



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



**UNEP**

Distr.  
LIMITED

UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG. 20/3  
24 September 2001

ENGLISH  
Original: ENGLISH

First Meeting of the Contracting Parties  
(COP) to the Protocol Concerning Specially  
Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA  
W) in the Wider Caribbean Region

Havana, Cuba, 24-25 September 2001

**D R A F T**

**Evaluation of the Work of the Interim Scientific and  
Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC)  
of the SPAW Protocol  
since its inception (1992-2000)**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
Executive Summary	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. BACKGROUND	1
2.1 Goals set by the ISTAC	2
3. FINDINGS	4
3.1 Achievements	4
3.2 Limitations	5
3.3 Gaps	8
3.4 Perception of the ISTAC Members	9
4. FOLLOW-UP REQUIRED	10
4.1 Issues to be Addressed	10
4.2 Opportunities and Future Directions	12
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
Literature Cited	16
List of Acronyms	17
Appendices	
Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for the Review	18
Appendix 2: Objectives of the ISTAC Meetings	19
Appendix 3: Major Products of the SPAW Programme	21
Appendix 4: Review Questions Sent to ISTAC Meeting Participants	26

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Introduction**

The Fourth Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA) recommended that a review of the ISTAC should be undertaken. This evaluation was conducted in May-June, 2001, and focused on the accomplishments and shortcomings of the ISTAC since its first meeting in 1992.

### **Accomplishments**

The review found that there were several areas in which the ISTAC process was successful. The major accomplishments include:

- a. Production of a number of products required for ISTAC operation and SPAW programme implementation, primarily:
  - The revised draft Rules of Procedure for the ISTAC;
  - The criteria for selection and listing of species in the Annexes to the Protocol;
  - The proposed species list to be included in the Annexes to the Protocol;
  - Guidelines related to protected areas establishment and management, national legislation for SPAW implementation, and financing for protected areas;
  - Guidance on the cooperative arrangements with other conventions;
  - Terms of Reference for the Regional Activity Centre for SPAW;
- b. Provision of advice to the SPAW Secretariat on the implementation of the SPAW Protocol and the SPAW Regional Programme; and
- c. Acting as a forum for consistent and ongoing collaboration among a diverse range of regional governments, intergovernmental institutions, and non-governmental organisations.

### **Shortcomings**

Despite the high level of success found, a number of shortcomings were also identified. These include:

- a. The need to develop a wider range of criteria and guidelines for SPAW implementation;
- b. The need to make linkages with a number of other multilateral environmental agreements and regional initiatives;
- c. The limited use of *Ad hoc* working groups;
- d. The need to have ISTAC meetings on an annual basis;
- e. The need to develop an improved evaluation method for the SPAW Programme to focus more on direct impacts at the national and local levels;
- f. The need for improved communication; and

- g. The limitations resulting from inadequate financial resources.

Additionally, a number of policy and operational gaps were also identified. These include:

- a. Omission of the private sector from the ISTAC; and
- b. The focus on linkages with the Biodiversity Convention and CITES to the exclusion of other important conventions, such as the Heritage Convention.

In addition to the above, it appears that the involvement of governments in SPAW-ISTAC occurs at a less than optimal level. This is based on the level of responsiveness to particular requests and initiatives of the ISTAC and Secretariat, the level of national implementation of the SPAW Protocol, and the level of uptake of SPAW products and opportunities.

### **Issues to be Addressed**

Based on the above, the review identified a number of issues that should be addressed by the STAC, primarily:

- a. Re-definition of the structure and scope of the STAC, to make it a standing permanent body, and one that includes non-governmental and private sector participants;
- b. Finalization of the Rules of Procedure for the STAC;
- c. Review of the criteria for listing of species in the Annexes to the SPAW Protocol;
- d. Completion of a number of needed guidelines for SPAW implementation;
- e. Reviewing the cooperative agreements with Ramsar and CBD in order to guide the implementation of those arrangements;
- f. Entering into agreements with the Heritage Convention and CITES as soon as possible;
- g. Institution of an orientation/preparation process for members to the STAC;
- h. Ensuring better uptake of SPAW products;
- i. Improving participation in SPAW initiatives and processes;
- j. Development of a method and mechanism for evaluation of the impact of the SPAW Programme at the national level; and
- k. Development of sustained financing arrangements for STAC operations and SPAW Programme implementation.

### **Conclusion**

Within the context of resource limitations, the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee was fairly successful in its operations in the nine years since the SPAW Protocol was adopted.

In addition to the many useful outputs, the ISTAC process presented an opportunity for the collaboration of a range of regional governments, intergovernmental institutions, and civil society institutions.

The ISTAC experienced a number of shortcomings, the majority of which seemed to be directly or indirectly related to the low level of financial resources available to the SPAW Programme of CEP. Most of these shortcomings can be addressed, not only with adequate injection of funds, but also with more active participation by governments.

Finally, there appears to be general support for the SPAW Programme, the Secretariat, and the STAC process. Now that the Protocol has entered into force, that support must be translated into improved programme implementation in order to meet the conservation needs of the Wider Caribbean Region.





**EVALUATION OF THE WORK OF THE  
INTERIM SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ISTAC)  
SINCE ITS INCEPTION (1992-2000)**

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1. This report presents the findings of a review of the work of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW), focusing on its accomplishments and shortcomings since its first meeting in 1992.
2. The review of the ISTAC was recommended by the Fourth Meeting of ISTAC (Recommendation No. 14), which took place in Havana, Cuba, 3-6 August 1999.
3. The report will be presented to the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife and the First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) (Havana, Cuba, 24-25 September and 27-29 September 2001 respectively). It is intended that this evaluation of the work of the ISTAC will be used to inform the discussions concerning the future work of the STAC.
4. The review was conducted during the period May-June 2001 by a consultant, and was guided by the Terms of Reference (Appendix 1) developed by the Regional Coordinating Unit of the UNEP-Caribbean Environment Programme (UNEP-CAR/RCU). The approach taken in conducting the review consisted of the following:
  - a. Review of the reports of the meetings of the ISTAC;
  - b. Review of publications and other materials relevant to the SPAW Programme;
  - c. Review of the reports of meetings of other technical bodies associated with the Secretariats of relevant conventions, primarily the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES Convention); and
  - d. Requesting feedback from a number of persons who participated in ISTAC meetings.

