



Distr. LIMITED

UNEP(DEPI)/CAR WG.40/4

21 November 2018

Original: ENGLISH

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

Panama City, Panama, 5 - 7 December 2018

REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF PROTECTED AREAS PROPOSED FOR LISTING UNDER THE SPAW PROTOCOL

Action to be Taken:

The 8th SPAW STAC (STAC8) is invited to review this report and make recommendations to the 10th Meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP10) to the SPAW Protocol, with respect to listing of the Protected Areas proposed and presented by the Parties.

For reasons of economy and the environment, Delegates are kindly requested to bring their copies of the Working and Information documents to the Meeting, and not to request additional copies.

Table of contents

I. BACKGROUND	1
II. LAUNCH OF NEW LISTING PROCESS OF PAs FOR PRESENTATION AT SPAW COP10	2
III. RESULTS OF THE REVIEW OF THE PRESENTATION REPORTS MADE BY THE WORKING GROUP ON THE EVALUATION OF PROTECTED AREAS PROPOSED FOR LISTING UNDER THE SPAW PROTOCOL	2
IV. SPAW-RAC OVERALL CONCLUSION	9
ANNEX I	10
LETTER TO THE MEMBERS OF THE “PROTECTED AREAS WORKING GROUP” (29 OCTOBER 2018) TO INVITE THEM TO REVIEW THE REPRESENTED PROTECTED AREAS FOR LISTING UNDER SPAW	
ANNEX II: LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE "PROTECTED AREAS WORKING GROUP"	11
ANNEX III: MAPS OF SPAW PROTECTED AREAS LISTED IN 2018	12

I. BACKGROUND

1. The listing of Protected Areas under the Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) Protocol, as per Article 7, has been made a priority since 2004 by successive Conferences of Parties. This directive also includes the development of a cooperation programme for the protected areas listed and will contribute to the building of ecological networks of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs).
2. The Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol were developed by a dedicated working group of experts nominated by the SPAW Contracting Parties, as well as a reporting format that aims to assist Parties to prepare their presentation reports on the Protected Areas they wish to propose for listing. The Guidelines were adopted at the Fifth Meeting of the Contracting Parties (COP5) to the SPAW Protocol (St. John's, Antigua, 8 September 2008), and the reporting format was adopted at the Sixth COP in Montego Bay, Jamaica, 5 October 2010.
3. A specific web-based tool that follows the reporting format was developed by the SPAW RAC in order to offer the possibility to Parties of preparing and submitting reports on-line, if they wish to do so as the use of the web-based tool was made optional. The tool is available at: <http://www.spaw-palisting.org/>
4. A dedicated database was also developed in the same timeframe in order to house the data provided in the reports, as well as to facilitate compilation and analyses of the characteristics of the Protected Areas listed under the SPAW Protocol.
5. To date, 32 Protected Areas have been presented and listed (see map attached in Annex III), namely and chronologically.
 - at COP 7 in 2012:
 - **Belize:** Hol Chan Marine Reserve and Glover's Reef Marine Reserve;
 - **Bonaire (Netherlands):** Bonaire National Marine Park;
 - **Colombia:** Ciénaga Grande de Santa Marta Sanctuary ; and Regional Seaflower Marine Protected Area in San Andrés and Providencia Archipelago ;
 - **Cuba:** Guanahacabibes National Park;
 - **French Guiana (France):** Grand Connétable Island Natural Reserve;
 - **French West Indies (France):** Agoa Sanctuary;
 - **Guadeloupe (France):** Guadeloupe National Park; Petite-Terre National Reserve ;
 - **Saba (Netherlands):** Saba Bank National Park;
 - **St Eustatius (Netherlands):** The Quill/Boven National Park;
 - **St Martin (France):** St Martin Lagoon Ponds Natural Reserve;
 - **United States of America:** Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary; Dry Tortugas National Park; Everglades National Park; and Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary in Texas (Gulf of Mexico);
 - at COP 8 in 2014 :
 - **Belize:** Port Honduras Marine Reserve;
 - **Colombia:** Regional Natural Park of Wetlands between the rivers León and Suriquí ;
 - **Dominican Republic:** La Caleta Submarine Park; the Jaragua National Park; Los Haitises National Park; and Sierra de Bahoruco National Park;
 - **France:** The Saline Pond Reserve; and Reserve du Versant Nord-Ouest de la Montagne Pelée (Martinique);
 - **Grenada:** Molinière-Beauséjour Reserve.
 - **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines:** Tobago Cays Marine Park;
 - **The Kingdom of the Netherlands:** Saba National Marine Park; St Eustatius National Marine Park; and Man O War Shoal Marine Park (Sint Maarten);
 - and at COP 9 in 2016:
 - **Cuba:** Cayos de San Felipe National Park.

