of the SPAW Protocol. (Curaçao, Netherlands Antilles, 3 - 6 June 2003)
- UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.25/INF.3 Status of Implementation of the Decisions of the SPAW COP1 and COP2 and of the Recommendations of the First Meeting of STAC. (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)
- Ramsar, 2002 Guidance for Identifying and Designating under-represented Wetland Types as Wetlands of International Importance. (Valencia, Spain, 18-26 November 2002)
- IUCN Establishment of the World Heritage List., (Revised 2002, Originally prepared 1998)
- 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, 24-25 September 2001)
- Ramsar, 1999 *“People and Wetlands: The Vital Link”*. Strategic Framework and Guidelines for the Future Development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance. (San Jose, Costa Rica, 10-18 May 1999)

ANNEX IV

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MEETING

The Meeting:

In keeping with Recommendation No. IV of the Second Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC 2) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW Protocol), (Curaçao, Netherlands Antilles, 3-6 June 2003) and Decisions of the Second Meeting of the Conference of Parties of SPAW (COP2) (Montego Bay, Jamaica, 6 May 2002), **reviewed** the draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/2);

Taking into account the other supporting documentation for the draft Guidelines and Criteria, presented to the Meeting, namely the Draft Annotated Format for Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/3), and the Draft Grid for the Objective Evaluation of Proposals for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/4, and

Taking into account the modifications provided to the draft Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/2), as contained in Annex V to this Report,

Recommends that:

1. The SPAW/RAC continues to coordinate the electronic Working Group as mandated by the STAC2, with a view to further advance the development of the revised draft Guidelines, and in particular, to address any pending issues not resolved by the experts at the Meeting;
2. The participants of the Meeting, in particular those who participated in the drafting Group of the Meeting, join the electronic Working Group to continue to enrich the process towards the finalization of the revised draft Guidelines;
3. The electronic Working Group also consider the draft Annotated Format for Presentation Reports for the Areas proposed for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/3), and the Draft Grid for the Objective Evaluation of Proposals for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/4), and make the necessary modifications on the scope and content of these documents, to the extent possible;
4. The Working Group examine CEP Technical Report No. 37, *vis-a-vis* the revised draft Guidelines and recommend the modifications and actions that will be required to ensure compatibility between these two documents;
5. The Working Group present through the Secretariat, the results of their deliberations to the SPAW COP 3, for consideration and further action.

ANNEX V

REVISED DRAFT

GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF PROTECTED AREAS TO BE LISTED UNDER THE SPAW PROTOCOL

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The SPAW Protocol creates an integrated framework for national obligations to establish and manage protected areas and for regional cooperation on protected areas.
2. Under Article 21, the Parties agree to adopt common guidelines and criteria to assist with the identification, selection, establishment, and management of protected areas.
3. According to Article 7 of the Protocol SPAW, the Parties shall establish a List of protected areas to create a regional network of protected areas and develop a cooperation programme. The purpose of this List is therefore to conserve the Caribbean natural heritage through a representative protected area network and regional cooperation.
4. Nominations to the List must provide supporting documentation to demonstrate that the nomination fulfils the common guidelines and criteria on matters adopted by the Parties and established pursuant to Article 21.
5. The First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol (24-25 September 2004, Havana, Cuba) agreed to develop guidelines and criteria for the evaluation of protected areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol.
6. The procedures for the establishment of the List of protected areas are outlined in Article 7(3).
7. For the purposes of these listing guidelines, the SPAW Protocol defines “protected areas” in Articles 1 and 4. “Protected Area” refers to an area that has been established pursuant to Article 4.
8. The regional network will contribute to achieving the targets of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD, 26 August- 4 September, 2002) to establish representative networks of protected areas under multilateral agreements and programmes including but not limited to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Millennium Development Goals, World Parks Congress’ Durban Accord, World Heritage Convention, Ramsar Convention, relevant UNESCO programmes including Man and the Biosphere Programme, Convention on Migratory Species, International Whaling Commission, and other international treaty frameworks.

A. General Principles

In establishing the SPAW List of Protected Areas, the Contracting Parties will be guided by the following general principles:

- I. The List of Protected Areas shall be comprised of sites that sustain the natural resources of the Wider Caribbean Region, and encourage ecologically sound and appropriate use; understanding and enjoyment of these areas, pursuant to SPAW Article 4.
- II. Such sites shall contribute to
 - protecting and preserving areas with special values preventing species from becoming endangered or threatened and support other special values, according to SPAW Article 4(d), and
 - providing for the special needs of threatened, endangered, endemic or migratory species in particular those species on Annexes I, II, III.
- III. The Protected Areas should constitute a network aiming at the effective conservation of the Caribbean natural heritage.
- IV. The Parties shall develop co-operative agreements on bilateral and multilateral bases in the field of conservation and management of natural sites to promote the effectiveness of the network.