**2. BACKGROUND**

5. The Establishment of a Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the SPAW Protocol is provided for by Article 20 of the Protocol. Article 20 (3) mandates the Committee to provide advice to the (Contracting) Parties, through the Organisation



(UNEP), on scientific and technical matters relevant to the Protocol. The matters listed in the Protocol for which advice should be provided include:

- a. The listing of protected areas;
  - b. The listing of protected species;
  - c. Reports on the management and protection of protected areas and species and their habitats;
  - d. Proposals for technical assistance for training, research, education and management (including species recovery plans);
  - e. Environmental impact assessment (associated with developmental projects that may have negative impacts on protected areas or species, as per Article 13);
  - f. The formulation of common guidelines and criteria (for protected areas and protected species, as per Article 21); and
  - g. Any other matters relating to the implementation of the Protocol, including those matters referred to it by the meetings of the Parties.
6. The Conference of Plenipotentiaries for the adoption of the SPAW Protocol, 15-18 January 1990, agreed to establish an Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) on Protected Areas and Wildlife until the Protocol entered into force.

## **2.1 Goals Set by the ISTAC**

7. Four (4) meetings of the ISTAC took place prior to the entry into force of the SPAW Protocol:
- First Meeting of the ISTAC, with 33 participants representing 12 governments and 8 intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations (NGOs), Kingston, Jamaica, 4-8 May 1992.
  - Second Meeting of the ISTAC, with 42 participants representing 24 governments and 5 intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, French Guyana, 3-5 May 1993.
  - Third Meeting of the ISTAC, with 44 participants representing 25 governments and 8 intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, Kingston, Jamaica, 11-13, October 1995.
  - Fourth Meeting of the ISTAC, with 50 participants representing 17 governments and 9 intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations, Havana, Cuba, 3-6 August 1999.
8. Article 20 (4) of the Protocol provides for the STAC to adopt its own Rules of Procedure. A preliminary draft Rules of Procedure was discussed and reviewed at the first ISTAC meeting in 1992. In order to fulfill the requirements of the Protocol, the agenda for each meeting of the ISTAC was set based on the objectives of each meeting (Appendix 2). The

objectives set for each ISTAC meeting (UNEP 1992, 1993, 1995, 1999) can be grouped as follows:

- a. Review of implementation of activities since the previous ISTAC meeting;
  - b. Review of biennial work plan and budget for the SPAW Regional Programme;
  - c. Review of technical/scientific matters (criteria, guidelines, etc.); and
  - d. Review of special and relevant initiatives (e.g. IUCN's IVth World Parks Congress, ICRI, etc.).
9. The documentation reviewed indicated that the greater portion of the time in ISTAC meetings was used to deal with programmatic matters (e.g. work plan, projects), rather than scientific and technical matters (e.g. species lists, etc.). This was a decision of the First ISTAC Meeting in 1992, which agreed to concentrate its efforts on the programmatic integration with the overall activities of the Caribbean Environment Programme (CEP). While more balance is preferable, the focus on implementation of activities in all likelihood also reflects the substantial amount of work undertaken, as well as the growing support for the SPAW Programme, particularly after surviving a rather difficult period in the mid-1990s.
10. The agendas for the ISTAC meetings were prepared by the Secretariat based on the need to report on follow-up actions from previous ISTAC meetings or SPAW implementation in general. The latter includes decisions taken by the Monitoring Committee on the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme and/or Intergovernmental meetings of CEP and of the Contracting Parties to the Cartagena Convention. In addition to the working documents provided by the Secretariat at the request of the Governments, a number of regional institutions also submitted documents, which, if not directly related to the agenda items, have usually been relevant to the issues addressed under the Protocol. The decisions taken at the ISTAC meetings were framed as recommendations to the next Intergovernmental and Cartagena Convention Contracting Parties Meetings (IGMs) for consideration and final approval or endorsement.
11. Once the work plan and/or specific initiatives were approved through the IGM process, the Secretariat followed through with implementation using a number of modes, including:
- Contracting institutions to carry out the necessary activities, projects, and/or studies;
  - Requesting a collaborating institution to carry out activities in association with the CEP; and
  - Contracting consultants to work under the direction of the Secretariat (mainly in the preparation of reports).

### 3. FINDINGS

12. In considering the achievements and shortcomings of the ISTAC, it is important to differentiate between the operations of the Secretariat and the operations of the ISTAC, even though it is difficult to make this distinction clearly in all areas. Additionally, it is important to remember that the ISTAC was established to **advise** the Contracting Parties to the Protocol, through the Secretariat, and had no implementation role.

#### 3.1 Achievements

13. The first area of achievement to be considered relates to the outputs generated from the ISTAC. The major outputs include:

- The revised draft Rules of Procedure for the STAC;
- The criteria for selection and listing of species in the Annexes to the Protocol;
- The proposed species list to be included in the Annexes to the Protocol;
- Guidelines for the selection, establishment, and management of protected areas (CEP Technical Report No. 37);
- Guidance for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)-SPAW Cooperative Programme;
- Terms of Reference for the Regional Activity Centre for SPAW;
- A legislative guide to assist with the implementation of the SPAW Protocol; and
- A funding guide for protected areas (UNEP/TNC, 2001).

14. In the second area of work to be considered, advising on the implementation of the Protocol, the ISTAC achieved a high level of success. Achievement in this area is based on review of the work plans and SPAW Programme implementation, review of outputs from the Secretariat, and review of relevant reports from collaborating institutions. Even with only four meetings held, the volume of documentation reviewed and the number and range of issues covered was quite significant. The reports of the meetings indicate that most of the matters presented to the ISTAC for discussion were brought to closure satisfactorily.