Full reports are available at <http://www.spaw-palisting.org/>

II. LAUNCH OF NEW LISTING PROCESS OF PAs FOR PRESENTATION AT SPAW COP10

6. The SPAW RAC on behalf of the Secretariat invited SPAW Contracting Parties in Spring 2018 to consider presenting additional Protected Areas for listing under SPAW Protocol at the Tenth Conference of the Parties and to initiate the elaboration of the presentation reports.
7. Three nomination proposals were acknowledged for review:
 - **Saba (Netherlands):** Mount Scenery National Park;
 - **France:** National Natural Reserve of the Amana and National Natural Reserve of Kaw-Roura (French Guiana).
8. To access PA reports presented in 2018, visit:
 - http://www.car-spaw-rac.org/IMG/pdf/listing_under_spaw_protocol_of_rnn-amana_report.pdf
 - http://www.car-spaw-rac.org/IMG/pdf/listing_under_spaw_protocol_of_rnn-kr_report.pdf
 - http://www.car-spaw-rac.org/IMG/pdf/mt-scenery_national_park_report.pdf
9. The admissibility of the reports presenting the protected areas proposed for listing under SPAW protocol have been first verified in October by the SPAW Regional Activity Center as a part of the SPAW Secretariat and coordinator of the Working Group on the Evaluation of Protected Areas proposed for listing under the SPAW Protocol (attached in Annex II list of members). The Working Group was then asked through the SPAW-RAC to review the presentation reports (external review) with a view to facilitate the assessment of the presentation reports to be made by SPAW STAC8. See this presentation report below.

III. RESULTS OF THE REVIEW OF THE PRESENTATION REPORTS MADE BY THE WORKING GROUP ON THE EVALUATION OF PROTECTED AREAS PROPOSED FOR LISTING UNDER THE SPAW PROTOCOL

10. Standard evaluation process by the "Protected Areas" working group - External review

NB: The Protected Areas Working Group established since 2007 for the development of the Guidelines and Annotated Format is consulted informally under the leadership and coordination of the SPAW-Regional Activity Center to conduct a first standard evaluation process of presentation reports (external review). The reports will then be assessed by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) before being presented to the Conference of the Parties (Spring 2019) for adoption.

11. The objective of this format is to facilitate first, the informal review of the presentation reports by the experts of the Working Group and the reporting of the main comments for transmission to the STAC. A first section summarizes the main comments of the SPAW-RAC on the report, followed by the expert review and comments in subsequent sections of the format below.

Summary of main comments by the experts of the Working Group:

- ✓ Overall mandatory documents missing in every proposal report.
- ✓ The reports are comprehensive but there is a general lack of information upon both common and specific aspects considered as important for PA listing.
- ✓ The protected areas presented match the Criteria for listing under SPAW.
- ✓ Every each of the three proposals having given rise to reserved reviews, the possibility to provide complementary elements as answers of these comments was offered to the concerned Parties.

12. **Name of the protected area for which the presentation report was submitted and country:** Mount Scenery National Park – Saba island, The Kingdom of the Netherlands

Summary of the SPAW-RAC's preliminary comments on the presentation report.

