



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**



**UNEP**

Distr. Limited

UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/6  
29 September 2001

Original: ENGLISH

---

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

**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: Review of the Draft Rules of Procedure for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of the SPAW Protocol.....	4
Agenda Item 6: Status of Implementation of the 2000-2001 Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme .....	5
Agenda Item 7: Mandate to STAC from the First Meeting of the Parties to the SPAW Protocol (Havana, Cuba 24-25 September 2001).....	8
Agenda Item 8: Review of the Criteria for the Listing of Species in the Annexes of the SPAW Protocol.....	9
Agenda Item 9: Review of the Proposed Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme for 2002-2003 .....	12
Agenda Item 10: Common Format for Reporting to the Organisation and Harmonisation with Formats of other Relevant Treaties .....	14
Agenda Item 11: Other business.....	16
Agenda Item 12: Adoption of the Report of the Meeting.....	18
Agenda Item 13: Closure of the Meeting .....	18
Annex I: Agenda	
Annex II: Recommendations of the Meeting	
Annex III: Summary Table of Decisions of the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol	
Annex IV: Draft Criteria for the Listing of Species in the Annexes of the SPAW Protocol (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4 Rev.1)	
Annex V: List of Documents	
Annex VI: List of Participants	



## **INTRODUCTION**

1. The Conference of Plenipotentiaries on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean (SPAW), held in Kingston, 15-18 January 1990, adopted the SPAW Protocol to the Cartagena Convention, which came into force on 18 June 2000. Article 20 of the Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW Protocol) in the Wider Caribbean, establishes the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC). This Article provides that each Party shall appoint a scientific expert appropriately qualified in the field covered by the Protocol as its representative on the Committee, who may be accompanied by other experts and advisors appointed by that party. Article 20 also provides that the Committee may also seek information from scientifically and technically qualified experts and organisations.
2. In light of the above, this Meeting was convened by the secretariat of the Caribbean Environment Programme in Havana, from 27 to 29 of September 2001.
3. The Meeting had the following objectives:
  - a) To review and adopt the Rules of Procedure for the STAC of the SPAW Protocol;
  - b) To review the status of implementation of the 2000-2001 Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme;
  - c) To review the mandate to STAC of the First Meeting of the Parties to SPAW (Havana, Cuba, 24-25 September 2001);
  - d) To review the criteria for the listing of species in the Annexes of the Protocol;
  - e) To review the proposed 2002-2003 Workplan and Budget for the SPAW Regional Programme, including the STAC activities; and
  - f) To adopt a common format for reporting by the Parties to the Organisation and harmonisation with formats of other relevant conventions.
4. The experts invited to the Meeting were nominated by the national focal points of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol. Other member Governments of the Caribbean Environment Programme, United Nations agencies and non-governmental and intergovernmental organisations were invited to participate as observers.

## **AGENDA ITEM 1: OPENING OF THE MEETING**

5. The meeting was opened at 9:45 AM on 27 September 2001, by Mr. Fabio Fajardo Moros, Vice-Minister of Science, Technology and the Environment (CITMA) in the conference facility of the Hotel Palco in Havana, Cuba. In his opening address, Mr. Fajardo Moros welcomed the participants and noted the great challenge before the meeting. He reminded the participants that the region has been working a long time

towards the entry into force of the SPAW Protocol and that we are now taking the first steps in its implementation.

6. Mr. Fajardo Moros noted the successful outcome of the First meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP) to the SPAW Protocol, having just concluded on 25 September 2001 in Havana, and the spirit of co-operation in which that meeting had been conducted. He further noted that the STAC had received a clear mandate from the First COP and much work was ahead for the meeting.
7. Mr. Fajardo Moros concluded his remarks by thanking the participants once again on behalf of the Government and people of Cuba and invited the participants to take advantage of their time in Cuba to get to know the people and culture and to see the country.
8. The Co-ordinator, Nelson Andrade Colmenares, welcomed the participants to the First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) and thanked the Cuban Government for hosting the Meeting. He stated his satisfaction at the outcome of the meetings of the ISTAC, which had created a forum where matters of regional interest and importance regarding the conservation of biodiversity were discussed openly at the governmental and non-governmental levels resulting in the creation of a dynamic, integrated programme to support the SPAW Protocol, based not only on scientific and technical evaluations, but on the socio-economic realities of the region. Mr. Andrade stated that this First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee, was vital to the Protocol and the present and future sustainability of the region, as identified in the priorities outlined by the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties, held 24 to 25 September 2001, in Havana, Cuba.
9. Mr. Andrade noted the importance of this first meeting of the STAC of the SPAW Protocol, the only region-specific legal agreement on biodiversity for the Wider Caribbean Region. He expressed that UNEP-CAR/RCU was pleased to continue to be able to serve the governments in this new and important stage as the SPAW Protocol, which had now entered into force and the STAC had been formally established.
10. Mr. Andrade mentioned the concerns of the secretariat in regard to the late responses from the Contracting Parties during the preparations for the First Meetings of the Contracting Parties and the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee. He strongly requested that the governments lend greater support to the work of the secretariat particularly in the intersessional periods, and in so doing, contribute positively to the productivity of the Cartagena Convention and its Protocols for the benefit of the entire region.
11. Before closing, Mr. Andrade took the opportunity to mention the tragic loss earlier this year of Mr. David McTaggart, founder of Greenpeace and the Third Millennium Foundation, who in his last few years devoted considerable effort to the promotion of the SPAW Protocol.
12. Mr. Andrade closed his opening remarks noting a substantial meeting agenda with little time to work and wishing the Meeting success in its deliberations.

**AGENDA ITEM 2: ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

13. The Meeting was invited to elect among the Parties a Bureau for the Meeting. A delegation suggested electing a Second Vice-Chair to assist in the work of eventual intersessional workgroup.
14. The Meeting elected from among the experts the following officers of the Meeting:

Chairman:	Mr. Antonio Perera	(Cuba)
First Vice-Chair:	Mr. Eric Newton	(Netherlands Antilles)
Second Vice-Chair:	Ms. Ana María Hernández	(Colombia)
Rapporteur:	Ms. Sara Gálvez	(Venezuela)

**AGENDA ITEM 3: ORGANISATION OF THE MEETING****a) Rules of Procedure**

15. 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**

16. English, French and Spanish were the working languages of the Meeting. The working documents of the Meeting were available in all the working languages.
17. The Chairman convened the Meeting in plenary sessions and as agreed by the Meeting without the establishment of intrasessional working groups. Simultaneous interpretation in the working languages was available for the Meeting.

**AGENDA ITEM 4: ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

18. The Meeting was invited to adopt the agenda of the Meeting as contained in document UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/1. The proposed agenda was adopted as reflected in annex I to the Report.

**AGENDA ITEM 5: REVIEW OF THE DRAFT RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (STAC) OF THE SPAW PROTOCOL**

19. The secretariat presented the Draft Rules of Procedure, UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/3, noting that the Rules of Procedure are required by Article 20 of the SPAW Protocol.
20. The secretariat's presentation noted that the Draft Rules of Procedure were developed by the First Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC). The presentation also highlighted the fact that the Draft Rules are based on the Draft Rules of Procedure for the Conference of Parties to the Caribbean Environment Programme and that of the Conference of Parties for the Cartagena Convention. The Draft Rules of Procedure of the STAC are influenced by the Articles 7, 11, 13, 15 and 21, which give additional functions to the STAC, in addition to those given by Article 20. The secretariat also suggested the Meeting to consider the Draft Rules of Procedure in relation to the information previously presented on the draft Scope and Structure of the STAC (UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/4), and the draft evaluation of the work of the ISTAC (UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/3).
21. The secretariat then summarised the information provided by each Rule set out in the Draft Rules of Procedure. The presentation was concluded with the reminder that the draft Rules was previously reviewed only once, by the First Meeting of the ISTAC and that there may be new issues which may need to be addressed.
22. The delegation of the Netherlands Antilles proposed that, since the Rules of Procedure for the Conference of Parties of the Cartagena Convention were not yet finalised, discussion in the draft Rules for the STAC should be deferred. The delegate also suggested that the Officers elected during this first Meeting of the STAC should continue to serve until the Second Meeting of the STAC.
23. The proposal by the Netherlands Antilles was generally accepted by the Meeting.
24. The observer from CITES noted that the Draft Rules of Procedure for the STAC provided for individuals, and not states, to be elected as Officers of the STAC, and since Parties were earlier elected, the issue should be clarified.
25. The delegate of the Netherlands Antilles then indicated that, based on the issue raised by the CITES observer, the Rules of Procedure used by the recently concluded Meeting of the Parties should be used for this Meeting of the STAC. This was agreed by the Meeting.
26. The delegation of Colombia then recommended that the secretariat conduct an analysis of the legal and operational issues related to the STAC during the intersessional period.



27. The meeting then agreed to defer discussion of the draft Rules of Procedure to the Second Meeting of the STAC as the Cartagena Convention does not yet have its own Rules of Procedure.

**AGENDA ITEM 6: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2000-2001  
WORKPLAN AND BUDGET FOR THE SPAW REGIONAL  
PROGRAMME**

28. The Programme Officer responsible for the Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) subprogramme made a presentation on the major SPAW activities implemented during the period under review and, in particular, since the Ninth Intergovernmental Meeting and Sixth Meeting of the Contracting Parties. The presentation focused on the four major areas of work (i.e. parks and protected areas, training, species conservation and ecosystem management), as well as on matters relevant to the co-ordination of the SPAW subprogramme. In this context, it was reported that progress had been made in the promotion of the Protocol through participation by the secretariat in various consultations and forums, which had resulted in renewed interest in the Protocol on the part of a number of Governments and its entry into force in 2000. This had also resulted in productive partnerships and collaboration with organisations such as The Nature Conservancy, the World Bank, the United Nations Foundation and the Ramsar Convention secretariat. It was also noted that an e-mail listserve of SPAW Parties was established to facilitate communications between the secretariat and the Parties and among the Parties themselves.
29. With regard to protected areas, progress was made in support of marine protected areas management through the existing Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers (CaMPAM) network, the establishment of a Small Grants Fund, implementation of the Training of Trainers Programme, and a funding guide published with The Nature Conservancy (TNC). It was noted that progress was slow with regard to the development of a Block B proposal to the Global Environment Facility GEF on marine biodiversity conservation, due in part to a budget freeze in late 2000 at GEF, and to funding from other sources for activities which were misinterpreted as overlapping with the GEF proposal.
30. Advances related to conservation of the sea turtle and the manatee, primarily through management and public awareness activities, were also mentioned.
31. Another major programme of work with significant accomplishments related to coral reef conservation, which included regional and national reports on the status of coral reefs, had been undertaken through the establishment and support of monitoring nodes in the region with local institutions. Information on the findings of those reports had been summarised in the status report and additional work would be undertaken in the upcoming biennium with funding received from the United Nations Foundation.

32. The presentation included information on problems and shortcomings encountered with SPAW implementation, such as insufficient funding (only 30 per cent of the required budget has been received), challenges faced by CAR/RCU to manage all aspects of the Programme and the Protocol, relatively poor participation and interest demonstrated by some institutions, communication weaknesses still experienced vis-à-vis Governments, and the insufficient support received from the Regional Activity Centre (RAC) for SPAW.
33. Several delegations thanked the secretariat for the presentation, noting the excellent report and that it reflected significant progress during the work period, despite funding limitations. Other delegates and observers noted that these achievements especially in light of the limitations experienced, underscored the importance of the strategic alliances with the non-governmental organisations and building partnerships.
34. Further, a delegate noted the limited number and scope of activities related to flora, and suggested that it would be useful for SPAW to start working on these aspects as well as economic studies of biodiversity conservation.
35. In commenting on the issue of partnerships, one delegate commended the secretariat for building partnerships with governments, non-governmental organisations, and other partner institutions. An observer also stated that the achievements of SPAW clearly demonstrated the importance of partnerships and their assistance in project implementation.
36. An observer noted that SPAW remains at the forefront of the conservation movement; especially as it relates to development of the ecosystem approach; a concrete regional approach to marine mammal conservation; and success in co-operation with the International Coral Reef Initiative. The observer also noted that the development of the Protocol Concerning Pollution from Land-based Sources and Activities (LBS) and AMEP Programme were further examples of how the Caribbean Environment Programme embraced the ecosystem approach.
37. The delegate from Panama requested that Panama be included in future training in marine protected areas and also offered Panama as a possible venue for future training activities.
38. The observer from the Association of Caribbean States (ACS) thanked the secretariat for the invitation to attend the meeting of the Parties to SPAW and the STAC Meeting. He noted that though the ACS secretariat had limited staff, the Secretary General of the ACS had established special committees on sustainable tourism and environment. He offered the support of the ACS secretariat to SPAW by means of continuing its direct contact with its member countries and encouraging them to ratify the SPAW and LBS Protocols.
39. An observer recommended that it was important to highlight positive elements especially in the current situation where programme implementation is limited by funding. He suggested that all Parties should actively participate in the work

programme, possibly by taking the lead role in specific activities rather than leaving all the work to the secretariat. In this way, much more could be achieved.