[To use the SPAW site network as tool to promote regional and international cooperation in relation to complementary environmental treaties, consistent with the SPAW criteria and listing process]
- V. No limit is imposed on the total number of areas included in the List nor on the number of areas any individual Party can propose for inscription.
- VI. The sites will be selected on a scientific and technical basis and included in the list based on the criteria below; (they will therefore have to) and fulfil the requirements set out by the SPAW Protocol.
- VII. Legal and institutional frameworks are prerequisites for the listing process as well as a general management framework.
- VIII. The network should facilitate the creation of a comprehensive, adequate, and representative system of protected areas in the wider Caribbean region, across all bioregions and across a range of ecosystems within bioregions.
- IX. The network should contribute to the adaptation and mitigation of the impact of global change to the extent possible.
- X. Provide opportunities for recreation, sustainable livelihoods, and conservation of the aesthetic and cultural values considering the needs of all users.

Any area to be included in the list of protected areas recognized by the SPAW Protocol must conform to the following guidelines and criteria:

B. Ecological, Cultural and Socio-Economic Criteria

Only protected areas established consistent with Article 4 are to be considered for inclusion on the List. Article 4 states that protected areas shall be established with a view to sustaining the natural resources of the Wider Caribbean Region and encouraging ecologically sound and appropriate use, understanding and enjoyment of these areas, in accordance with the objectives and characteristics of each of them, within a framework of sustainable development.

The area must fulfil at least one of the ecological or cultural or socio-economic criteria in accordance with Article 4. **RETURN TO THIS ISSUE**

[The area must fulfill one of the ecological criteria, in addition may fulfill one of the cultural or socio-economic criteria in accordance with Article 4]

The same area can in certain cases fulfil several of these general criteria, and such a circumstance cannot but strengthen the case for the inclusion of the area in the List.

Ecological Criteria

The area is of key importance for conserving the components of biological diversity in the Wider Caribbean Region:

- a) Representativeness – the protected areas **must** be representative of the region or eco-region's characteristic physiographic features, species, populations, habitats and ecosystems types or ecological processes.
- b) Size – The protected area **must** have an adequate size to ensure the conservation of the elements for which it is listed.
- c) Species - The area must help prevent species from becoming endangered or threatened.
- d) Uniqueness – The area **should** contain unique or rare species, habitats, or ecosystems. An area or ecosystem is unique if it is among the few of its kind in the country or Wider Caribbean Region or has been seriously depleted across its range. The area may contain habitats that occur in a limited area, or rare, endemic, threatened or endangered species that are geographically restricted.
- e) Naturalness – The area should a high degree of naturalness as a result of the lack of or low level of human-induced disturbance and degradation.
- f) Critical habitats – The protected areas **should** contain habitats and ecosystems that are critical to the survival and have recovery of endangered, threatened, endemic species, or to species listed in Annex I, II and III of the Protocol.
- g) Diversity – The area **should** contain the variety or richness of species, communities, ecosystems, landscape, seascape and genetic diversity that allow for the conservation of their long term viability and integrity, especially where there are endangered, threatened, endemic and/or migratory species, and those listed under the SPAW Protocol.
- h) Connectivity/coherence – Protected areas that are adjacent, transboundary or ecologically connected and thus contribute to the regional network are valued components of the regional network and **should** be considered if nominated by the Parties which have jurisdiction over these areas.
- i) Resilience – The area **may** contain biological components (habitats, species or populations) that have the ability to recover to from disturbances in a reasonable timeframe, or are naturally resistant to threats such as climate change. For example, the protection of these areas may be able to enhance the recovery of damaged ecosystem elsewhere in the eco-region by providing a source of larvae and juveniles.

Cultural and Socio-Economic Criteria

- a) Productivity – The protected area should conserve, maintain or restore natural processes that contribute to increase the abundance of natural resources used by humans, as a contribution to regional sustainable development.

- b) Cultural and traditional use – The protected area should have a special value in the regional context in order to conserve, maintain and restore the productivity and biological integrity of natural resources that provide for sustainable traditional or cultural activities such as those of indigenous communities.
- c) Socio-economic benefits – The protected area should have a special value in the regional context in order to conserve, maintain and restore the productivity and biological integrity of natural resources that provide for economic or social benefits of user groups such as subsistence fishers and rural communities.

(New section)

[In addition to the fundamental criteria specified in paragraph B, the following characteristics and factors should also be considered as favourable attributes for the inclusion of the site in the List.]