The report is well completed. No mandatory information missing (Admissibility)

Seven ecological Criteria proposed: Representativeness, Conservation value, Rarity, Naturalness, Critical habitats, Diversity and Resilience.

All three of the cultural and socio-economic Criteria proposed: Productivity, Cultural and traditional use, Socio-economic benefits.

As a non mandatory criterion but highly recommended information to provide, "the presentation of a Planning and Management based on scientific, traditional and technical knowledge" can be judged as missing.

External review by the experts :

Name of the expert consulted: *Lloyd Gardner*

Country: *U.S. Virgin Islands*

Position: *Environmental Planning Consultant*

Email contact: *LSG_JR@hotmail.com*

Date of review: *November 8, 2018*

Name of the expert consulted: *Georgina Bustamente*

Country: *U.S.A.*

Position: *CaMPAM Coordinator*

Email contact: *gbustamante09@gmail.com*

Date of review: *November 10, 2018*

According to you, did you find in the report mandatory information missing for the adequate evaluation of the conformity of the proposed site with the Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be Listed under the SPAW Protocol ? If you did, which elements are missing ?

(Content of the report: (I) Identification of the Proposed Protected Area, (II) Executive Summary, (III) Site Description, (IV) Ecological Criteria, (V) Cultural and Socio-Economic Criteria, (VI) Management, (VII) Monitoring and Evaluation, (VIII) Stakeholders, (IX) Implementation Mechanism, (X) Other Relevant Information).

LG, GB : Mandatory and important information missing from the application dossier include:

- 1) Adopted / approved management framework / plan*
- 2) Public use levels and patterns (including tourism visitation)*
- 3) Identification of any standard / agreed monitoring or evaluation protocols.*

CRITERIA SATISFIED:

Ecological criteria

According to you, does the PA proposed satisfy at least one ecological Criteria? If you don't, please justify. If you did, which ones. (Proposed criteria for the PA listing process : Representativeness, Conservation value, Rarity, Naturalness (level of disturbance), Critical habitats, Diversity, Connectivity/coherence, Resilience)

LG : Ecological criteria satisfied are : Representativeness, Conservation value, Rarity, Critical habitats and Diversity.

GB : Ecological criteria satisfied are : Representativeness, Conservation value, Rarity, Naturalness, Critical habitats and Diversity.

Cultural and socio-economic criteria

According to you, does the PA proposed satisfy at least one cultural and socio-economic benefits Criteria? If you did, which one? (Productivity, Cultural and traditional use, Socio-economic benefits)

LG : The proposed site satisfies the 'socio-economic benefits' criterion, based on its support to the local tourism sector.

However, there are four (4) related issues of concern:

- 4) The application dossier says that the "nature values" of the site "can be monetized by small entrepreneurs operating within the park providing services to visiting tourists." (Chapter 5, p.17) The information on stakeholder engagement (Chapter 8 of the dossier) does not suggest any stakeholder participation in decisions regarding types, scale, selection mechanisms, or management of private enterprises operating in the national park. The current mechanism for stakeholder consultations will undoubtedly need to be revised to facilitate more participation in decision making.*
- 5) The application dossier (including the management planning information) does not address visitor management within the park.*
- 6) The potential for "small-scale sustainable forest agriculture" within the park is noted by the application dossier, but not addressed as a management strategy.*

GB : 7) The park was only recently declared, and the dossier expresses, "management framework as described above is sufficient to manage the Mt. Scenery National Park, as the SCF has in effect already been maintaining the trail network for many years before the formal establishment of the park." However, it is required for the SPAW inscriptions to have a formal, public MP, which may include increasing some protection measures, surveys of some important fauna and flora species, limits to the "small-scale sustainable forest agriculture" within the park, etc. as the park declaration and SPAW listing may increase the visitation.

Global assessment of the proposal

According to you and given the comments made in the above section, do you recommend the listing of the proposed Protected Area under the SPAW Protocol ? Please provide a brief statement supporting your position with respect to the listing or not of the proposed Protected Area

LG : I recommend that the application for listing the Mt. Scenery National Park, Saba, Natherlands Antilles, under the SPAW Protocol should not be approved at this time.