15. Arguably the most notable achievement of the ISTAC is that it acted as a forum that facilitated discussion among a wide range of regional and international institutions. Though many of these institutions are non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and therefore participate as Observers, there was a substantial amount of input and support from these institutions. In fact, it can be said that the ISTAC presented the best example of an institutional space in the Wider Caribbean Region that consistently allowed for the input of NGOs in full partnership with government institutions. This was so, not only in the discussions that took place in the ISTAC meetings, but also in terms of the contribution of (technical) documentation and collaboration in SPAW Programme implementation. This open and technical contribution provided by the NGOs to the ISTAC process has been valuable, and should continue in the STAC.

16. The Secretariat, despite having faced severe resource constraints over the years, has done a very good job of following through on most of the recommendations of the ISTAC. This was noted by participants in a number of the ISTAC meetings, who commented not only on the level of output of the Secretariat, but also on the high quality of the reports brought before the ISTAC. Appendix 3 contains a summary of the major accomplishments of the SPAW Regional Programme since the adoption of the SPAW Protocol.

### **3.2 Limitations**

17. As before, it is necessary to differentiate between the limitations of the Secretariat and that of the ISTAC. The review found that the ISTAC members had previously noted a number of shortcomings, including:
  - a. The need to develop a wider range of criteria and guidelines for SPAW implementation (e.g. guidelines for the harmonization of protected area management categories at the regional level);
  - b. The need to make linkages/agreements with a number of other multilateral environmental agreements and regional initiatives;
  - c. The limited use of the *Ad hoc* working groups;
  - d. The need to have ISTAC meetings on an annual basis;
  - e. The need to develop an improved evaluation method for the SPAW Programme to focus more on direct impacts at the national and local levels; and
  - f. The need for governments to develop mechanisms to improve communication at the national level among their focal points to CEP, SPAW, CITES, CBD, Global Environmental Facility, and other similar institutions, as well as between the SPAW Focal Points and the Secretariat.

#### **3.2.1 Limited Focus of ISTAC Deliberations**

18. One of the shortcomings of the ISTAC process was the somewhat narrow focus of the deliberations. It was noted above (Section 3.1) that there has been significant achievement in the area of review of the SPAW Programme work plan and implementation. There appears not to have been consistent focus on matters that are more “scientific” and/or “technical” in focus. For example, the proposed inclusions in the Annexes were presented in the first ISTAC meeting in 1992, and the inconsistencies with the species listed in the three CITES Appendices were noted. However, since then the matter has still not been resolved. Although it is understood that such substantive matters can only be finalized through a Meeting of the Parties, which can only occur once the Protocol enters into force, it would have been useful for the ISTAC to resolve this matter for adoption by the First Meeting of the Parties. Additionally, there are a number of other guidelines that need to be developed for implementation of the Protocol. The most obvious omission in this respect concerns the Rules of Procedure for the STAC. The second meeting of the ISTAC (1993) observed that the Sixth Intergovernmental and

Third Contracting Parties Meeting of the Cartagena Convention required that the Rules of Procedure be finalized by the ISTAC “...prior to their presentation for consideration by the First Meeting of the STAC...”. It would have been useful for subsequent ISTAC meetings to address this issue in order to make further progress prior to the First Meeting of the STAC.

### **3.2.2 Linkages to Other Agreements**

19. A second matter that requires additional attention is the linkage with other international and regional initiatives. While it is important for the Secretariat to be informed of the different initiatives, the many experts that participated in the ISTAC also participated in many of the other initiatives in the region and could have assisted in promoting linkages with SPAW at that level. Greater support and coordination with SPAW would have been desirable from government participants at meetings of the CBD, CITES, Ramsar etc. As such, it was important not only to bring technical competence to the ISTAC, but participants (together) should have developed a clearer picture of regional needs, priorities, initiatives, and trends to have better guided UNEP-CAR/RCU as to strategic interventions and the most appropriate allocation of resources. Possible explanations for this lack were:

- The business of “strategic planning” was perceived to be the role of the Secretariat;
- The Caribbean Environment Programme and SPAW was perceived as having limited comparative benefits for most countries, and thus did not justify the additional effort required for preparation to ISTAC meetings; and/or
- Focal points to SPAW or CEP not always the same for the other regional/international initiatives and poor national coordination.

### **3.2.3 Inter-Sessional Activity**

20. Another limitation in the operation of the ISTAC was the limited extent to which it used the facility of *Ad hoc* standing working groups. This mechanism was used for the drafting of common guidelines on protected areas and for development of the Annexes. It was also used to examine the compatibility of SPAW with CITES during and following the Fourth ISTAC Meeting in 1999, but there was very limited activity and interaction among members of the group after the meeting was concluded. More consistent use of working groups would, to a significant degree, address a number of the shortcomings here noted.

### **3.2.4 Limited Number of ISTAC Meetings**

21. The small number of meetings of the ISTAC may also have hampered its effectiveness. If nothing else, it limited the number of matters that could be addressed, as well as increased the time to bring matters to completion. The frequency of meetings has a number of other, less obvious, but no less important, impacts. One such impact was that

technical matters related to SPAW lagged behind the developments taking place with other multilateral environmental agreements, or other regional programmes. This was noted in the Fourth ISTAC Meeting as one of the possible reasons for the perceived inconsistencies between the species lists of SPAW and CITES.

22. The other major impact was the lack of continuity resulting from the relatively high turnover of experts. In reviewing the reports of the ISTAC meetings, it was discovered that, apart from Secretariat staff, only one person had attended all four ISTAC meetings. It can be argued that continuity was based on the retention of personnel by member governments and availability to the ISTAC process. However, this rate of change of personnel, for whatever reasons, reduced the effectiveness of the ISTAC. An additional consideration was the fact that while the reports of the meetings convey the decisions taken, the rationale behind many of those decisions resided only in the memories of ISTAC participants.
23. Another impact of the small number of meetings is the fact that too many issues accumulated and had to be addressed in each meeting, limiting the time and depth of discussion that could be dedicated to each issue. However, it should be noted that given the financial implications of convening these meetings in three languages, and where attendance costs of one participant from each government were paid by the Secretariat, it was not feasible to have convened more meetings.