40. The observer from the Humane Society of the United States of America informed the Meeting that the two agreements, on conservation of marine turtles of the Atlantic Coast of Africa and on the conservation and management of marine turtles and their habitats of the Indian Ocean and south-east Asia, have recently been concluded under the auspices of the Bonn Convention, and asked if the SPAW Secretariat was corresponding with secretariat to the Bonn Convention.
41. The observer from IFAW reiterated that IFAW and ECCN will continue to assist the SPAW secretariat with the development of education materials as until now.
42. The secretariat was invited by the Chairman to respond to the comments made by the Meeting. The secretariat responded by first noting the Panama had been invited to participate in the Training of Trainers course in Marine Protected Areas Management, but for some reason, the park manager identified was unable to attend the course.
43. The secretariat noted that the greater emphasis on fauna relative to flora was based on the priorities set by the Contracting Parties to the Cartagena Convention. However, the STAC, as the advisory body dealing with scientific and technical matters could provide the secretariat with the priorities needed for work on flora.
44. Regarding the GEF Block B proposal on marine protected areas, the secretariat indicated that the draft project brief had been submitted to the GEF via UNEP. However, since the ICRAN project on coral reef conservation already funded by the United Nations Foundation, the GEF had suggested that there was no need anymore for such a GEF proposal on marine biodiversity conservation. At the request of the 13<sup>th</sup> Monitoring Committee Meeting, the secretariat is trying to resolve this issue.
45. With regard to the issue of partnerships, the secretariat noted that few Caribbean countries were parties to the Bonn Convention and that contact thus far with the Bonn secretariat was limited to exchange of information. The SPAW secretariat recently received an invitation from Bonn Convention to participate in their regional meeting in South America. The ongoing collaboration with the IFAW was described as extensive and productive, citing the large amount of education materials produced by the joint effort. The secretariat noted that the alliance with the non-governmental organisations produced important synergies, and welcomed the proposal by the government of the UK for Parties to become more active in programme implementation.
46. Specifically, the secretariat expressed their appreciation for the offer of support by the ACS, noting that the secretariat already participates in the environment and sustainable tourism committees of the ACS with the ACS to promote the Cartagena Convention and its Protocols.
47. Remarking on the ability of the SPAW Programme to produce its many achievements in the face of the limitations, the Co-ordinator, Mr. Nelson Andrade Colmenares,

acknowledged the tremendous efforts made by the SPAW Programme Officer, Mrs. Alessandra Vanzella-Khoury.

48. The observer from Animal Welfare Institute, Mr. Milton Kaufmann, took the opportunity to note the dedication of the secretariat to the development of the SPAW Programme during the 18 years he has been associated with the Caribbean Environment Programme. He noted the consistently high quality of the work and large output by the SPAW Programme. He stated that he was optimistic about the future of the programme, especially now that all the necessary infrastructure (RCU, STAC, and RAC) was in place.

**AGENDA ITEM 7: MANDATE TO STAC FROM THE FIRST MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE SPAW PROTOCOL (HAVANA, CUBA 24-25 SEPTEMBER 2001)**

49. The secretariat presented to the Meeting the summary table of the decisions taken by the First Meeting of the Parties (COP) that represented mandates to the STAC, UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/CRP.3
50. The delegation of Venezuela noted that the priorities for the workplan should have a short-term focus on the definition of criteria for the listing of species to be included in the annexes and on criteria for protected areas, as established in the Protocol.
51. During the ensuing discussion, the Parties and observers agreed that the first order of priorities for the STAC would include in the short-term: (a) revision of the draft criteria for the listing and evaluation of species in the Annexes to the SPAW Protocol, (b) revision of the criteria for the listing and evaluation of protected areas, and (c) the analysis of the provisions of relevant multilateral environmental agreements dealing with criteria for protected areas and species.
52. Related to the above priorities, the Meeting decided that the SPAW secretariat should prioritise the multilateral environmental agreements with which to improve linkages, in which case the priority treaties should be CITES, CBD, Ramsar, and the World Heritage Convention.
53. The delegate of St. Lucia reminded the Meeting that during the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties, St. Lucia had proposed that SPAW should include a focus on action that prevented species from becoming endangered or threatened, and that the agreement of the COP was contained in Decision IV (5). The delegate suggested that this decision should be part of the short-term work programme of STAC, and proposed that a working group be established to deal with this issue.
54. In discussing the proposal made by St. Lucia, the Meeting agreed that the development of management plans to prevent species from becoming threatened, while important, was not urgent enough to be considered part of the first order of business for the STAC. The delegate of the Netherlands Antilles recommended that the SPAW-RAC be asked

to prepare a background paper on the issue. While there was general agreement to this approach, the delegate of Cuba expressed concern that the RAC would be given a specific task before the secretariat and RAC had a chance to resolve a number of outstanding operational issues, including its relationship with the secretariat and the STAC.

55. The secretariat noted that the concern raised by Cuba highlighted the need to resolve the issue of the role of the RAC in the implementation of priorities identified by the STAC. The secretariat also confirmed that the secretariat and the RAC would be meeting shortly to deal with a number of the pertinent issues.
56. The delegate of Colombia suggested that the matter of criteria for evaluation and listing of protected areas required a preliminary discussion before being handed to a working group. She suggested that discussion of protected areas criteria be deferred until the second meeting of the STAC. Venezuela supported this view, stating that criteria for protected areas were less complicated than that for protected species, and that international guidelines existed. Venezuela proposed that a background document on the matter be prepared for discussion at the second meeting of the STAC.
57. The secretariat reminded the Meeting that the workplan was based on the decisions and recommendations of the ISTAC, 10<sup>th</sup> Intergovernmental Meeting of CEP (IGM) and 13<sup>th</sup> MonCom. It was noted that the convening of a workshop to revise the protected area criteria was recommended by the first ISTAC meeting in 1992. As such, if the STAC so recommends, the secretariat would try to obtain the necessary funds to convene the workshop. Several members expressed support for the workshop to address the issue of the revision of the criteria for listing of protected areas.
58. A number of delegates also suggested that the RAC could assist with the preparation of a background paper on protected areas criteria to support the work of STAC in its next meeting.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 8: REVIEW OF THE CRITERIA FOR THE LISTING OF SPECIES IN THE ANNEXES OF THE SPAW PROTOCOL**

59. The Chairman invited the secretariat to open the agenda item and present the draft document "Criteria of the Listing of Species in the Annexes of the SPAW Protocol", UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4. In her presentation, the representative of the secretariat noted the background of the criteria document and the authority under which it was originally drafted. Articles 20 and 21 provide the legal authority for the formulation of criteria by the STAC for adoption by the Parties. The original set of draft criteria was formulated by the ISTAC (established under the Resolution of the 1990 Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the adoption of the Protocol) and adopted by consensus by the 1991 Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the adoption of the initial Annexes to the Protocol.

60. Main elements of the draft criteria include factors for determining “threatened” or “endangered” status, issues of trade, endemism, terrestrial species and the use of higher taxa to cover broader groups of species. Additionally included are groups of species essential for maintenance of fragile and vulnerable ecosystems and other special conditions agreed by the 1991 Conference of Plenipotentiaries.
61. The secretariat noted that although all Parties were given the opportunity to comment on the draft criteria prior to this Meeting, only the government of Cuba provided written comments, which are included in document UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4. The secretariat further noted that it was important to remember that the Rules of Procedure for the Meetings of the Contracting Parties to the Cartagena Convention were still under discussion and consequently not yet adopted.
62. The Chairman opened the floor for discussion and asked that Cuba provide an overview of their comments as provided in document UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4. Following the presentation of each of Cuba’s suggested changes to the criteria, other Parties and observers were given the opportunity to comment as well. Several delegations and observers made interventions regarding Cuba’s proposal. Many participants congratulated Cuba on their efforts and for providing a foundation to further discussions. Some interventions favoured parts of the proposal while others were opposed to parts of the proposal. The delegations of Colombia, Netherlands Antilles, Venezuela and St. Vincent noted that they were not prepared to take any decisions on criteria at this Meeting as there were other factors to be considered, including the criteria of CITES which are currently under revision as well as some related aspects of national legislation. Consistency or complementarity with the CITES criteria was an issue brought forward by many delegations and observers.
63. Other delegations expressed their view on the need to proceed with caution regarding the development of criteria, which had to be a broad-based and careful process, given the implications for the future implementation of the Protocol. It was noted that the process in other relevant treaties such as CITES had taken many years and lessons learnt from the process which could be useful to SPAW. It was also noted that, the term “definitive” Annexes should not be used when referring to revision of the initial Annexes, as the provisions in Article 11 for amending the Annexes contradicted the concept of “definitive” Annexes.
64. The delegation of Colombia noted the need to decide on the steps necessary to continue with the revision of the criteria and proposed the creation of an *ad hoc* working group consisting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol and other members. Although observers would be invited to participate, it was decided that an equilibrium between Parties and observers must be maintained such that the number of observers would not overwhelm the number of Parties.
65. Following a lengthy discussion on each criteria and specifically in response to the proposal from Cuba, the Parties decided to form an *ad hoc* working group, to begin work immediately and to work intersessionally, via e-mail, to revise the criteria and report back to the STAC. The *ad hoc* working group is to be chaired by the Netherlands

Antilles with the secretariat facilitating the exchange of information by the members of the working group. Observers would be allowed to participate in the group so long as the number of observers from other countries and NGOs would not exceed the number of Parties to the Protocol (i.e., nine Parties and no more than nine observers in total). Preference will be given to those government observers that can demonstrate that they are currently in a ratification process for the SPAW Protocol. Several NGO observers asked to participate in the working group as well and recalled Decision I.10 of the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol, Havana (24-25 September 2001). The Parties once again welcomed their participation in limited numbers and noted that the observers would have to demonstrate to the Bureau of the STAC and the secretariat, their scientific and technical competence in the subject area prior to acceptance into the group. To ensure transparency of the process, the delegation of the Netherlands Antilles suggested that regular reporting of the working group, during the intersessional period, be provided for public review. The Parties also accepted this proposal.

66. To facilitate their deliberations in the *ad hoc* working group, the Meeting requested that the secretariat provide a summary of the comments provided thus far under this agenda item. As such, the secretariat requested comments in writing and made a revision to UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4. The revised document was presented to the meeting as UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4 Rev.1, as the basis for discussion and further work by the *ad hoc* working group and is contained in Annex IV
67. When reviewing the revised document, most delegations expressed the view that the revised document accurately reflected their previous comments on the matter, exceptions are the delegates from Cuba and the United Kingdom. Both delegations agreed to provide written comments to the secretariat.
68. The delegation from the Netherlands Antilles, as Chairman of the *ad hoc* working group on criteria for listing of species in the SPAW annexes, proposed a set of guidelines for the operation of the working group. These included: a) that all Parties and observers wishing to participate in the working group should submit to the secretariat the name(s) and statement(s) of qualifications of the proposed experts for participation in the *ad hoc* group, (b) the STAC Bureau, assisted by the secretariat, would decide on the final composition of the working group, (c) submissions to the secretariat for participation in the working group should be received by the secretariat within one month of the closing of this Meeting, and (d) the secretariat and the STAC Bureau will finalise the list of working group members within one and a half (1.5) months of the closing of this Meeting. The delegation of Cuba proposed that a balanced geographic representation of the different subregions be taken into account when considering the selection of non-member States.
69. The Director of the SPAW-RAC inquired whether the RAC was considered to be a participant in the working group, or whether the RAC should concentrate on some other activity. One delegate recommended that the RAC should submit the required qualifying documentation, as with the observers, if it wished to participate in the working group.