8) The applicant should be advised to re-submit the application after completing a more rigorous management planning process and obtaining state approval of the management plan and supporting operating plans (e.g. monitoring, visitor management, endangered species management).

GB : I recommend not to approve the site Mt. Scenery National Park, Saba, Kingdom of Netherlands under the SPAW Protocol but wait until the nomination is completed by including the management plan, probably in the next period.

Other Comments:

LG :

9) The information presented in the "management information" document indicates that there is lack of capacity for dealing with the tourism and visitor management requirements of the park under the anticipated increase in user numbers.

10) This capacity constraint also applies in the areas of permitting, interacting with regulatory agencies for environmental impact assessment (required under the ordinance for park designation), and restoration and management of archeological resources within the site.

11) There is no indication of how climate change is to be addressed, in what is supposed to be the most important terrestrial ecosystem on the island. This major oversight, and the state of readiness of the management institution, suggests that the application for listing under SPAW is premature.

12) The Island Council proposal for establishment of the Mt. Scenery National Park clearly states that the value to be derived from the establishment of the park is its use value. "The economy of Saba relies on international nature-related tourism. Therefore, the most important ecosystem service value is the use-value for nature-related tourism." (Island Council Proposal No. 2018.003, page 2 or 5, paragraph 2).

13) The council hopes to extract that use value by doubling tourist arrivals by 2020, and the park is central to that tourism strategy. However, the site management information note included in the application dossier indicates that Saba's nature policy plan, strategic development plan, and tourism development plan are all outdated, and it is unclear how these outdated plans can function as the "larger planning framework" for management of the new national park (see guideline 14(d)).

14) Most of the land within the national park is said to be privately owned (council proposal for site designation), though abandoned. Does the declaration of intent by the government automatically transfer ownership to the state? Is it possible that once the site is declared persons or institutions will claim ownership? If it is possible that parcels of lands within the park could end up in non-state ownership, what are the management implications during the legal process for resolving ownership, or afterwards? In-holdings are notably problematic for protected areas management, and there is no indication in the application dossier that this issue will be addressed in the management framework.

15) There is a tendency towards making management plans 'living documents', translated as listing management activities that can be changed periodically without rewriting the management plan. Without opining on the efficacy of this approach, I strongly recommend that this form of management planning be discouraged for protected areas to be listed under the SPAW Protocol, as such plans do not provide enough strategic guidance for longterm planning, particularly within the context of regional conservation objectives.

GB : The information presented in the "management information" document is very well structured and detailed. All who have visited Saba understand the high level of conservation of the small island and the need to protect it in the long term. Increasing the visitation may affect the conservation value and relatively high level of naturalness of the park, so additional conservation measures may be needed.

Regarding these comments the Focal Point of the Netherlands provided the following contents:

Name of the Focal Point: *Paul Hoetjes*
Country: *The Kingdom of the Netherlands*
Position: *Policy coordinator Nature*
Email contact: *paul.hoetjes@rijksdienstcn.com*
Providing date: *November 15, 2018*

For a better understanding of the Focal Point statements, these have been numbered, following the experts comments numbering:

2) Transportation to the island by air and sea ferry is very limited and in itself poses a restriction on how many visitors the island can receive. The growing sector is small cruise ship tourism and hikes are the most popular excursions. However, all hikes are guided by the SCF and there is a maximum amount of persons allowed per guide / hike. As a conservative estimate, there are presently only between 9,000 and 10,000 hikers a year within the park, 27 hikers/day

3) Management will be monitored yearly using the DCNA Management Succes protocol and the WWF METT protocol

4) As indicated, the management plan is currently being developed and part of that process is the involvement of the various stakeholders to address such things as specific types of possible private enterprises. Nonetheless, so far every community member (Saba only has 2000 inhabitants) had the opportunity to get actively involved in the planning process of the park (several town hall meetings) and overall overwhelming support was received by the community.