### **3.2.5 Development of the Agenda**

24. In addition to the above limitations identified by the ISTAC, the review has identified that one of the shortcomings of the ISTAC process was the way in which the agenda was set. The circulation of the Preliminary Agenda for each ISTAC meeting has apparently not always met the requirement of sixty days (60) advance circulation proposed in the draft Rules of Procedures. Instead, the Secretariat followed the customary United Nations rule of circulating the agenda six weeks prior to the meetings. Regardless of why this happened, the impact on the ISTAC process appear to be negligible, as only in one meeting has any member requested that an additional item be added to the agenda. A notable exception is the preparation for the Fourth ISTAC meeting, for which the Secretariat invited comments for the agenda from all governments six months prior to the meeting, but after several reminders, inputs were received from only three governments. Thus, it appears that (government) members of ISTAC were willing to restrict themselves to matters presented to them by the Secretariat. It has been suggested that this apparent *laissez-faire* approach was taken because the SPAW ISTAC process was not perceived by governments to be an institutional space that dealt with matters that impacted their economies or environmental management strategies in any major way. Comparison was also made with the CITES process, in which Caribbean members have apparently been much more proactive.

25. Underlying many of these limitations is the scarcity of financial resources. However, with the entry into force of the Protocol, the perceived importance of the STAC process should improve, and the necessary resources and creativity should be released to enable the STAC to become more productive and effective.

### **3.3 Gaps**

26. As above, the review found that ISTAC members had identified a number of gaps in both the policies affecting the ISTAC and its operations.
27. The first omission was the composition of the ISTAC. In addition to the technically qualified experts from governments, persons from international, intergovernmental, and non-governmental organisations were invited to participate in the ISTAC as observers. Implied in this listing, more from its tone than from the omission, is that private sector organisations would not normally be asked to participate in ISTAC meetings. This “oversight” should be corrected for the STAC, primarily because many of the persons and institutions that ultimately conduct trade and/or research in wildlife species are from the private sector. This is even more so in the case of ownership of lands identified as potential protected areas. Even if full Observer status in the STAC is not desirable<sup>1</sup>, the use of the working group mechanism will allow for input from this group.
28. A second gap identified was the narrow focus of the attempts to forge linkages with the secretariats of other conventions. The focus thus far has centered on the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and only recently with the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention), which are logical choices. However, the documentation reviewed does not provide an explanation for the exclusion of other logical choices from initiative. Though the SPAW Protocol refers specifically to CITES and the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, another logical choice would have been the UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (Heritage Convention). With nine Caribbean governments being signatories to the Heritage Convention, with the importance of World Heritage Sites, and with the norm of conducting site assessments prior to designation, linkages with UNESCO for collaboration between SPAW and the Heritage Convention should have been included in this initiative.
29. Linkages with the secretariats of other conventions must go beyond the development of Memoranda of Cooperation. Although the ISTAC requested these to be developed with CBD and CITES, apparently members (governments) of ISTAC did not assist with their development, nor actively promote their implementation with the respective Secretariats.

---

<sup>1</sup> The possibility of trade advantages or other benefits directly accruing to private sector interests from STAC participation would have to be examined. The issue here would be more one of unfair advantages (vis a vis other firms) rather than merely the negation of benefits.

The lack of active input in this regard could be attributed to the factors mentioned above; that is, the apparent low level of importance placed on the ISTAC process, and the inadequate communication mechanisms and coordination at the national level among the focal points to the various conventions, including the SPAW focal points. The STAC should play a greater and more active role in ensuring that linkages with other conventions are not only developed, but mutually beneficial activities are implemented.

30. It could be argued that many of the limitations and gaps identified in this report are related to the apparent low level of importance placed by the governments on the Protocol and ISTAC process. For example, a significant amount of effort has been expended in trying to get governments to designate SPAW focal points, yet most have not yet done so. This, combined with the limitations of financial and physical resources in the Secretariat, has made it difficult to explore and/or follow through on each important matter to the extent desirable.

#### **3.4 Perceptions of the ISTAC Members**

31. Feedback on the perceptions of the members of the ISTAC was obtained through discussions with a number participants prior to the review, and more recently through a request for feedback directed to a small number of ISTAC members. The request for feedback on the ISTAC process took the form of a simple questionnaire (Appendix 4) sent to eight (8) persons who had participated in ISTAC meetings. The individuals were randomly selected to represent language groups, differences in the size of countries, jurisdictional differences (independent states and dependent territories), governments, and NGOs.

Only one (1) response to the questionnaire was received.

32. The level of response is here noted not to establish any statistical significance, but instead to underscore a commentary on the communication mechanisms used by SPAW and ISTAC. The poor level of feedback to this request reflects the apparent poor level of responses experienced by the Secretariat to other requests dealing with other matters. On the surface, this seems to confirm the point made above concerning the perception held by ISTAC members of the importance of SPAW and the ISTAC process. However, people's levels of comfort with particular communication modes, as well as the importance attached to those modes, should not be ignored. A more in-depth examination of the issue of communication mechanisms and costs relative to the SPAW process should be undertaken.
33. The general reactions to the operations of the ISTAC were positive. While acknowledging that more could have been accomplished, members point to the many products of the SPAW Programme, the ability of the Secretariat to work well with a range of Caribbean institutions, and the increased number of ratification of the Protocol as healthy signs.



34. Specific responses included the following:

- a. Accomplishments of ISTAC
  - Their technical nature,
  - Their regional character,
  - Their durability, in so far as supporting the operation of SPAW.
- b. Other benefits of ISTAC
  - It improves the capacity of the specialists in the region.
- c. Limitations of ISTAC
  - Limited finances.
- d. Major issues to be addressed by the STAC
  - Technical advice to the SPAW Secretariat in matters related to problems in the Caribbean region,
  - Information and technical advice to the Parties to SPAW,
  - Optimization and integration of technical capacity in benefiting the Parties to SPAW.

#### **4. FOLLOW-UP REQUIRED**

35. The future actions of the STAC need to address some of the issues raised above, primarily the limitations identified. Additionally, the focus should be modified to make use of a number of opportunities, as well as build on the existing support.