70. It was also recommended that the working language of the working group be English, and that the number of experts representing each Party could be more than one (1), but no more than three (3). The Meeting accepted both recommendations.
71. In response to a question from the delegate of Venezuela, the delegate from the Netherlands Antilles indicated that circulation of documentation in digital format would depend on the eventual size of the working group. The two options discussed involved starting a separate e-group, or asking each working group member to set up a small address book/distribution list on his/her computer. On this final matter, the secretariat volunteered the services of the CEPNET Programme Officer, to assist the working group in setting up an e-list.

**AGENDA ITEM 9: REVIEW OF THE PROPOSED WORKPLAN AND BUDGET  
FOR THE SPAW REGIONAL PROGRAMME FOR 2002-2003**

72. The secretariat, in making its presentation, noted that the 2002-2003 draft workplan and budget was prepared on the basis of the recommendations of the Fourth Meeting of the ISTAC, the Ninth IGM and Contracting Parties Meeting of the Cartagena Convention and few recommendations from the Thirteenth Meeting of the Monitoring Committee of the CEP Action Plan, which also reviewed the draft workplan. As such, the following description of the proposed SPAW is taken from the document UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/8: "Draft workplan and budget for the Caribbean Environment Programme for the biennium 2002-2003"
73. The secretariat presented the proposed activities for the SPAW Regional Programme for the biennium 2002-2003, highlighting the additional responsibilities of the secretariat and the Parties with the entering into force of the SPAW Protocol one year ago. In this context, the secretariat outlined the activities for SPAW coordination which included continuing to promote the Protocol through various mechanisms, coordination and communication with several organisations relevant to SPAW objectives active participation of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of SPAW, and fundraising.
74. With regard to strengthening of protected areas, it was noted that activities will continue in the promotion of the Marine Protected Area network (CaMPAM), implementation of the small grant fund for MPAs, guidelines for the development of a list of protected areas under SPAW, and a regional workshop for MPA managers. The secretariat informed the Meeting of a major undertaking for the biennium, the implementation of the four-year project entitled the International Coral Reef Acting Network (ICRAN), which is being funded primarily by the United Nations Foundation and which includes the Wider Caribbean as one of the four areas of concentration. The secretariat referred the Meeting to document UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/INF.5, which provided details on the ICRAN project. It was explained that the main objective of the project in the region would be to reverse the decline of coral reefs. It was also noted that the MPA training of trainers programme of SPAW would also be supported through ICRAN during the upcoming biennium. With



regard to species conservation, the secretariat noted the efforts to continue supporting sea turtle and manatee recovery plans, as well as working towards the development of an action plan for marine mammals and coordination with partners on the management of economically important species such as the queen conch and spiny lobster. A major area of work presented included the activities in support of the International Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI), which would also be funded through ICRAN. These activities include ecological and socio-economic assessments of coral reefs, monitoring, status on the condition of reefs and a compilation of best practices on reef management.

75. With regard to the proposed overall budget for SPAW, it was noted that although almost 50% of the projected costs were already available through ICRAN, those funds would only be provided in their totality if counterpart funding was also raised. In this context, the Meeting was urged to assist the secretariat with its fund raising efforts for this important project.
76. The delegate from Cuba commended the secretariat on the workplan, but noted that the budget did not include any provision for the next meeting of the STAC. The delegates stated that, given the mandate given to the STAC, it would require budgetary support but only the COP could decide and request a meeting for STAC.
77. A prolonged discussion ensued concerning the input of the STAC to the Second Meeting of the Parties. At the centre of this discussion was the concern that with the priorities and working arrangements set for the STAC, a second meeting of the STAC could be required prior to the Second Meeting of the Parties. The Meeting eventually noted that a decision in this regard that this was outside the mandate of the STAC.
78. The observer from the CITES secretariat identified a number of potential sources of resources to the SPAW Programme. Primary among these is the proposed hiring of the Programme Officer to be jointly funded by the SPAW secretariat and other secretariats of other biodiversity-related conventions. A second source of inputs would be the criteria developed/used by other programmes, such as the European Union criteria for listing protected areas, and the CITES criteria for threats to species. These could be used to form a basis for the criteria developed for SPAW.
79. As the agenda item closed, Monitor International informed the Meeting that the database of species currently listed in the three SPAW Annexes would be operational on its website in another two weeks. The CaMPAM database would also be loaded to the website in the near future. The URL for the website was given as: <http://www.caribbeanenvironment.net>.

**AGENDA ITEM 10: COMMON FORMAT FOR REPORTING TO THE ORGANISATION AND HARMONISATION WITH FORMATS OF OTHER RELEVANT TREATIES**

80. The secretariat made a presentation on the harmonisation of information management and reporting as contained in the draft document, "Format for the Contracting Parties of the SPAW Protocol to Report to the Organisation", UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/5. The secretariat noted that harmonisation of reporting across the different biodiversity-related conventions is now taking place. After establishing a common understanding by defining the process of reporting, the secretariat pointed to the need for harmonisation to reduce reporting burden and to facilitate the reporting responsibilities of the Contracting Parties to the various conventions. Harmonisation is seen as an effort to increase access to more useful information and facilitate exchange of experiences and knowledge. However, it was pointed out that harmonisation does not imply standardisation of formats.
81. The secretariat noted that not only will the governments benefit from harmonisation, but it will also provide a general increase in access to information by the public, which in turn, is an important step toward increased environmental awareness. Decreasing the reporting burden and streamlining reporting also has benefit for the convention secretariats as it facilitates and increases government reporting. The secretariats then review briefly the different efforts undertaken globally by other conventions to harmonise and streamline their reporting processes.
82. Various options and advantages for harmonised reporting were presented, placing emphasis on the need to take advantage of the Internet environment. The secretariat finally presented for discussion a report format for the SPAW Protocol, as contained in Appendix 3 of UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/5. This format was designed taking into account Article 19 of the SPAW Protocol on reporting obligations and by the tasks and responsibilities implied by different Articles as well. The presentation focused on specific sections and questions in the format where additional clarification, or more detail, may be required by the entity preparing the report.
83. The delegate from the Netherlands Antilles congratulated the secretariat for the presentation of a draft format that is thorough and workable and informed the Meeting that the Netherlands Antilles will start reporting accordingly. The delegate also asked about making the reporting data available via a clearing-house, but raised questions about the budgetary implications.
84. A few other delegations noted that while they were supportive overall of such an exchange of information and harmonisation with other conventions, they would need more time to review the proposal presented by the secretariat. Such review would analyse the proposal for compatibility with national databases.

85. The observer from the CITES secretariat noted that CITES has 26 years of experience on reporting of species, but CITES was not specifically mentioned in the document presented by the secretariat. The observer noted the two-pronged objective of CITES reporting -- as a management tool and as a measure of compliance. He concluded his intervention noting that the reporting burden was an issue of environmental governance that would be reviewed by the World Summit on Sustainable Development in 2002.
86. An observer from the United States with experience in reporting on the Ramsar Convention noted that a common concern in reporting was the time required to report, especially for organisations of limited resources. Parties should decide on the most basic needs for reporting and start with a simple format and architecture. He further noted that reports should be both nationally and regionally relevant and useful, including consideration of performance indicators, which will also aid in compliance with reporting requirements.
87. Another observer noted that the STAC may want to consider a new section in UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/5 that would consider reporting on efforts to implement Article 3, paragraph 3 of the Protocol, following the development of guidelines and criteria for the same Article 3, paragraph 3.
88. The secretariat responded to the issues raised. To begin, the representative of the secretariat noted that the Parties should begin to look at these things now in a simple and basic way and then move their way up as reporting capability evolves. For example, web-based reporting is preferable, but should start more simply. The first report is in fact the most difficult and then it gets easier with greater familiarity. Regarding CITES, the secretariat noted that its reporting format had been included in the review by the secretariat, but was found to be more trade related, though the STAC should review it for common elements and particularly in light of its historical efforts toward harmonisation.
89. The secretariat also importantly noted that the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC), now part of UNEP, was working to assist the convention secretariats in their efforts to harmonise reporting (see paragraph 25 of UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/5). In this regard, Panama had been tentatively pre-selected by the WCMC process to participate in a pilot project to harmonise reporting.
90. One delegate supported the idea of the pilot project through WCMC as the means to move ahead. Such a project should be able to inform future STAC discussions, meanwhile governments will review the proposal presented in UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/5 for complementarity with their national reporting systems. This proposal was widely supported by all delegations and it was noted that the results of the pilot should be reported back to the next meeting of the STAC.

## **AGENDA ITEM 11: OTHER BUSINESS**

91. The participants of the Meeting were invited by the Chairman to raise other issues not covered by the preceding agenda items, but which were relevant to the scope of the Meeting.
92. Having already presented the document, "Proposal from the Netherlands Antilles Concerning the Bottle-nosed Dolphin", UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF.7, to the First Meeting of the Parties (COP), the government of the Netherlands Antilles made a presentation on its proposal.
93. The delegation of the Netherlands Antilles started noting that there was no provision under the SPAW Protocol that legally required to inform about any intention to adopt an exemption according to Article 11-2. The requirement is to report the exemption after the exemption has been granted. However, national legislation of the Netherlands Antilles does require the intention to be brought to the STAC and its acceptance prior to the adoption of the exemption.
94. Citing the provisions of Article 11, paragraph 2 and the need for the STAC to review the "pertinence" of any exemptions granted by the national authorities, the delegation of the Netherlands Antilles was seeking the view of the STAC on the proposal for the dolphinarium. Among the criteria given to the company of the proposed dolphinarium were that: 1) the environment must mimic the natural environment of the dolphins; 2) excellent veterinary care; 3) a large enclosure that would allow "escape" from encounters with humans; and 4) a substantial education programme. The delegation noted that the company had complied with these criteria. Additionally, it was noted that the dolphins would come from Mexico.
95. The delegation of the Netherlands Antilles closed by noting that dolphinarium can provide enormous goodwill for the species and humans and will improve the goals of the SPAW Protocol. Finally, the delegation requested the STAC's support of the proposal and also invited the creation of standard guidelines as these types of facilities are quickly spreading through the region.
96. The Chairman requested comments from the Meeting, beginning with the Parties.
97. The delegation of Cuba noted that it was fortunate to have visited the site of the proposal years ago and noted that it was well conceived and developed. They further noted that they were convinced that the current conditions would guarantee those required to permit an exemption under Article 11, paragraph 2. Based on these observations the delegation of Cuba endorsed the proposal, but noted the necessity to consider proper planning and management of extraction of this species from the environment.

98. Some of the Parties noted the importance on moving ahead on a recommendation, but noted that the Parties did not need to give an exemption nor should they begin to develop criteria for exemptions as this would be interpreting the Protocol and this was not something the STAC was authorised to do.
99. The delegation of the Netherlands Antilles reiterated that they were aware that the STAC was not required to grant an exemption and that this was simply a requirement of national law.
100. The Chairman noted the general acceptance by the Parties and requested any comments from observers.
101. The observer from the United States congratulated the Netherlands Antilles on their “up-front” approach and transparency. They further noted that the US had been one of the first countries to capture wild animals for display and urged caution to other countries engaging in this to learn from their mistakes. In the past, conditions for captive dolphins were poor and led to the need to constantly replenish from wild dolphins which in turn led to a decline of wild populations in the state waters of California and Florida, which have never recovered. Following conservation measures and improvements in the conditions of captive animals, things have improved. Ultimately, they agreed with the delegation of Cuba that any take from the wild should be managed so as not to deplete local population of dolphins.
102. The observer from the United Kingdom noted that his country had prepared a national review on dolphinarium and proposed guidelines and recommended that similar review of dolphinarium be undertaken so that sufficient information be gathered before making any decisions. The review by the United Kingdom was made available to the Meeting in an executive summary.
103. The observer from the Association of Caribbean States (ACS) indicated that he will take the opportunity of the coming Meetings on the Natural Resources and Sustainable Tourism Committees, to inform its members about the SPAW Protocol and the SPAW Regional Programme. ACS will also present to its General Secretariat a proposal to include in the Declaration of the Head of States and/or of the ACS Governments, during the Third Summit to be held on 11-12 December 2001, to reiterate to member States and Associate member States, the importance of becoming Contracting Parties to the Cartagena Convention and its Protocols, including the SPAW Protocol, as soon as possible.
104. The observer from the Humane Society of the United States suggested that the STAC should develop criteria for judging requests under Article 11 paragraph 2 before making a decision on the current application. The observer from IFAW noted that the STAC, in its discussions on marine mammals, could: collect and assimilate existing scientific papers and reports from symposia and workshops on dolphinarium; address the issue of carrying capacity; and examine known life history and distribution data on populations of dolphins subject to live capture. Information on captive species was offered by several NGOs. The observer from the CITES secretariat suggested looking at other

countries' or regional criteria and guidelines before any new criteria is developed as much had already been done in this regard.