C. Legal Criteria Framework

- I. The protected area must have a legal status, guaranteeing its effective long-term protection, in conformity with the Party's national legislation and international law and consistent with the SPAW Protocol, including Articles 3, 4, 5 and 6.
- II. [In the case of areas situated, partly or wholly, on the high sea or in a zone where the limits of national sovereignty or jurisdiction have not yet been defined, the legal status, the management plan, the applicable measures and the other elements provided for in Article 9(?) of the Protocol will be provided in accordance with UNCLOS??? by the neighbouring Parties concerned in the proposal for inclusion in the SPAW List.]

D. Protection, Planning and Management Measures

Any protected area to be listed must have a management plan and a mechanism for implementation that conforms to the following:

I. Management Plan

- a) *The protected area must have a management plan that has been adopted by the Party and specifies the legal and institutional framework and protection measures applicable to the area consistent with Article 6 of the Protocol.
- b) *The protected area must have a functional management body with the authority and means to implement the plan.
- c) *Conservation and management objectives for an area must be clearly defined in nomination documentation, management guidelines and management plan and be implemented by the measures consistent with Article 5.2. The protected area management plan should be integrated within the larger planning framework of the Party where possible.
- d) The planning, management and enforcement measures identified should be based on available traditional, scientific, technical and management-oriented knowledge and information. The management plan should address programmes to fill shortcomings in knowledge and information.

II. Evaluation

The plan should include appropriate indicators to measure the management success, pursuant to Article 6.2(c).

NOTE: For the reporting procedure, in order to promote cooperation, documentation should demonstrate that the Party concurs in the participation of the listed site in the cooperation programme pursuant to Article 7.

III. Stakeholders

The relevant stakeholders and local communities should be involved through inclusive and participatory processes in the planning and management of the protected area as appropriate. Such participatory process should include institutional arrangements for the effective participation and empowerment of stakeholders and local communities.

IV. Implementation Mechanism

- a) With regard to the characteristics specific to each site, the management plan should address those measures cited in Article 5.2 which are relevant to both the goals and objectives and specific threats at that particular site and that are within the scope of the management plan.
- b) The management plan should address public awareness and education programmes for users, decision-makers and the public to enhance their appreciation and understanding of protected areas and of the objectives for which they were established, and empower their participation in planning and management as appropriate.
- c) The protected area must have a research and monitoring programme. It should include research and monitoring on user impacts, ecological processes, habitats, species, and populations, and the impact of implementing management measures on the biological resources, human communities and threats thereto. This programme should use appropriate indicators to measure the afore-mentioned factors.

[A new c: The Protected Area's research and monitoring programme must include research and monitoring on the indicators of management performance.]

V. Management Effectiveness:

The protected area must demonstrate that the objectives could/are being complied with.

E. **Annotated Format for the Presentation Reports for the Areas Proposed for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List**

The STAC did not explicitly ask for the preparation of such a document. The group chose to draft a form to be filled that would be of use to the Parties in making nominations for protected areas to be included in the SPAW list pursuant to Articles 7(3) and 19(2) and the criteria set out. [see Draft Annotated Format: UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/3].

F. Preliminary Procedure Proposal (Procedures for Listing and De-Listing)

The STAC did not explicitly ask for addressing the procedures, but the group chose to precise the procedures described in Article 7(3) of the SPAW Protocol:

- Each Party making a nomination shall provide the STAC with the necessary supporting documentation, including in particular, the information noted in Article 19(2).
- The presentation report shall include the nomination form completed.
- A grid will be used by the SPAW/RAC and the STAC for SPAW to perform the due-diligence regarding the nomination for inclusion of sites in the SPAW Protected Areas List. [Draft Grid for the Objective Evaluation of Proposals for inclusion in the SPAW Protected Areas List: UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.26/4].

Listed protected areas shall report periodically to the STAC through the Organization regarding changes in the status of protected areas pursuant to Articles 15, 19 and 20. Protected areas may be removed from the list by the same procedures by which they were incorporated, pursuant to Article 15.

Main documents used to prepare this draft:

- Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean, in particular Annex I
- Guidelines for the Identification and Selection of Marine Protected Areas in the OSPAR Maritime Area (OSPAR ref number 2003-17)
- IUCN Protected Area Management Categories
- Note on Criteria for the Choice of Areas and Designation Procedures in other International Frameworks Applicable to the Mediterranean Region [UNEP(DEC)/MED WG.172/INF.3]
- Common Guidelines and Criteria for the Protected Areas in the Wider Caribbean Region (CEP Technical Report No. 37).