##### **4.1 Issues to be Addressed**

- a. It is important to define as soon as possible the structure and scope of the STAC, and to ensure its functioning as a “standing” permanent body that the Parties and the Secretariat can utilize for guidance as necessary, instead of only through the convening of meetings. In this context, Parties (as well as other governments and relevant organisations) need to expeditiously nominate their members for the STAC. The composition of the STAC, in terms of the omission of private sector participants, has been noted above (Section 3.3). While the resolution of this latter matter is not urgent, it should be corrected in the near future.
- b. Concurrently, and with equal importance, the STAC needs to address the finalization of the Rules of Procedure. As mentioned above (Section 3.2.1), now that the Protocol has entered into force, there is a requirement for this to be completed.

- c. There is a need to review the criteria for the listing of the species in the Annexes to the Protocol, to ensure that the criteria still satisfies the objectives of the Protocol and responds to regional conservation issues. This may result in the revision of the Annexes, in particular with regard to endemic species.
- d. The first meeting of the ISTAC agreed that, regarding nominations for the listing of species, when sufficient evidence did not exist to satisfy Articles 11 (4) and 19 of the Protocol, the STAC would assist in the collection of the necessary information. This requires further discussion in the STAC, as such a role may broaden the mandate of the STAC.
- e. The agreements with CBD and Ramsar, and the future one with CITES, need additional attention. The agreement with the CBD needs to move into an implementation phase, and needs to be broadened to deal with specific complex issues such as biotechnology and trade in genetic material. Additionally, the data from the national Scientific Authority (designated for implementation of CITES) in each Caribbean country could be shared with the UNEP-CAR/RCU and used to inform the deliberations of the STAC. For these agreements to be effective, full support from governments for SPAW is required at both national and international levels, in particular when participating in meetings of other conventions and ensuring that the necessary linkages with SPAW are specifically mentioned and implemented.
- f. Criteria and/or guidelines that need to be completed include:
  - Ecological typology for protected areas in the Caribbean;
  - Guidelines for the evaluation of protected areas for listing under the SPAW Protocol;
  - Priorities for a monitoring programme on wildlife and protected areas; and
  - Model national legislation for implementation of the SPAW Protocol.
- g. The high turnover of ISTAC members, and its implications, was noted above. It may be useful for the STAC members to be taken through some form of “orientation” exercise at the beginning of the first meeting. This would help clarify expectations, as well as inform the work agenda for the following meeting. Additionally, governments should institute some form of preparation process nationally, wherein members attending the STAC meeting would be better prepared to deal with the range of issues to be addressed by the agenda.
- h. Experience has shown that SPAW products are not always reaching many of the persons that need them most. While this is more a function of the operation of the Secretariat than of the ISTAC, in the future STAC members can assist by simply sharing information and materials that are available from the UNEP-CAR/RCU. For example, the Small Grants Fund developed under the Network of Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers (CaMPAM) became operational in June 2000, yet to date only three marine protected areas (MPAs) have applied for resources from the Fund.

The more recent practice of the Secretariat of making documents available on the website for the Caribbean Environment Programme should result in more persons being able to access relevant information.

- i. Related to the above issue (h) is the need to develop a mechanism and method to better evaluate the impact of the SPAW Regional Programme at the national and local levels, which should include active and regular feedback from governments and the focal points. The STAC should assist in both the development of the evaluation method and the active feedback from governments.
- j. The issue of inadequate funding has already been noted. As discussed in meetings of the ISTAC, the inconsistency of financing resulted in the non-completion of a number of activities and projects in the past. Conversely, the low rate of response to SPAW initiatives where funds exist, as with the CaMPAM Small Grants Fund and the local training activities following the regional Training of Trainers courses, for MPAs may reflect a perception that SPAW-related funds may be too small in quantity to be worth the bother, especially when governments are overwhelmed by the obligations associated with the plethora of multilateral and bilateral agreements. It has been suggested that both increased productivity and fuller government involvement in SPAW implementation would result from having the Cartagena Convention being supported by a dedicated source of funds, such as the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). Whether the dedicated source of funds is the GEF, or the Caribbean Trust Fund of CEP, the STAC needs to address this issue of financing of STAC and SPAW activities.

#### **4.2 Opportunities and Future Directions**

36. In addition to the issues that need to be addressed by the STAC, there are a number of opportunities where collaborative action could enhance the work of the STAC, while at the same time reduce the burden on the Secretariat.

##### **a. Establish agreements with the CITES and Heritage Conventions**

Agreements with the above conventions have a number of benefits, including:

- Designation of a protected area under the Heritage Convention could result in an automatic listing under the SPAW Protocol;
- Both SPAW and the Heritage Convention require site assessments prior to protected status designation. This could facilitate the process for one or the other not to have to invest heavily in the development of site evaluation procedures when these have already been completed for one of the treaties. Secondly, SPAW experts (the STAC and its subsidiary bodies) could participate in assessments conducted under the Heritage Convention, ensuring that skills are transferred and methodologies become somewhat standardized;
- Such agreements could form one mechanism to update the SPAW database, and provide current information on protected areas and species in the Caribbean;

- Greater coordination in activities dealing with protected areas and species in the Wider Caribbean, to avoid duplication or conflicts of action; and
- Greater participation of Wider Caribbean Nations in CITES, Bonn, Heritage and Ramsar Conventions.

b. **Establish *Ad hoc* working groups on a more consistent/permanent basis**

The work of the *Ad hoc* working group on guidelines for protected areas demonstrates the usefulness of establishing working groups/subsidiary committees of the STAC on a more consistent or permanent basis. The widespread use of the Internet as a communication medium should significantly reduce the cost of operation of working groups. Additionally, this allows for the incorporation of private sector inputs. Issues that such groups could deal with include:

- Development of guidelines and criteria;
- Cooperation, coordination, and promotion of SPAW with other relevant conventions and initiatives, including tracking the evolution of other multilateral agreements to ensure ongoing SPAW compatibility; and
- Sustained financial support for SPAW implementation.

c. **Develop a regional working relationship with IUCN**

UNEP and IUCN have an agreement at the global level, and the Secretariat has been trying for some time to establish a working relationship at the regional level. In addition to IUCN participating in the STAC meetings in a general way, the substantial work being carried out by IUCN's Species Survival Commission and the World Commission on Protected Areas could easily be made to coincide more closely with the needs of the STAC and SPAW Programme.