105. The observer of IWMC asked if those Contracting Parties that provide animals to dolphinarium should also request an exemption from the SPAW Protocol. Finally, one observer noted that as an exemption had not yet in fact been granted (as the dolphinarium was still a proposal) how could a finding of "pertinence" be determined by the STAC. Some of the Parties noted that this was essentially a legal issue that was not a subject for the STAC to debate.
106. Another issue was brought up under this agenda item by the observer of the Animal Welfare Institute. The intervention was solely to note that a library of SPAW related documents was needed and should be kept at the RAC. The observer then presented a relevant document on overfishing for inclusion in the library.
107. The Co-ordinator of the RCU as a representative of the secretariat raised the point that as the secretariat been asked by the Parties on several occasions to forge partnerships and linkages with other conventions and regional and international bodies. Despite these requests, the secretariat noted that on several occasions while promoting the CEP and SPAW Programme in other fora, it had not been supported by the CEP member governments present. As this was giving both the secretariat and the participants in the other fora a mixed message, he was seeking guidance by the Meeting.
108. A number of delegations noted that they support the secretariat in these endeavours and that if any one Party is not supportive of the secretariat that they should be specifically admonished as this was not the case with all Parties.
109. Several observers including the CITES secretariat, Humane Society and the Association of Caribbean States reaffirmed their commitment to assisting the secretariat and to promote CEP and the SPAW Protocol and the LBS Protocol.

## **AGENDA ITEM 12: ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING**

110. The Rapporteur of the Meeting presented the Draft Report of the Meeting. The Meeting adopted the Report, with amendments and corrections as reflected in this Report.

## **AGENDA ITEM 13: CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

111. Congratulations were given by all Parties to the Chairman, the Government of Cuba, the secretariat, rapporteur and the team that worked for the Meeting. Also praised was the fact that the report was presented on time in the three languages. Thanks were also given to translators and interpreters. A special tribute was made to observers and the manner in which all were able to participate. The observers in turn noted the efficiency

of the secretariat and were also appreciative for the opportunity that was given to them by the Parties.

112. The Chairman in closing noted the spirit of cooperation in this historical and successful Meeting. He thanked the non-Governmental Organizations for the contribution and looks forward to more parties in the future. He stated that Cuba is pleased to be host and hopes that the participants enjoy the rest of their time in the country.
113. The secretariat commented on the spirit of collaboration and thanked the Government of Cuba for its hospitality and for giving us the opportunity for this meeting. He noted that the secretariat is very pleased with the success of the meeting stating that the future of biodiversity in the region is brighter. Special mention was made of the work of Mr. Milton Kaufmann and his many years of continued support for SPAW.
114. The Meeting was closed at 2.30 p.m. on Saturday, 29 September 2001 by the Chairman and secretariat.





**ANNEX I: AGENDA**



## AGENDA

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

- Agenda Item 1: Opening of the Meeting
- Agenda Item 2: Election of Officers
- Agenda Item 3: Organisation of the Meeting
  - a) Rules of Procedure
  - b) Organisation of Work
- Agenda Item 4: Adoption of the Agenda
- Agenda Item 5: Review of the Draft Rules of Procedure for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of the SPA W Protocol
- Agenda Item 6: Status of Implementation of the 2000-2001 Workplan and Budget for the SPA W Regional Programme
- Agenda Item 7: Mandate to STAC from the First Meeting of the Parties to the SPA W Protocol (Havana, Cuba 24-25 September 2001)
- Agenda Item 8: Review of the Criteria for the Listing of Species in the Annexes of the SPA W Protocol
- Agenda Item 9: Review of the Proposed 2002-2003 Workplan and Budget for the SPA W Regional Programme
- Agenda Item 10: Common Format for Reporting to the Organisation and Harmonisation with Formats of other Relevant Treaties
- Agenda Item 11: Other Business
- Agenda Item 12: Adoption of the Report of the Meeting
- Agenda Item 13: Closure of the Meeting



**ANNEX II: RECOMMENDATIONS**



**RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE  
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE PROTOCOL  
CONCERNING SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS AND WILDLIFE IN THE  
WIDER CARIBBEAN REGION**

**The Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee:**

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

**Taking note** of the Draft Rules of Procedure for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of the SPA Protocol (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/3) and the Report of the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPA Protocol, Havana, Cuba, 24 to 25 September 2001, (UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG. 20/7);

**Having reviewed** the Draft Criteria for the Listing of Species in the Annexes of the SPA Protocol, (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4);

**Taking note** of the Status Report on the Implementation of the SPA Regional Programme (contained in UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/5);

**Having reviewed** the Draft Workplan and Budget of the SPA Regional Programme contained in UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/8, and the Draft Format for the Contracting Parties of the SPA Protocol to report to the Organisation (UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/5); and

**Having reviewed** the Proposal from the Netherlands Antilles Concerning the Bottle-nosed Dolphin, as contained in UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF.7;

**Recommends that,**

1. The Rules of Procedure for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the SPA Protocol be revised as soon as possible, in keeping with the draft Rules of Procedure for the Meetings of the Contracting Parties to the Cartagena Convention, and be adopted once the Rules of Procedure for the Cartagena Convention have been finalised and adopted by the Contracting Parties of the Convention.
2. The Parties to the SPA Protocol, the STAC and member governments of CEP play a more active and dynamic role in the implementation of the activities of the SPA Regional Programme in order to assist the Secretariat with Programme delivery and share the work load of Programme implementation.

3. The SPAW Regional Programme continues forging strategic alliances and partnerships with relevant donors, agencies and organisations, including NGOs, to assist with Programme delivery and to maximise resources.
4. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group established by the Meeting to work on the review of the criteria for the listing of species in the Annexes to the Protocol, consider *inter alia* all the comments and inputs provided by the Meeting for this purpose. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group is further directed to work during the intersessional period under the co-ordination and leadership of the Government of Netherlands Antilles as Vice-Chair of the STAC, with the support of the rest of the Bureau and with the assistance of the secretariat. Members of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group will include all nine Contracting Parties (each Party represented with a maximum of three experts), plus representatives from non-Parties who demonstrate that the process of ratification is underway, as well as representatives from the scientific and NGO communities totalling no more than nine observers. A balanced geographic representation of the different subregions will be taken into account when considering the selection of non-member States. No later than 31 October 2001, the secretariat should receive all nominations for participation in the working group along with their scientific and technical qualifications of both Parties and observers. On 15 November 2001, the Bureau of the STAC with the support of the secretariat will have the final composition of the group.
5. In the case the number of nominees for the *ad hoc* working group on species exceeds the established number of participants (3 for each Contracting Party and a total of 9 for the observers), the Bureau with the support of the secretariat would make a determination on the participants based on the scientific and technical qualifications.
6. The *Ad Hoc* Working Group on species criteria works in English through an e-group to be facilitated by the secretariat and present the status of its progress and advancements toward its objectives to the Second Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol. To ensure transparency in the process and review by all members and observers of the Cartagena Convention and the Caribbean Environment Programme, interim reports will be distributed in the intersessional period.
7. In keeping with Decision III of the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol (Havana, 24-25 September 2001), the development of the criteria for species listing by the *Ad Hoc* Group will include the review of approaches of relevant treaties such as those for the CITES Convention to ensure that the common elements and complementary actions with the SPAW Protocol be identified.
8. In addition to the above priorities identified by the STAC, the development of the guidelines for the evaluation and listing of protected areas under the SPAW Protocol also becomes a priority for the future work of the STAC and further recommends to the secretariat to actively fundraise in this regard to implement this activity in keeping with the proposed Workplan and Budget of the SPAW Regional Programme for the 2002-2003 biennium.



9. In the development of the guidelines for protected area evaluation and listing, the STAC considers the approaches of relevant treaties such as those of the CBD, the Ramsar and the World Heritage Conventions with a view to identify common elements and complementary actions with the SPAW Protocol in keeping with Decision III of the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol.
10. The SPAW RAC, in collaboration with partner organisations such as The Nature Conservancy and the Wildlife Land Trust, compile information and documentation relevant to the development of guidelines and criteria on preventing species from becoming threatened or endangered to be compiled into a background paper to be presented to the STAC, in keeping with Decision IV, 5 of the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol.
11. The proposed Workplan and Budget for 2002-2003 biennium be revised according to the comments provided at this Meeting and forwarded to the Second Meeting of the Parties to SPAW (COP) and Tenth Intergovernmental Meeting of the Action Plan and Seventh Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Cartagena Convention for approval.
12. Members of the STAC and relevant observers assist the secretariat in a systematic, continuous and active manner with the implementation and delivery of the SPAW Regional Programme, including the work to support the SPAW Protocol at the national, regional and international levels, including at relevant fora of the Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).
13. The secretariat pursue, with UNEP-WCMC, a pilot project for the Wider Caribbean Region for the harmonisation of reporting under the biodiversity related conventions as an element to assist with developing an appropriate format for reporting under SPAW.
14. The government of the Netherlands Antilles ensures that the proposed dolphinarium meets, and will continue to meet, the conditions under which the government of the Netherlands Antilles will grant an exemption under Article 11 (2) of the SPAW Protocol and which the STAC found satisfactory, taking into account the observations of this Meeting.



**ANNEX III: SUMMARY TABLE OF DECISIONS  
OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE  
CONTRACTING PARTIES TO THE SPAW PROTOCOL**



**SUMMARY TABLE\* OF DECISIONS OF THE FIRST MEETING OF THE  
CONTRACTING PARTIES TO THE SPAW PROTOCOL**

<b>Scientific and Technical Matters</b>		<b>Institutional Matters</b>
<b>Specific Mandate</b>	<b>General Mandate</b>	
Decision IV – 1, 5	Decision I – 2, 3, 4	Decision I – 5, 7, 9, 10, 11
Decision III	Decision IV – 2, 3	
Decision VII – 1, 3, 4		

*\* Agenda item 7, First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the SPAW Protocol, Havana, Cuba, 27 to 29 September 2001*



**ANNEX IV: DRAFT CRITERIA FOR THE LISTING  
OF SPECIES IN THE ANNEXES OF THE SPAW PROTOCOL  
(UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4 REV.1)**





**Draft**

**Criteria for the Listing of Species  
in the Annexes of the SPAW Protocol**

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Article 21 of the SPAW Protocol calls for the Contracting Parties to evaluate and adopt common guidelines and criteria formulated by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC), dealing, inter alia with the identification and selection of protected species.
2. Article 11(4) of the SPAW Protocol outlines the procedures for amending the lists of species in the Annexes to the Protocol. One of the requirements outlined includes the need to take into account the advice of the STAC to ensure that the nomination of species meets the common guidelines and criteria established under Article 21 (Article 11(4)(c)). In turn, Article 20 on the establishment of the STAC requests that the Committee advises the Parties through the Secretariat on scientific and technical matters such as the listing of protected species, in keeping with the provisions of Article 11 and with the formulation of common guidelines and criteria in keeping with Article 21 (Article 20(3)(b) and (3)(f)).
3. At the Conference of Plenipotentiaries for the Adoption of the Annexes to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW Protocol), Kingston, 10-11 June 1991, the Parties endorsed the criteria which had been used by the Ad Hoc Group of Experts for the selection of flora and fauna for inclusion in the Annexes of the Protocol (Martinique, 5-8 November 1990). Furthermore, the Conference decided that at the next meeting of the Group of Experts, these criteria were to be reviewed, and if appropriate, recommended modifications and/or additions were to be submitted for approval to the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol. In light of the fact that a group of experts has yet to meet on this matter, and given the above requirements of the Protocol, it is one of the functions of STAC to review these criteria prior to their approval by the Parties.
4. The Secretariat is therefore presenting herewith said criteria as the basis for the review and comments by the First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) with a view to make any pertinent modifications or additions, considering the recommendations of the 1991 Conference of Plenipotentiaries, as well as those made by SPAW Contracting Parties in preparation for this Meeting.

**CRITERIA FOR THE LISTING OF SPECIES IN THE ANNEXES OF THE SPAW PROTOCOL USED BY THE CONFERENCE OF PLENIPOTENTIARIES ON THE ADOPTION OF THE ANNEXES:**

- (a) For the purpose of all three annexes, the scientific evaluation of the "threatened or endangered" <sup>1</sup>status of the proposed species is to be based on the following factors: size of the populations, evidence of decline, restrictions on range, and the importance of the species to the maintenance of fragile and vulnerable ecosystems;
- (b) Whether the species is the subject of trade and whether international trade is regulated under CITES;
- (c) Given the wide definition of the territorial ambit of the Protocol under Article 1(c) and the particular circumstances of the region, listing will not be limited to marine and coastal species;
- (d) Given the regional, co-operative nature of the protection to be accorded to listed species, species endemic to only one country are generally not regarded as appropriate for listing, these species being more appropriate for protected status under Article 10 of the Protocol. In certain cases where international co-operation is considered important in recovery efforts, endemic species are to be included in the lists;
- (e) Given that the listing of a taxonomic unit is agreed to cover all the lower taxa, higher taxa are utilised, where appropriate, to simplify the lists and to address the problems caused by species of similar appearance. The listing of species is taken to include all sub-species and as a general rule, sub-species are not recommended for separate listing; and
- (f) In the case of species essential to the maintenance of fragile and vulnerable ecosystems (such as mangrove forests, seagrass beds and coral reefs), the listing of such species are felt to be "appropriate measure to ensure the protection and recovery" of the ecosystem which they constitute, and hence to fulfil the requirements for listing under Article 11 (1) (c) of the Protocol. Because these systems as a whole are subject to anthropogenic changes, as well as large-scale natural disturbances (such as the consequences of sea level and temperature rise induced by global warming), appropriate protection should be focused on the system as a whole, rather than on individual specimens. This approach is thought to be appropriate to foster

---

<sup>1</sup> Definitions in the SPAW Protocol:

- (a) "Endangered species" are species or sub-species of fauna and flora, or their populations, that are in danger of extinction throughout all or part of their range and whose survival is unlikely if the factors jeopardising them continue to operate.
- (b) "Threatened species" are species or sub-species of fauna and flora, or their populations:
  - (i) that are likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all or part of their range if the factors causing numerical decline or habitat degradation continue to operate; or
  - (ii) that are rare because they are usually localised within restricted geographical areas or habitats or are thinly scattered over a more extensive range and which are potentially or actually subject to decline and possible endangerment or extinction.

comprehensive national and regional policies for managing these fragile and threatened ecosystems.

5. At the 1991 Conference of Plenipotentiaries, the Parties also agreed:
- (a) That the provisions of Article 11 of the Protocol should not apply to specimens legally acquired prior to the entry into force of the Protocol or to their progeny;
  - (b) That species listed under Annex III may be utilised on a rational and sustainable basis, but require management for their protection and conservation. Not all of the conservation measures set forth in Article 11(1)(c) may be appropriate for all species. The measures listed in Article 11 (1)(c) are illustrative of the measures that each Party could adopt. Management of Annex III species may include, but is not limited to, the conservation measures identified in Article 11 (1)(c);
  - (c) That the mechanisms specified in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) may be used to govern international trade in wild fauna and flora under Article 11 of the Protocol;
  - (d) That the provisions and obligations of the Protocol do not apply to non-native species, defined as species found outside of their natural geographical distribution, as a result of deliberate or incidental human intervention;
  - (e) That the attribution of responsibility for complying with the substantive obligations of the Protocol will be effected by each Party according to its own constitutional and administrative system.

## **COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM SPAW CONTRACTING PARTIES**

6. Following the requests made by the Secretariat to the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol regarding comments for the agenda of the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP) and the First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) in preparation for these Meetings, the Government of Cuba provided written comments (below), prior to the First Meeting of the STAC, other comments below were provided by the delegations and observers of the STAC during the First Meeting of the STAC. The additional comments include those relevant to the criteria themselves as well as to the process (e.g., the *ad hoc* working group) for their revision:

### **General Comments:**

#### *Netherlands Antilles*

7. In regard to paragraph 20 of the document UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4: The Netherlands Antilles is of the opinion that the present annexes are also the presently valid annexes that do need adaptation. The annexes are an integral part of the protocol and in that sense they are already “definitive”. This does not, however, mean that they are unchangeable, because they are of course subject to the dynamics of nature and conservation efforts.

8. In addition the Netherlands Antilles suggests that the IUCN criteria should be used as a guideline in the listing of species.

***St Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG)***

9. The Governments of St. Lucia and SVG are pleased to be a part of this historic first meeting of the STAC to the SPAW Protocol.
10. Our Governments fully support the principle of sustainable use of all living marine resources in the world and more specifically within the Caribbean region. This is borne out by our efforts, as a part of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, in harmonizing our legislation in relevant areas such as closed seasons, minimum sizes and conservation areas in an effort to protect and conserve our natural resources.
11. Our governments are in the process of reviewing legislation and matters relating to the protection and conservation of biological diversity would also be considered.
12. We have a number of concerns with respect to the criteria for the listing of species in the annexes to the SPAW Protocol, namely:
  - (a) The listing of higher taxa is too broad and can lead to the inclusion of non-threatened species along with those in need of protection. This broad listing should only be used if (i) all included species are clearly endangered; or (ii) if more specific identification is difficult. This provision, however, should not be allowed to jeopardise traditional sustainable use of a non-threatened species.
  - (b) The existing list of species in the annexes will require review, particularly taking into account the traditional use and the social value of such use, which does not pose a threat to their survival or recovery (criterion b).
  - (c) The limited financial and organisational capacity of Small Island Developing States (SIDS) are not adequately considered in the requirements for scientific assessment of the status of species that may be considered as "threatened" or "endangered".
  - (d) Related to (3), greater emphasis must be placed on the traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) of local communities who have traditionally been involved in the utilisation of these resources.
  - (e) The principle of sustainable use of all living marine resources must be clearly enshrined in the criteria for selection and management of such species that may be included in the annexes to the protocol.
  - (f) A sufficiently flexible mechanism must be put in place to allow for reviewing / modifying the status of species listed in the annexes.

***Venezuela***

13. Venezuela considers that the adoption of criteria for the selection of species of flora and fauna to be included in annexes should contain general criteria that provide general guidelines for the assessment of such species and specific criteria for each one of the annexes. These criteria should result from the revision of the original criteria adopted

during the Conference of Plenipotentiaries of 1991 on the adoption of the annexes to the Protocol.

14. The definition of threatened and endangered status should be based on scientific and technical evaluation, under the approach of the precautionary principle, therefore it will not require strict scientific certainty of its status to be included under a protection framework within the annexes of the SPAW protocol.
15. Another consideration in the analysis of the criteria is the ecosystem approach which should prevail in the evaluation of the criteria.
16. Additionally, an important aspect to take into consideration in the assessment of the evaluation of the criteria is that the species be under conservation management or sustainable use plans.

### *USA*

17. To set the scene for this discussion, the US believes that we have before us two separate areas for consideration (1) the criteria to define species for which we have enough concern to list on the Annexes and (2) the implementation of the Protocol. The criteria express the biological status of the species and as such they are the “red flags” to alert us that species need help. The Protocol, specifically Articles 11 and 14, contain the measures to take to conserve the species and we believe that they contain considerable flexibility. Thus, the criteria should be restricted to biological questions.

### *United Kingdom*

18. The UK considers it appropriate to review the criteria for the selection of species to be listed on Annexes I, II and III, to ensure they fully serve the purpose of the SPAW Protocol, with a view to updating the guidelines and recommending them for adoption by SPAW.
19. There is a need to ensure the criteria are objective, definitive and transparent in their application.
20. In revising the criteria, we should learn from the extensive and detailed work on this subject in other fora, especially the IUCN criteria (revised in 2001) and their application in a regional context (Gardenfors et al. 2001). The application of IUCN Red List criteria at regional levels. Conservation Biology). The criteria need to be formulated so as to readily allow the assessment of species as to whether they are endangered or threatened (as defined in the Protocol) and whether they should be listed on Annex I/II or Annex III or not at all.
21. The criteria need supporting text to aid their application which should include what taxa are eligible for consideration (such as excluding non-indigenous species), the geographical area for consideration (addressing how terrestrial species should be considered in principle) and the need to maintain records of proposals to add or remove species which include the criteria used in such assessments.

22. In revising the criteria, close attention needs to be given to the definitions for endangered and threatened species as given in Article 1 of the Protocol as these must form the basis for listing species. Such listing should be done on the basis of a scientific assessment of the status of species being considered, separating this from the subsequent conservation and management mechanisms needed.
23. More specific comments on the criteria will be contributed at an appropriate stage in the review process.

***The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS)***

24. The HSUS commended the government of Cuba for submitting detailed and carefully thought-out written comments on the Draft Listing Criteria, but disagreed with a number of Cuba's suggestions for amendment.
25. HSUS explained that Resolution Conf 9.24, the current CITES criteria, were developed over a two-year period with broad input from many countries and expert groups, including IUCN. Appropriate criteria are important not only to determine proper placement in the Annexes, but may be central to the image of the Protocol as a whole. The observer strongly recommended that the Parties take the time necessary to seek broad input as the criteria are developed.
26. In further intervention, HSUS offered its services, and that of the Species Survival Network Listing Criteria Working Group, to the Parties and expressed an interest in serving on the Ad Hoc Working Group.
27. In a final intervention, HSUS advised the Parties to differentiate clearly between the question of the structure and operation of the Ad Hoc Working Group from that of the process of criteria adoption, which would inevitably include approval (and possibly further amendment) at both the STAC and COP levels. With reference to an intervention by the International Wildlife Management Consortium, referring to the need to interpret the use, in Article I of the protocol itself, of the term "population" as well as a species or subspecies, HSUS argued that the best interpretation would be to consider that the term applied to a situation in which the population in the Wider Caribbean Region represented a subset of the global range of the specie, rather than allowing populations to be divided up among countries within the region. This was because most of the species involved are marine and coastal, making it extremely difficult (and possibly controversial) to define boundaries between local populations. [This comment, however, refers only to the unit to be listed; it was not meant to imply that the status of rare local populations should not be taken into account when assessing the status of the Wider Caribbean Region as a whole and therefore does not affect the criteria directly.]

***ECCEA***

28. ECCEA is a Regional Coalition of 25 groups presently engaged in a "Regional Initiative for Community Based Nature and Heritage Tourism, Environmental Education and the Conservation of Island Ecosystems". Co-founded by the European Union, with 9 projects

running concurrently in the Eastern Caribbean for a 3 year period. ECCEA has, as per its mandate, created a roster of Scientific and Technical experts, which includes persons with traditional knowledge working in these territories.

29. According to present discussions and the establishment of an Ad Hoc working group, ECCEA is pleased to inform the partners and members that a major segment of the present programme is dedicated to the development of a fauna and flora database and assessment of populations. Therefore ECCEA would 1) be pleased to share/coordinate its data with the SPAW/STAC in the context of the Ad Hoc group, 2) negotiate exchange of information developed through the Zones Naturelles d'Intérêts Ecologiques Faunistiques et Floristiques (ZNIEFF), inventories at the Museum of National History in Fort de France.

### ***World Conservation Trust (IWMC)***

30. In the SPAW Protocol, the definitions of the terms “Threatened species” and “Endangered species” refer to “species, sub-species and population thereof”. However, the term “population” is not defined. We wonder therefore whether it refers to the population of the Wider Caribbean Region of a species with a broader range, or to the national population of a species or sub-species within the region. In other terms, is it possible to list the population of a particular country in one Annex and the other population in another Annex of the Protocol? This should be clarified in the criteria.
31. The “criteria” proposed in the document under consideration, including those proposed by Cuba, are not, in our view, actual criteria. They indicate elements to take into consideration when a species is proposed for listing. They do not permit a determination of whether the species should be listed in Annex I or II, or in Annex III, or should remain out of the Annexes. Criteria must be different for each of the Annexes, although those for Annex I (plants) and for Annex II (animals) may be the same. Proper criteria should allow Parties to the SPAW Protocol to decide objectively in which Annex a species should be listed. They should also allow the Parties and STAC to analyse the initial Annexes to determine whether the species are listed in accordance with the criteria or whether changes should be made following the amendment procedure described in the Protocol.

### **Criterion a:**

#### ***Cuba***

32. The success of the national management programmes is one of the way to guarantee of the state of conservation of the species, therefore these programmes should be included among the factors to be considered for a complete scientific evaluation of the “threatened or endangered” status of a species proposed to be included in the Annexes.
33. On the other hand, modern assessment criteria such as quantitative analysis of the probability of extinction, as well as the fragmentation of populations, introduced species, etc. should be incorporated.