d. **Establish linkages to the biodiversity clearing house mechanism in member governments**

A number of Caribbean countries have developed national biodiversity strategies and action plans. As part of such action plans, national clearing-house mechanisms (and related databases in some instances) have been established. The information that could be provided by such structures would be beneficial to SPAW, both in terms of measuring the effectiveness of the SPAW Programme, and ensuring that the Annexes remain relevant to the Caribbean's reality. Additionally, further attempts should be made to establish a link between the STAC and the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN). This could easily be achieved if members of the STAC are the national CBD focal points and members of the IABIN.

e. **Establish a more central role for the World Conservation Monitoring Centre**

The World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) became a part of UNEP in 2000. This should have two immediate benefits. First, the WCMC has a data collection network in the Caribbean and, with the assistance of the Secretariat and the STAC, could conceivably increase the size and/or scope of the network to make it more relevant to the needs of the SPAW Programme and the countries of the region.

Secondly, WCMC could assist the Secretariat and STAC with development of relevant databases within the framework of the Caribbean Environment Programme.

f. **Develop EIA guidelines**

It is consistently stated that the greatest impacts on protected areas and wildlife habitats in the Caribbean result from development activity. The SPAW Protocol makes provision for the conduct of EIAs where such impact is likely to occur. Many Caribbean countries currently possess some form of an EIA process, with a few countries having legislation and detailed guidelines. Additionally, a vast amount of literature on EIA theory and practice exist, and development of guidelines for the specific use for the SPAW Protocol should not be difficult. The following products and/or procedures should be considered:

- Generic EIA legislation;
- EIA guidelines and procedures; and
- An external evaluation process, within the SPAW framework, for major projects (e.g. infrastructure, power, etc.) that assists governments where local technical capacity for evaluating such projects may be limited.

g. **Expand the guidelines series for protected areas**

The guidelines for site establishment and management (UNEP, 1996) is a first good step in improving protected area management. Additional work needs to be done in the following areas:

- Site evaluation criteria and procedures;
- Data management;
- Management effectiveness; and as mentioned above
- Evaluation criteria for listing protected areas under the Protocol.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

37. There were four meetings of the ISTAC in the nine years since the SPAW Protocol was adopted. Once operational, the ISTAC quickly addressed a number of the major tasks required by the SPAW Protocol, the primary tasks being the development of the Rules of Procedures and the Annexes listing the species to be protected by the Protocol.

38. In addition to dealing with the development of a number of technical guides, the ISTAC was very successful in providing guidance to the Secretariat and its collaborating institutions in the development and implementation of the SPAW Programme.

39. This review notes the tremendous benefit that the ISTAC provided by facilitating the working together of national, regional, and international intergovernmental and civil society organisations. This working situation resulted in a fairly high level of success, and generated substantial support for the Secretariat and the SPAW Programme.

40. The achievements of the ISTAC were somewhat muted, but in no way overshadowed, by a number of shortcomings and gaps in its operations. Most of these shortcomings, such as the limited use of working groups, can be addressed with more active involvement and participation by governments and adequate injection of funds.
41. However, as it is unlikely that government contributions will increase substantially in the near future, a number of actions have been recommended that should improve the effectiveness of the STAC. Recommended actions include:
- a. Establishment of cooperative agreements with the CITES and Heritage Conventions.
  - b. Use *Ad hoc* working groups on a more consistent basis, as well as use of the STAC on a standing and more permanent basis, with participation of NGOs (as under the ISTAC process), and the possible inclusion of private sector participants as appropriate.
  - c. Develop a regional working relationship with IUCN, in particular its Species Survival Commission and the World Commission on Protected Areas.
  - d. Establish linkages to other regional programmes, such as the biodiversity clearing house mechanism for member governments.
  - e. Better utilization of the data contained in the World Conservation Monitoring Centre.
  - f. Development of a source of sustained financing to support the work of the STAC.

## LITERATURE CITED

UNEP, 1990. Conference of Plenipotentiaries Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region, Final Act, Kingston, 15-18 January 1990.

UNEP, 1992. First Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW): Report of the Meeting, Kingston, 4-8 May 1992.

UNEP, 1993. Second Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW): Report of the Meeting. French Guyana, 3-5 May 1993.

UNEP, 1995. 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: Report of the Meeting, Kingston, 11-13 October 1995.

UNEP, 1996. Common Guidelines and Criteria for Protected Areas in the Wider Caribbean Region: Identification, Selection, Establishment and Management. CEP Technical Report No. 37. UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme, Kingston, Jamaica.

UNEP, 1999. 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: Report of the Meeting, Havana, Cuba, 3-6 August 1999.

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

CaMPAM	- Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers (Network of)
CBD	- Convention on Biological Diversity
CEP	- Caribbean Environment Programme
CITES	- Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
EIA	- Environmental Impact Assessment
GEF	- Global Environmental Facility
IABIN	- Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network
IGM	- Intergovernmental Meeting
ISTAC	- Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee
IUCN	- The World Conservation Union
MPA	- Marine Protected Area
NGO	- Non-governmental Organisation
RAC	- Regional Activity Centre
SPAW	- Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife
STAC	- Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee
UNEP	- United Nations Environment Programme
UNEP-CAR/RCU	- United Nations Environment Programme, Caribbean Environment Programme, Regional Coordinating Unit
UNESCO	- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
WCMC	- World Conservation Monitoring Centre



## **Appendix 1**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

This consultancy is related to UNEP-CAR/RCU's Regional Programme on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW), established in the project CR/FP/CP/0401-94-15: "Regional Programme on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW)".

Under the guidance of the Coordinator of the Regional Coordinating Unit (CAR/RCU) for the Caribbean Environment Programme and in close consultation with the Programme Officer for SPAW, the Consultant will assist with the preparations of two documents for the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties of the SPAW Protocol (SPAW COP1) and First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of the SPAW Protocol, planned from 23-29 September 2001 in Havana, Cuba, specifically:

- Report on the review and analysis of the work of the Interim STAC since its first meeting in 1992 until now to highlight its main progress, achievements and shortcomings, as well as major gaps and follow-up required by the STAC and the Parties to the SPAW Protocol. The document will be based on the reports of the four meetings of ISTAC, relevant intergovernmental meetings of CEP, other relevant reports and information provided by the SPAW Secretariat, governments and relevant organisations.