34. In light of the above we consider that the criterion should be developed in the following manner:

- (a) for the purpose of the three Annexes, the scientific assessment of the condition of “threatened or endangered” status of the proposed species should be based on the following factors: size of populations; evidence of decline; restrictions on its range of **distribution or fragmentation of the populations; quantitative analyses of probability of extinction; effect of introduced taxa; hybridization; pathogens; pollutants; competitors or parasites;** importance of the species for the management of fragile and vulnerable ecosystems; **levels of exploitation and evaluations and national management programmes.**

#### *Netherlands Antilles*

35. In criterion a), Cuba has presented a number of additions based on new insights into the threats to species, and it states that national management programs are also relevant to the degree of threat or endangerment to a species. The Netherlands Antilles is of the opinion that national management practices are only relevant to the degree of threat or endangerment to a species when they have regional effects. Furthermore the practices themselves are not a measure of the degree of threat or endangerment to a species.

#### *Trinidad and Tobago*

36. The proposed criteria (a) from Cuba is acceptable since it provides very objective factors to make the assessments on status.

#### *Barbados*

37. Barbados offered the following comments on Cuba’s comments.

38. Listing in the Annexes is to be based on the Scientific Assessment of the condition of threatened or endangered species. We agree with some of the additions put forward for consideration by Cuba, but do not agree that national management and assessment programmes are criteria that determine the biological status of species, but rather a means that can be used to gather the scientific information that is needed.

#### *USA*

39. Criterion (a). We agree with the comments of Cuba, except that we believe that the last element of the criterion should be “adequacy” of national management plans. This reflects the comment of the Netherlands Antilles that national management plans can have regional impacts.



### *HSUS*

40. HSUS pointed out that the list of factors to be considered in criteria (a) could be expanded to include, for example, the effect of global climate change. HSUS objected, however, to the including of “national management and assessment programmes” on the grounds that these programmes referred to implementation of the Protocol rather than the biological status of the species involved. The biological status could be affected, one way or the other, by a national management programme, but the mere existence of such a programme should not, in itself, be a factor determining whether or not it should be listed.

### **Criterion b**

#### *Cuba*

41. To include any species in the Annexes, one of the principal aspects to be considered is its social value, both the traditional uses as well as the non-traditional ones, in order to ensure that the Protocol has a solid social base and that the conservation of the species does not become separated from the human dimension.
42. The social and human dimension is not adequately considered in the evaluation of the species, which are to be included in the Annexes.
43. The criterion should be drafted in the following manner:
- (b) **The social value of the species, their traditional and non-traditional uses, that are or are not the object of trade, and said trade has a negative impact on the conservation of the species in the region.**

#### *Netherlands Antilles*

44. Regarding the change proposed by Cuba to criterion b), the Netherlands Antilles is of the opinion that while social values can indeed be important for management programs, they do not change the biological status of a species.

#### *Trinidad and Tobago*

45. The criterion (b) proposed by Cuba should be reviewed as it leaves a lot of room for debate by not basing the criterion on scientific analysis but rather on a somewhat subjective evaluation.
46. This criterion should be made more objective, based on scientific and technical assessments.

*USA*

47. Criterion (b). We believe that this criterion does not provide a way to analyse the biological status of a species. In any case, we believe that the Protocol offers sufficient flexibility, particularly in Articles 11 and 14, so that this change is unnecessary.

*HSUS*

48. In criterion (b), HSUS commented that the term “social value” was ambiguous. HSUS also added that requiring that trade be shown to have a “negative impact on the conservation of the species” placed an extreme burden on the Parties. It is often difficult, if not impossible, to determine if trade has a negative impact, especially if the other threats are also present. We recommend the precautionary approach of merely factoring in the existence of trade without being required to demonstrate its effect.

**Criterion c:**

*Cuba*

49. This criterion contradicts the wording of the Protocol and it is not clear which are the species that really belong to the scope of application of the Protocol. Its wording must be revised by the Contracting Parties in order to clearly define its scope and link to the radius of action of the Protocol.

50. In their analysis the Contracting Parties should consider that given the characteristics of the states of the region, the criterion should make a distinction between insular states and continental ones, as well as when defining its scope for those species which are not coastal nor marine.

*Netherlands Antilles*

51. Before changing anything in criterion c), the Netherlands Antilles is of the opinion that first a discussion is needed about how the SPAW protocol fits in with the CBD and whether or not it should function as a regional implementation instrument for the CBD.

**Criterion d:**

*Cuba*

52. In principle, endemic species should not be included in a Protocol which is regional in nature. The protection of endemic species is the responsibility of each Contracting Party and should be resolved through their internal legislation.

53. The criterion should be drafted in the following manner:

- (d) Given the regional nature of the SPAW Protocol, it is not considered appropriate to include in the lists species which are endemic to a single country. Any Contracting Party may request the inclusion on the lists of a species that is endemic to their territory, if regional cooperation is deemed important for the recovery efforts.

*Netherlands Antilles*

54. Cuba proposes a textual change in criterion d), to bring forward more clearly that the country involved should take its own responsibility, and should take the initiative to request cooperation in protecting a particular species if it feels this is necessary. The Netherlands Antilles supports this.

*Barbados*

55. We agree with Cuba on comments re endemic species and acknowledge that there is a need for countries to examine the listing of species in the Annexes. However, Barbados would view that changes can only be made to the Annexes through the procedures established under SPAW Protocol Article 11(4), since our understanding is that these Annexes were adopted as an integral component of the Protocol in 1991.

*USA*

56. Criterion (d). We would point out that endemics can be an important indicator species. For this reason, we support the retention of the original wording of the criterion.

*HSUS*

57. With respect to criterion (d) and criterion (e), HSUS pointed out that it may be necessary to include endemic species as part of a higher taxon listing. Listing higher taxa should be done not only when there is “scientific certainty” that lower taxa are at risk – a matter that is in any case impossible to demonstrate – but may be necessary when listing individual lower taxa would create identification or taxonomic problems. In such cases, as a management unit, it may be easier to deal with the higher taxon.

**Criterion e:**

*Cuba*

58. The lists should not be prepared at the level of higher taxa. By not delimiting at the level of the sub-species, we run the risk of including sub-species of the same taxon that are not threatened.
59. The criterion should be drafted in the following manner:

- (e) **The lists should be prepared at the level of species and/or sub-species. The higher taxa shall only be used when there is scientific certainty that all the lower taxa are in equal or similar conditions.**

*Netherlands Antilles*

60. Although the Netherlands Antilles agrees in general with Cuba on criterion e), it feels that the language proposed by Cuba should be less absolute. The Netherlands Antilles proposes the following text:

*“The lists should be prepared at the level of species and in some cases subspecies. Higher taxa may be used if there is a ‘reasonable assumption’ that all lower taxa are in a similar condition. This would most often be the case with listings on annex III.”*

*Trinidad and Tobago*

61. In addition to the comments from the Netherlands Antilles above, the term “reasonable assumption” could be replaced by “scientific evidence” in order to keep within the scientific and technical nature of the criteria.

**Criterion f:**

*Cuba*

62. We do not propose any modifications

*Cuba (additional comments)*

63. In keeping with the elements which are outlined below:

- (a) That the guidelines and criteria used for the drafting of the initial Annexes, as well as the initial Annexes themselves, were adopted at the Conference of Plenipotentiaries of the CEP over ten years ago.
- (b) That there is no correspondence between the regional nature of the SPAW Protocol and the species listed in its Annexes, many of which are endemic.
- (c) Due to the length of time which elapsed between the adoption and entry into force of the SPAW Protocol, the initial Annexes only constitute an approximation to the complex issue of conservation of the flora and fauna of the coastal ecosystems of the region and do not reflect the reality of the evolution dynamics of the listed species, therefore it may be necessary to include new species or remove some of those already listed.
- (d) That in accordance with the provisions of Articles 24 of the Cartagena Convention and 21.1(a) of the SPAW Protocol, the Contracting Parties to this Protocol have the sole and exclusive right to revise and adopt as final, both the criteria and guidelines used, as well as the Annexes themselves.

64. We consider it necessary that a mandate be given to the STAC, so that on the basis of the Common Guidelines and Criteria for the selection of the species adopted by the Conference the Parties, the STAC evaluates the lists of the initial Annexes and presents a proposal of Definitive Annexes to the next Conference of Parties.
65. Concerning the remarks made by different delegations on the Cuban opinions concerning the different selection criteria, the Cuban Delegation presented the following comments:

***Criterion a:***

66. By no means did Cuba state that national management plans are determinant as selection criteria. Cuba expressed and ratifies its opinion about the fact that the existence of National Management Plans is one of the ways that must be considered among the selection criteria because, if a management plan is well elaborated, it has a significant component of research and monitoring allowing to obtain the information needed for sustainable management and use of the resource.
67. In addition, we are convinced that many management plans may be made at the national level, but if there is no national management plan, regional plans are but good office and history documents far from being implemented, since there is no national tool for their implementation.

***Criterion b:***

68. Having stated that the term *social value* is ambiguous is not acceptable to the Cuban Delegation, since it is clearly stated in the opinions that we are making reference to Use, whether traditional or not. We are ratifying our criterion that this is an important element to be considered within the selection criteria, as there are more than sufficient examples about regulations and prohibitions on many species where not considering the use made of the species has led to significant increase of the illegal use of the species.

***Criterion e:***

69. We accept that perhaps it is not possible to generalize the criterion on the use of only the lower taxa, but that was not our purpose, perhaps something should be clarified in the criterion we proposed. We are ratifying our opinion that the criterion on the use of only the higher taxa should not be accepted either; instead, applying these very same remarks, whenever possible, one should go up to the feasible lower taxa on the basis of the existing scientific evidences and information.



**ANNEX V: LIST OF DOCUMENTS**





## LIST OF DOCUMENTS

### Working Documents

UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/1	Provisional Agenda
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/2	Provisional Annotated Agenda
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/3	Draft Rules of Procedure for the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to the SPAW Protocol
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/4	Draft Criteria for the Listing of Species in the Annexes of the SPAW Protocol
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/5	Draft format for the Contracting Parties of the SPAW Protocol to Report to the Organization
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 (to be prepared during the Meeting)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/5	Status report on the Implementation of the Caribbean Environment Programme for the biennium 2000-2001 (includes status of the SPAW Regional Programme)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/6.Rev.1	Priorities for implementation following the entry into force of the Protocol: responsibilities for the Contracting Parties, for the STAC and for the Secretariat (as revised by the First Meeting of the SPAW Contracting Parties (COP), Havana, 24-25 September 2001)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/8	Draft Workplan and Budget for the Caribbean Environment Programme for the biennium 2002-2003 (includes the Workplan and Budget of the SPAW Regional Programme)

### Information Documents

UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/INF.1	Provisional List of Documents
UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/INF.2	Provisional List of Participants
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF.3	Elements for the Development of a Marine Mammal Action Plan for the Wider Caribbean

UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF.4	Report to the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity(CBD) from the Secretariat of the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena 1983) and its Protocols, including the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA W) (February 2001)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/INF.6	Cooperative linkages in marine and coastal biodiversity between the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Cartagena Convention
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF.5	Funding Protected Areas in the Wider Caribbean: A Guide for Managers and Conservation Organizations
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF.6	Directory of Members of SPA W Protocol e-group
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/INF. 7	Proposition des Antilles néerlandaises concernant le Grand dauphin (French only)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/INF.4	Rapport du gouvernement français sur les activités mise en œuvre par le Centre d'activités régionales (CAR) du SPA W de Guadeloupe (French only)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/INF.5	The International Coral Reef Activity Network (ICRAN): A Global Partnership for Coral Reefs - A Summary
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/3	Evaluation of the work of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) since its inception (1992-2000)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/4	Structure and Scope of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) of the SPA W Protocol
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/5	Relationship between the SPA W Protocol, the STAC and the work undertaken by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/7	Report of the 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, 25-25 September 2001
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.17/INF.5	Legal Assessment of "Compatibility" issues between the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA W) to the Cartagena Convention and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)

- UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.17/INF.5/Add.1 U.S. Comments on SPAW-CITES Compatibility issues
- UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.17/CRP.1 Comments by Cuba on the Contextualization of SPAW and its Relationship with CITES
- UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/CRP.2 Priorities for Implementation Following the Entry into Force of the SPAW Protocol: Responsibilities for the Contracting Parties for the STAC and for the Secretariat (proposed revision to UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.20/6) (in Spanish and English only)