## **Appendix 2**

### **OBJECTIVES OF THE ISTAC MEETINGS**

#### **First Meeting – Kingston, 4-8 May 1992**

- To review and prepare detailed recommendations and priorities for the 1992-1993 and 1994-1995 workplans for the SPAW Regional Programme;
- To review the criteria for listing species in the Annexes to the Protocol and the criteria for the establishment of specially protected areas; and
- To initiate the development of the Rules of Procedure for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of the SPAW Protocol.

#### **Second Meeting – French Guyana, 3-5 May 1993**

- To review the completed, ongoing and planned activities for 1993 of the SPAW workplan and budget and provide recommendations for their implementation;
- To review and prepare detailed recommendations for the prioritization of the 1994-1995 workplan of the SPAW Regional Programme;
- To review and provide comments on the draft terms of reference for the administrative, technical and financial operation of the Regional Activity Centre (RAC) for Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife; and
- To review and provide recommendations for the finalization of the draft common guidelines and criteria for the identification, selection, establishment and management of protected areas in the Wider Caribbean as proposed by the *Ad hoc* Group of Experts to the ISTAC.

#### **Third Meeting – Kingston, 11-13 October 1995**

- To review the status of implementation of activities of the revised 1994-1995 SPAW workplan and budget and provide recommendations as appropriate for their finalization;
- To review and provide concrete recommendations for the implementation of the 1996-1997 workplan of the SPAW Regional Programme;
- To decide on the adoption of the revised draft “Common Guidelines and Criteria for the Wider Caribbean Region for the Identification, Selection, Establishment and

Management of Protected Areas of National Interest”, in keeping with Decision No. 1 of the Seventh Intergovernmental Meeting on the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme (CEP) and Fourth Meeting of the Contracting Parties (Kingston, 12-14 December 1994);

- To review and provide recommendations on the relationship between the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), and the Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW), as well as between the species listed in CITES and the SPAW Protocol, and to provide guidance for the development of the CBD and SPAW co-operative programme to be developed in keeping with Decision No. 1 of the Seventh Intergovernmental Meeting of CEP and Fourth Meeting of the Contracting Parties (Kingston, 12-14 December 1994);
- To review the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) process and provide recommendations on its implementation in the Wider Caribbean Region; and
- To note the status of development concerning the establishment of the Regional Activity Centre (RAC) for the SPAW Regional Programme.

#### **Fourth Meeting – Havana, Cuba, 3-6 August 1999**

- To review the status of implementation of activities since the last ISTAC Meeting in 1995, with emphasis on the 1998-1999 SPAW Workplan and budget and to provide recommendations as appropriate for their finalization;
- To review and provide concrete recommendations for the implementation of the 2000-2001 Workplan and Budget of the SPAW Regional Programme;
- To review and discuss the activities in support of the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) in the Wider Caribbean Region and provide recommendations for its further implementation; and
- To note the status of development concerning the establishment of the Regional Activity Centre (RAC) for the SPAW Regional Programme.

## **Appendix 3**

### **MAJOR PRODUCTS OF THE SPAW PROGRAMME**

The products listed in this appendix were generated either by the Regional Coordinating Unit of the UNEP-Caribbean Environment Programme (in its capacity as Secretariat for the SPAW Protocol) or by the institutions that participated in the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC). These products were produced either to support the ISTAC process and SPAW implementation, or emanated from the recommendations made by the ISTAC.

#### **A. Operation of the ISTAC/STAC**

1. Draft Rules of Procedure for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the SPAW Protocol (1992).
2. First Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW). Kingston, 4-8, May 1992.
3. Second Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region (SPAW). French Guyana, 3-5 May 1993.
4. 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, 11-13 October 1995.
5. 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.

#### **B. Standards/Guidelines**

6. Proposed Guidelines to be used in the Analysis of Case Studies to be presented at the CCA Workshop on the Management of Protected Areas, 1992
7. Criteria for Species listing in the Annexes to the Protocol and for the establishment of specially protected areas, 1992.
8. Additions to Annexes I, II, & III of the SPAW Protocol. Species recommended for priority consideration under the Protocol, 1992.

9. Draft General Guidelines and Criteria for Management of Threatened and Endangered Marine Turtles in the Wider Caribbean Region (UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.19/INF.7).

**C. Species Management Plans**

10. Regional Management Plan for the West Indian manatee. CEP Technical Report No. 35.
11. Sea turtle recovery plans for 11 countries: Antigua & Barbuda, Aruba, Barbados, Belize, British Virgin Islands, Netherlands Antilles, St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname, and Venezuela (see series of CEP Technical Reports).
12. Manatee recovery plans for 6 countries: Belize, Costa Rica, Jamaica, Mexico, Suriname, and Trinidad & Tobago.
13. Queen Conch (*Strombus gigas*): The Need for Caribbean-wide Management (UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.19/INF.13)

**D. Technical Reports**

15. Plan de Acción para la Recuperación de las Tortugas Marinas de Venezuela, WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 39, 1992.
16. Coastal Tourism in the Wider Caribbean Region: Impacts and Best Management Practices. CEP Technical Report No. 38. UNEP Caribbean Environmental Programme, Kingston, 1997.
17. Common Guidelines and Criteria for Protected Areas in the Wider Caribbean Region: Identification, Selection, Establishment and Management. CEP Technical Report No. 37. UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme, Kingston, Jamaica., 1996
18. Status of Protected Area Systems in the Wider Caribbean. CEP Technical Report No. 36. UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme, Kingston, Jamaica, 1996.
19. Regional Management Plan for the West Indian Manatee, *Trichechus manatus*. CEP Technical Report No. 35. UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme, Kingston, Jamaica., 1995
20. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for St. Vincent and the Grenadines WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 27, 1993.
21. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for St. Lucia WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 26, 1993.

22. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for Aruba WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 25, 1993.
23. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for Suriname WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 24, 1993.
24. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for Belize WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 18, 1992.
25. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for St. Kitts and Nevis WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 17, 1992.
26. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for Antigua and Barbuda WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 16, 1992.
27. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for the British Virgin Islands WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 15, 1992.
28. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for Barbados WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 12, 1992.
29. Sea Turtle Recovery Action Plan for the Netherlands Antilles WIDECAS. CEP Technical Report No. 11, 1992.

**E. Other Publications/Reports**

31. Funding Protected Areas in the Wider Caribbean: A Guide for Managers and Conservation Organisations. UNEP Caribbean Environment Programme and The Nature Conservancy, 2001.
32. Brochure on the SPAW Protocol, (its obligations, and benefits), 2001.
33. Comparative analysis of the CBD, CITES Convention, and SPAW Protocol (UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.19/4).
34. Comparative analysis of the species listed in SPAW and CITES (UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.19/INF.12).
35. Legislative guide to assist with the national implementation of the SPAW Protocol (UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.13/3).

**F. Training**

36. Training of Trainers course in MPA management:

- Saba, November 1999 - 9 English and Dutch-speaking MPA personnel from 7 countries
- Dominican Republic, May 2000 - 15 Spanish-speaking MPA personnel from 8 countries
- MPA training Manual, Modules and related documentation produced in CD-Rom
- National/local courses during 2000-2001 in Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Colombia, Cuba, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Netherlands Antilles, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, and Venezuela.

37. Caribbean Environment Network (CEN) Project training activities (see below).

### **G. Special Projects**

The UNEP/USAID Caribbean Environment Network (CEN) Project (1996-1999). The goal of the CEN Project was to improve environmental quality and coastal and marine natural resource protection in the Wider Caribbean Region, by promoting the use of environmentally sound practices by the tourism industry.

38. CEN Reports (all produced in CD-Rom format)

- Improved Training and Public Awareness on Caribbean Coastal Tourism
- Why Treat Wastewater? Environmental, Health and Legal Consideration
- Trends in Hotel Certification and Rating Programs: Guidelines for the Caribbean.
- Manual for Sand Dune Management in the Wider Caribbean. November 1998
- Caribbean Regional Training Manual on Integrated Coastal Area Management for the Tourism Industry, 1999
- Sewage Treatment Operators Manual for the Caribbean Region
- Caribbean Regional Training Manual on Environmentally Sound Tourist Facility Design and Development for the Tourism Industry, 1999
- Caribbean Regional Training Manual on Solid Waste and Sewage Control for the Tourism Industry, 1999.

39. CEN Training Courses

- One bilingual ten-days *Training the Trainers Course in ICAM* Kingston, Jamaica in February 1998. Involved twenty-two participants from fifteen different countries
- Two, three-day *Workshops on Integrated Coastal Areas Management for Tourism*. Barbados, April 1998 and Puerto Rico, June 1998.
- Two five-day training courses in *Best Management Practices in Water and Solid Waste Management for the Tourism Industry*. St. Lucia, February 1998 and Playa del Carmen, Quintana Roo, Mexico, June 1998
- Two five-day training courses in *Siting and Design of Tourist Facilities*. Tobago, May 1998 and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, June 1998.

40. CEN Demonstration Activities

- Integrated Coastal Resources Management in the Dominican Republic with Special Emphasis on Target Tourist Areas
- Rehabilitation of Sand Dunes in Anguilla
- Improvement of Quality of Near-Shore Waters on the West Coast of St. Lucia: Sewage Treatment Plant Operations in tourism facilities.

**H. Institutional Partnerships**

41. Memorandum of Cooperation with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), March 3, 1997

- Information exchange on relevant matters
- Provision of information on Caribbean experts for inclusion in the CBD's roster of experts, as well as for its working group on marine protected areas
- Programmatic Linkages between the Cartagena Convention and the Convention on Biological Diversity, (UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.6.19/INF.6).

42. Collaboration with the Government of France for the establishment of the Regional Activity Centre (RAC) in Guadeloupe. The RAC opened in January 2000.

43. Development and support of the Network of Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers (CaMPAM):

- Database of 300 sites in CD-Rom
- Internet listserv
- Small Grants Fund operational since June 2000.

44. Memorandum of Co-operation with the Bureau of the Ramsar Convention, May 1, 2000. Ramsar secretariat convened the first Ramsar/SPAW Caribbean Training Workshop in Trinidad, from 11 to 15 December 2000

45. Regional Contact Point for the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI) and collaboration with the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN), as well as with regional and national institutions, which produced current and consolidated sub-regional reports for the Tropical Americas, on the status of coral reefs (Status of Coral Reefs of the World: 2000).



## **Appendix 4**

### **REVIEW QUESTIONS SENT TO ISTAC MEETING PARTICIPANTS**

Dear Colleague,

The Regional Coordinating Unit of UNEP-Caribbean Environment Programme is conducting a review of the work of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) of the SPAW Protocol. The review will be presented to the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties of the SPAW Protocol and the First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee of the SPAW Protocol.

We invite your inputs to this review, by requesting your views on the work of the ISTAC to date. Your comments will be held in complete confidence, as your individual response will neither be included in the review report nor submitted to the UNEP-CAR/RCU.

1. How many meetings of the ISTAC have you attended?
2. Were you aware of the goals and objectives of the ISTAC before participating in your first meeting?  
If no, do you think you are now fully aware of its goals and objectives?
3. Does the work of the ISTAC fulfill its objectives, as you understand them?
4. List the accomplishments of the ISTAC as you perceive them to be (list in order of importance, with 1 being the most important).
5. List any other benefits of the ISTAC, if deemed to be different from (4) above.
6. List the shortcomings/limitations of the ISTAC, as you perceive them to be (list in order of importance, with 1 being the most important).
7. What do you think are the major issues to be addressed in the future work of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) (list in order of importance, with 1 being the most important)?
8. Provide any additional comments on the work of the ISTAC to date, and/or future directions and opportunities for the STAC.

Thank you.