### **Conference Room Paper**

- UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/CRP.1 WDCCS Briefing Cetacean Captivity and SPAW
- UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/CRP.2 Early History and Interpretation of the Appendices to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and its Relevance to the Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW). The Humane Society of the United States, September 2001
- UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/CRP.3 Summary Table of Decisions of the First Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the SPAW Protocol
- UNEP(DEC)/CAR WG.23/CRP.4 Review of Dolphinarium in the United Kingdom and Proposed Guidelines – Executive Summary (Government of the United Kingdom)

### **Reference Documents**

- UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.19/6 Report of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Monitoring Committee on the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme and Special Meeting of the Bureau of Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region. San Jose, Costa Rica, 9-13 July 2001
- UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.17/5 Appendices I and III Report of the Ninth Intergovernmental Meeting on the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme and Sixth Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region. Kingston, Jamaica, 14-18 February 2000

UNEP(WATER)/CAR WG.22/5	Fourth Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA W) in the Wider Caribbean Region. Havana, Cuba, 3-6 August 1999
UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.19/6	Third Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA W) in the Wider Caribbean, Region. Kingston, Jamaica, 11-13 October 1995
UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.11/7	Second Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA W) in the Wider Caribbean, Region. French Guiana, 3-5 May 1993
UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.5/1	First Meeting of the Interim Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (ISTAC) to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA W) in the Wider Caribbean, Region. Kingston, Jamaica, 4-8 May 1992
UNEP, 2001	Directory of Focal Points of the Caribbean Environment Programme. CEP Information Paper, June 2001 (English only)
UNEP/Ramsar, 2000	Memorandum of Cooperation between the Secretariat of the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean (Cartagena, 1983) and the Bureau of the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, 1971)
UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG.17/INF.6	International Trade in Species Listed in Both the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA W) and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)
IUCN Species Survival Commission, 1999	CITES: A Conservation Tool - A Guide to Amending the Appendices to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. 6th Edition
UNEP/GC/3/Rev.3,1998	Rules of Procedure of the Governing Council of UNEP

UNEP(WATER)/CAR WG.11/INF.6	Memorandum of Cooperation between the Secretariat of the Convention of the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena, 1983) and its Protocols, including the protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPA W) and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) (Nairobi, 1992)
UNEP, 1991	Conference of Plenipotentiaries for the Adoption of the Annexes to the Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region. Final Act
UNEP, 1990	Conference of Plenipotentiaries Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife in the Wider Caribbean Region. Final Act
UNEP, 1983	Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena Convention)
UNEP/CBD	Format of Reporting by the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)
IUCN/Ramsar	Format of Reporting by the Parties to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance
UNEP/CMS	Format of Reporting by the Parties to the Bonn Convention on Migratory Species
ICRI, 2001	Decisions and Resolutions Adopted during the International Coral Reef Initiative - Coordination and Planning Committee Meeting (April, 2001, Cebu, Philippines)
UNEP(OCA)/CAR WG.13/3	Legislative Guide to Implement the SPA W Protocol (Workshop to Assist with the Formulation of National Legislation to Implement the SPA W Protocol in the Common Law Countries of the Wider Caribbean Region (Ocho Rios, Jamaica, 6-9 December 1993))
CITES, 1994	Resolution Conf.9.24 and Resolution Conf.9.25 rev adopted at Ninth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties of CITES (Fort Lauderdale, USA, 7 to 18 November 1994)
UNEP(OCA)/CAR ISTAC1/INF.8	Proposal for an Ecological typology of Protected Areas in the Caribbean

UNEP(DEC)/CAR IG. 19/3	Proposed Draft Rules (March 2001) of Procedure of the CEP Council for the Meetings and Conferences Convened within the Framework of the Action Plan for the Caribbean Environment Programme and Meetings and Conferences of the Contracting Parties to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region and to its Related Protocols
IUCN, 2000	IUCN Red List Categories
H. R. Akçakaya et al.	Conservation Biology, Vol. 14, No. 4, August 2000 Making Consistent IUCN Classifications under Uncertainty
J.A.Musick	The American Fisheries Society Initiative, Vol. 24, No.12, December 1999 Criteria to Define Extinction Risk in Marine Fishes. Endangered Species Management
Jeffrey A. Hutchings	Nature, Vol. 406, 24 August 2000 Collapse and recovery of marine fishes
Jeffrey A. Hutchings	Can. J. Aquat. Sci. 58, 2001 Conservation biology of marine fishes: perceptions and caveats regarding assignment of extinction risk
CBD, 1998	Modus Operandi of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (Annex I, COP Decision IV/16, Bratislava, Slovak Republic, 4-15 May 1998)
Ramsar, 2000	Work Plan 1999-2002 of the Scientific and Technical Review Panel (revised)
Posted at Ramsar,1999 <a href="http://www.ramsar.org/key_strp_nfp_tor.htm">http://www.ramsar.org/key_strp_nfp_tor.htm</a> .	Terms of Reference for the STRP's National Focal Points
UNEP(OCA)/CAR ISTAC 1/INF 2	Draft Principles and Goals for the Implementation of the Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW)
Dept. of Conservation, Wellington, New Zealand, 2001	Classifying species according to the threat of extinction

**ANNEX VI: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**





**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
CONTRACTING PARTIES**

**CUBA**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Felix Guillermo Moncada Gavilan	Jefe de Proyecto Tortugas del MIP	Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera 5 <sup>th</sup> Ave y 246 Barlovento Santa Fé	Tel. 24 5895 Fax 24 5895 E-mail – <a href="mailto:tortugas@cip.fishnavy.inf.cu">tortugas@cip.fishnavy.inf.cu</a>
Plácido R. Sánchez Vega	Especialista Principal	Ministerio de la Industria Pesquera Dir. Regulaciones Pesquera	Tel. 29 7253 Fax : 24 9168 E-mail : <a href="mailto:regpes@fishnavy.inf.cu">regpes@fishnavy.inf.cu</a>
Enrique Moret	Asesor Legal	Agencia de Medio Ambiente Calle 20 esq. 18-A, Playa Ciudad Habana	Tel. 22 81042 Fax : 24 0852 E-mail : <a href="mailto:moret@ama.cu">moret@ama.cu</a>
José Alberto Alvarez Lemus	Autoridad Administrativa	Centro de Inspección y Control Ambiental Calle 28 esq. 5 <sup>th</sup> Ave. Miramar Playa, Ciudad Habana	Tel . (537) 23-1936 Fax : (537) 22-7030, 24-2676 E-mail : <a href="mailto:jose@ama.cu">jose@ama.cu</a>
Reinaldo Estrada	Subdirector	CITMA (CNAP) Calle 18A #4114 e/ 41 y 47 Playa Ciudad Habana	Tel. (537) 22-7970 Fax : (537) 24-0796 E-mail : <a href="mailto:rey@ama.cu">rey@ama.cu</a>
Antonio Perera*	Director	CITMA (CNAP) Calle 18A #4114 e/ 41 y 47 Playa Ciudad Habana	Tel. (537) 22 7970 Fax : (537) 24 0798 E-mail : <a href="mailto:tonyperera@ama.cu">tonyperera@ama.cu</a>
Gricel Acosta Acosta	Especialista	CITMA Dir. Colaboración Internacional Capitolio Nacional	Tel. (537) 67 0606 Fax : (537) 33 8054 E-mail : <a href="mailto:gricel@dci.citma.gov.cu">gricel@dci.citma.gov.cu</a>
Dalia María Salabarría		Calle 20 No. 4103 esq. 18A	Tel. (537) 22 9351 Fax : (537) 24 9031
Fabio J. Fajardo Moros*	Viceministro	Ministerio Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente	Tel. 67 0621 Fax : 67 0600 E-mail : <a href="mailto:fabio@ceniai.inf.cu">fabio@ceniai.inf.cu</a>
Modesto Fernández Diaz-Silveira	Funcionario	CITMA Capitolio Nacional Prado y San José La Habana	Tel. (537) 67 0598 Fax : (537) 67 0615 E-mail : <a href="mailto:mffds@hotmail.com">mffds@hotmail.com</a>
Silvia María Alvarez Rossell	Directora	CITMA (CICA) Calle 28 esq. 5ta Ave Playa	Tel. 22 7573 Fax : 7030 E-mail : <a href="mailto:silvia@ama.cu">silvia@ama.cu</a>

\* Head of Delegation

\*\* Alternate Head of Delegation

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Justo A. Quintero Mendez	Director de Colaboración Internacional	Capitolio Nacional La Habana	Tel. (537) 67 0606 Fax : (537) 33 8054
Enrique Hernández Hernández	Especialista	Centro Nacional de Areas Protegidas Calle 18A No. 4114 e/ 41 y 47 Playa, La Habana	Tel.202-7970 Fax : 204-0798 E-mail : enrique@ama.cu

### COLOMBIA

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Ana María Hernández**	Advisor	Ministerio de Medio Ambiente Calle 37 # 8-40 Piso 2 Bogotá, Colombia	Tel. (571) 288 98 60 Ext. 182 Fax : (571) 288 95 64 E-mail : <a href="mailto:amhernandez@minambiente.gov.co">amhernandez@minambiente.gov.co</a>
Dalila Caicedo Herrera	Profesional Especializado	Ministerio de Medio Ambiente Calle 37 # 8-40 Piso 2 Bogotá, Colombia.	Tel. (571) 288 68 77 Ext. 407 Fax : (571) 340 62 06/ 07 <a href="mailto:dcaicedo@minambiente.gov.co">dcaicedo@minambiente.gov.co</a>
León Ricardo Pérez Valderrama	Delegado	Embajada de Colombia. Cuba	Tel. 24 1246 Fax : 24 1249

### NETHERLANDS ANTILLES

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Darryllin Van Der Veen	Legal Advisor	Bureau of Foreign Relations of the Netherlands Antilles Fort Amsterdam 4 Curacao, Netherlands Antilles	Tel. (599) 9-461 39 33 Fax : (599) 9-461 71 23 E-mail : <a href="mailto:dvdveen.bbb@curinfo.an">dvdveen.bbb@curinfo.an</a>
Paul Hoetjes**	Policy Advisor	Environmental Section of the Ministry of Public Health and Environment Santa Rosaweg 122 Willemstad, Curacao	Tel. (599) 9-736 35 30 Fax : (599) 9-736 35 05 E-mail : <a href="mailto:milvomil@cura.net">milvomil@cura.net</a>
Eric Newton*	Policy Advisor CITES	Environmental Section of the Ministry of Public Health and Environment Santa Rosaweg 122 Willemstad, Curacao	Tel. (599) 9-736 35 30 Fax : (599) 9-736 35 03 E-mail : <a href="mailto:enewton@mina.vomil.an">enewton@mina.vomil.an</a>

### PANAMA

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Marisol Emelda Dimas*	Jefa Dpto. de Conservación de la Biodiversidad	Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente República de Panamá. Apartado C Zona 0843, Balboa Ancon. Albrook edif. 804	Tel. (507) 315-08 55 Fax : (507) 315-0573 E-mail : <a href="mailto:biodiversidad@anam.gob.pa">biodiversidad@anam.gob.pa</a>

**ST. LUCIA**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Lyndon John	Research Officer Forestry Department	Union, Castries St. Lucia	Tel. (758) 450 2078 Fax : (758) 450 2287 E-mail : lynamazon@hotmail.com

**ST. VINCENT & THE GRENADINES**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Franklin Murphy	Chief Fisheries Officer Fisheries Division	Ministry of Agriculture, Lands & Fisheries Kingstown	Tel. (784) 456-2738 Fax : E-mail : fishdiv@caribsurf.com

**TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Kenny Singh	Conservancy Coordinator	Ministry of the Environment, Forestry Division P.O. Bag 30, Long Circular Road, St. James. Trinidad	Tel. (868) 622-3217/ 4521 Fax : (868) 628 5503 E-mail : <a href="mailto:forestry@tstt.net.tt">forestry@tstt.net.tt</a>

**VENEZUELA**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Alberto Belzares*	Embajador Jefe de la Division de Fronteras Maritimas	Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores Direccion General de Soberania Limites y Asuntos Fronterizos	Tel. 862 88 86 Fax : 860 93 72 E-mail : <a href="mailto:albertobelzares@yahoo.com">albertobelzares@yahoo.com</a>
Biomar F. Blanco	Analista en Tematica Maritima	Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores Direccion General de Soberania, Limites y Asuntos Fronterizos/ Direccion de Fronteras Terrestres y Maritimas. Venezuela	Tel. 0212-862-88-86 Fax : 0212-860-93-72 E-mail : <a href="mailto:bioma1@starmedia.com">bioma1@starmedia.com</a>
Ileana Villalobos**	Directora de Cooperacion Tecnica	Ministerio del Ambiente y de los Recursos Naturales C.S.B Torre Sur, El Silencio	Tel. 40815 01-06 Fax : (58-212) 4081503 E-mail : <a href="mailto:odepri@marn.gov.ve">odepri@marn.gov.ve</a> <a href="mailto:ivillalobos@cantv.net">ivillalobos@cantv.net</a>
Sara Gálvez	Jefe de Division/Direccion de Areas Naturales Protegidas para la Fauna	Ministerio del Ambiente y de los Recursos Naturales C.S.B. Torre Sur piso 6, El Silencio, Direccion General de Fauna	Tel. 4081552/1553/1550 E-mail : <a href="mailto:profauna@marnr.gov.ve">profauna@marnr.gov.ve</a> <a href="mailto:sgalvez@cantv.net">sgalvez@cantv.net</a>

**OBSERVERS  
UNITED NATIONS/SPECIALIZED AGENCIES/  
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS**

**BARBADOS**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Julia Harrocks	Senior Lecturer Dept. Of Biological & Chemical Sciences	University of the West Indies Cave Hill Campus	Tel. 246 417 4320 Fax 246 417 4325 E-mail – <a href="mailto:horrocks@uwichill.edu.bb">horrocks@uwichill.edu.bb</a>

**JAMAICA**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Andrea Donaldson	Coordinator-Fauna in the Biodiversity Branch	National Environment and Planning Agency 10 Caledonia Avenue, Kingston 5	Tel. (867) 754 75 70 Fax : (867) 754 75 95 E-mail : <a href="mailto:adonaldson@nepa.gov.jm">adonaldson@nepa.gov.jm</a>

**MEXICO**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Rafael Solana-Sansores	Director General de Investigación de Proceso para el Desarrollo Sostenible	Instituto Nacional de la Pesca – SAGARPA Pitágoias 1320 Sta. Cruz Atoyac, Mexico	Phone : (52) 562 80600 – 12038 E-mail : <a href="mailto:aglender@semarnat.gob.mx">aglender@semarnat.gob.mx</a>
María Pia Gallina	Directora de Captación Financiera y Cooperación en ANP	Comisión Nacional de areas Naturales Protegidas (SEMARNAT) Ave Revolución 1425 – Nivel 28, Col. Tlacopac San Angel 01040, México, D.C.	Phone : 5624-33-44 Fax : 5624-35-90 E-mail : <a href="mailto:mgallina@conanp.gob.mx">mgallina@conanp.gob.mx</a>

**UNITED KINGDOM**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
David Connor*	Head, Marine Information Team	Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Monkstone House, City Road, Peterborough, PE1 1JY	Phone : 44 (0) 1733 866837 Fax : 44 (0) 1733 555948 E-mail : <a href="mailto:david.connor@jncc.gov.uk">david.connor@jncc.gov.uk</a>

**CAYMAN ISLANDS**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
John Bothwell	Research Officer	Cayman Islands Department of Environment, P.O. Box 486GT, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands (UK)	Phone : 345-949-8469 Fax : 345-949-4020 E-mail : <a href="mailto:john-doe@candw.ky">john-doe@candw.ky</a>

### TURKS AND CAICOS

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
Monica Wilson	Deputy Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Natural Resources, Government Compound, Front Street, Grand Turk,	Phone : 649-946-1728 or 649- 946-2801 Fax : 649-946-2751 E-mail : <a href="mailto:natural@tci.tc">natural@tci.tc</a>
Judith Lynette Garland**	Project Manager	Coastal Resource Management Project P.o Box 54, Cheshire Hall Providenciales	Phone : 649-9415122 Fax : 649-9464793 E-mail : <a href="mailto:crmpgarland@tciway.tc">crmpgarland@tciway.tc</a>

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
Richard Wilbur**	International Relations Officer	Department of State OES/PA Room 5805 Washington, DC, U.S.A	Phone : 1-202-647-3879 E-mail : <a href="mailto:wilburrm2@state.gov">wilburrm2@state.gov</a>
Nancy Daves**	International Coordinator	National Marine Fisheries Services 1315 East West Highway Silver Spring, MD 20910	Tel. 301 713 2319 ext. 413 Fax: 301 713 0376 E-mail: <a href="mailto:nancy.daves@noaa.gov">nancy.daves@noaa.gov</a>
Arthur Paterson*	International Affairs Specialist	National Ocean Service (NOAA), 1315 East West Highway, Silver Spring MD, 20910, USA	Tel. 301 713 3078 x217 Fax: 301 7113 4263 E-mail: <a href="mailto:arthur.e.paterson@noaa.gov">arthur.e.paterson@noaa.gov</a>
Gilberto Cintron-Molero	Chief Western Hemisphere Program	US Fish and Wildlife Service 4401 N Fairfax Dr. Arlsq 740 Arlington VA 22203	Tel. 703 358 1765 Fax: 703 358 2849 E-mail: <a href="mailto:gil_cintron@fws.gov">gil_cintron@fws.gov</a>

### ANIMAL WELFARE INSTITUTE

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
Milton Kaufmann**	Representative	19102 Roman Way, Montgomery Village, MD 20866, U.S.A	Phone : (301) 948 1831 Fax : (301) 948 1831 E-mail :
Thomas Garrett*	Rural Affairs Director	1686 34 <sup>th</sup> Street, Washington DC 20067, USA or Garrett Route, Rock River, Wyoming 82083, USA	Phone : 307-322-5883 Fax : 307-322-5882 E-mail : <a href="mailto:tomotm@netcommander.com">tomotm@netcommander.com</a>

### ASSOCIATION OF CARIBBEAN STATES

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
Mario Estrada*	Director, Sustainable Tourism	Asociación de Estados del Caribe 5-7 Sweet Briar Rd. St. Clair. Port-of-Spain Trinidad, W.I.	Tel. (868) 622 95 75 Ext. 240 Fax : (868) 622 1653

**CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF  
WILD FAUNA AND FLORA (CITES) SECRETARIAT**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Willem Wijnstekers*	Secretary General	15 Chemin des Anemones, CH-1219, Geneva, Switzerland	Phone : 41229178149 Fax : E-mail : <a href="mailto:willem.wijnstekers@unep.ch">willem.wijnstekers@unep.ch</a>

**EASTERN CARIBBEAN COALITION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AWARENESS /  
ENVIRONMENT AWARENESS GROUP (ECCEA/EAG)**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Lesley Suttly*	Head of Operations/C.E.O.	Museum Histoire Naturelle (Galleries de Géologie et Botanique) BP 4030, Terrers Sainville, 97254, Martinique CEDEX, Fort de France	Phone : 596 6567 25 GSM : 596 332348 Fax : 596 656725 E-mail : <a href="mailto:lsuttly@wanadoo.fr">lsuttly@wanadoo.fr</a> <a href="mailto:Eccea@candw.lc">Eccea@candw.lc</a>
Sherrod James	SP2 Coordinator	Long Street (Upstairs Museum) St. John's Antigua and Barbuda	Tel. 268 462-6236 Fax : 268 463-7740 E-mail : <a href="mailto:eag@candw.ag">eag@candw.ag</a>

**DELEGATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION IN BARBADOS**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Hans Lancee	Environmental and Tourism Advisor	Mearne House Marine Garden Hastings Christ Church Barbados	Phone : 1-246-427-4362 ext.222 E-mail : <a href="mailto:hans.lancee@delbrb.cec.eu.int">hans.lancee@delbrb.cec.eu.int</a>

**GREENPEACE**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Geert Drieman	Director Int.& Legal Affairs	Keizersgracht 174 1015 st Amsterdam Holland	Phone : 00-31-20-5249537 Fax : 00-31-20-5236.618 E-mail : <a href="mailto:gdrieman@ams.greenpeace.org">gdrieman@ams.greenpeace.org</a>

**HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Ronald Orenstein (normally with International Wildlife Coalition)		1825 Shady Creek Court Mississauga, Ontario Canada	Phone : 905 820 7886 Fax : 905 569 0116 E-mail :

### INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR ANIMAL WELFARE (IFAW)

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
Carole Carlson	Sr. Marine Habitat Advisor	411 Main Street Yarmouth Port MA 02675 USA	Phone : 1508 7442086 Fax : 1508 7442089 E-mail : <a href="mailto:ccarlson@ifaw.org">ccarlson@ifaw.org</a>
Beatriz Bugada Bernal	Directora para America Latina	International Fund for Animal Welfare IFAW Prol. Angelina No. 10 Col. Guadalupe Inn Mexico D.C.	Phone : 56-61-0166 E-mail : <a href="mailto:bbugada@ifaw.org">bbugada@ifaw.org</a>

### IWMC- WORLD CONSERVATION TRUST

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
Jaques Berney	Executive Vice-President	IWMC World Conservation Trust 3 Passage Montriond CH – 1006 Laussane Switzerland	Phone: 4121 6165000 Fax: 4121 6165000 E-mail: <a href="mailto:iwmcch@iwmc.org">iwmcch@iwmc.org</a>

### MONITOR INTERNATIONAL

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
David Read Barker	President	300 State Street Annapolis, MD 21403 USA	Phone: (410) 262-5155 Fax: (410) 268-8788 E-mail: <a href="mailto:drbarker@monitorinternational.org">drbarker@monitorinternational.org</a>

### PRO-NATURALEZA

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
María Elena Ibarra-Martin	Presidenta	Calle 16 #114 e/ 1ra y 3ra, Playa Ciudad Habana	Phone : 23-0617, 22-5223 Fax : (537) 24-2087 E-mail : <a href="mailto:cim@nova.uh.cu">cim@nova.uh.cu</a>

### REGIONAL ACTIVITY CENTRE OF SPAW (RAC-SPAW)

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
Bernard Domenjoud	Director	CAR-SPAW 1Rue du Capitaine Bébel 97100 Basse-Terre, Guadeloupe, France	Phone : 0590 410451 Fax : 0509 410462 E-mail : <a href="mailto:domenjou@outremer.com">domenjoud@outremer.com</a>

### THE NATURE CONSERVANCY (TNC)

Participants	Title	Address	Tel./Fax/e-mail
Randall Curtis	Director of Policy & Conservation Finance	4245 N. Fairfax Dr. Arlington VA 22203, USA	Tel. 703 841 4864 E-mail: <a href="mailto:rcurtis@tnc.org">rcurtis@tnc.org</a>

**THIRD MILLENIUM FOUNDATION**

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Tel./Fax/e-mail</b>
Domitila Senni*	Chairperson	Los Fossil Aq 06060 Paciano (PG) Italy	Phone: 39-075-830351 Fax: 39-075-830381 E-mail: <a href="mailto:3mf@3rdmf.org">3mf@3rdmf.org</a>

**SECRETARIAT OF THE CARIBBEAN ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME**

United Nations Environment Programme  
Caribbean Regional Unit (UNEP-CAR/RCU)  
14-20 Port Royal St., Kingston, Jamaica  
Tel: (876) 922-9267  
Fax: (876) 922-9292

<b>Participants</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>e-mail</b>
<i>Nelson Andrade Colmenares</i>	Co-ordinator	<a href="mailto:nac.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com">nac.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com</a>
<i>Timothy J. Kasten</i>	Acting Deputy Co-ordinator and AMEP Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:tjk.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com">tjk.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com</a>
<i>Alesandra Vanzella-Khoury</i>	SPAW Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:avk.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com">avk.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com</a>
<i>Luc St-Pierre</i>	CEPNET Programme Officer	<a href="mailto:lsp.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com">lsp.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com</a>
<i>José Maria Beato</i>	Funds Administrator	<a href="mailto:txema.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com">txema.uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com</a>
<i>Lloyd Gardner</i>	Consultant	<a href="mailto:lgardne@uvi.edu">lgardne@uvi.edu</a>
<i>Ingrid Lee-Smart</i>	System Analyst	<a href="mailto:uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com">uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com</a>
<i>Brenda L. Dewdney</i>	Bilingual Secretary (SPAW)	<a href="mailto:uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com">uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com</a>
<i>Donna Henry-Hernandez</i>	Bilingual Secretary (CEPNET)	<a href="mailto:uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com">uneprcuja@cwjamaica.com</a>