5) There is ongoing interaction between the SCF and the Island Government with regards to visitor management. SCF has for many years been tasked by the island government to manage the hiking trail network of the island (most of which will now fall within the park). Visitors are not allowed to venture off the established trails, thus also preventing conflicts with private land owners.

6) Small scale agriculture is already happening (e.g small banana farm on the Sandy Cruz trail, tannia plantation on the Buds Mountain Trail and the rastafarian plantation on the Mount Scenery Trail, bordering the park), except for the one bordering the park, these are all very small plots (< 3000 m²). Possibilities of harvesting existing wild cocoa trees and coffee shrubs (and possibly increasing their numbers) to develop a niche product will be evaluated.

8) The management plan is being developed by the island government in conjunction with SCF, with funding (and input) from the national government and guided by a steering group consisting of SCF, the archaeological centre, the island government and the national government. Thus approval of the final plan is all but certain.

9) With regards to visitor management, transportation to the island by air and sea ferry is very limited and in itself poses a restriction on how many visitors the island can receive. The growing sector is small cruise ship tourism and hikes are the most popular excursions. However, all hikes are guided by the SCF and there is a maximum amount of persons allowed per guide/hike. There are presently only estimated 9,000 to 10,000 hikers a year within the park. Even if the amount of hikers in the park would double by the year 2020, which is highly ambitious, there would be only about 55 hikers on the trails every day.

10) In addition to visitors' management, there is also interaction between the SCF and the Island Government with regards to permitting (all proposals are reviewed by the SCF in an advisory capacity to the Island Government), interacting with regulatory agencies, EIAs et cetera.

Although there is no official management plan yet, there already is active management, because the Island Government is paying for 6 trail wardens and a trail manager under administration by the SCF (although we don't receive compensation for the latter overheads). Furthermore, there is a Canadian volunteer program for the development of the park in place for over two decades. The SCF parks manager has just been sworn in as 'special agent of police' formally allowing him to enforce relevant legislation and island ordinances. There is now also a second terrestrial park ranger paid for by the SCF and they both are basically in the park on a daily basis, addressing any issues there may arise.

11) There are light intensity and temperature gauges installed on the top of Mount Scenery and at the hot springs / sea water temperature are being monitored in the attempt to address climate change.

13) The provided management information document was the first draft provided by the consultant commissioned by the island and still needed to be reviewed and verified. The particular information referred to here was incorrect. There is in fact a National Nature Policy Plan for the Caribbean Netherlands 2013-2017 (being renewed this year). Saba itself also has an Economic Development Plan 2004-2007 which is still valid and which includes as one of its guiding principles: "Maintaining and protecting Saba's identity and environment" Saba also has a Tourism Action Plan 2016-2018

In addition there is an Island Ordinance that prohibits development above the 550 meter topographic contour.

14) The island council did not just make a declaration of intent but also approved the corresponding legislation which legally establishes the park, including the regulations that apply inside the park. This does not impact ownership within the park, there is no transfer of ownership. Private land owners of areas within the park are however, bound by the regulations that apply within the park for any new activities they want to undertake on their land (i.e. they will need a permit). Ongoing activities (only small scale traditional agriculture) can continue. Furthermore the north coast of the island (most of the park) is considered "waste land" of no value and only the south part of Mt. Scenery has potential for development, but that is protected by the long existing island ordinance restricting development higher than 550 meter. Thus no conflicts are foreseen, in particular because a previous study of the land ownership situation in the area concluded that most of the private ownership consisted of undivided legacy parcels in which individual ownership is nigh impossible to establish. In the few cases where ownership was clear, the owners all supported the establishment of the national park. Since visitors are only allowed on the trails no conflicts are foreseen there either.

15) The management plan for the park will be a five year plan. Yearly evaluation of management effectiveness (following the DCNA 'management success' protocol, but since this year also the WWF METT protocol) will allow adjustment of actions, thus 'adaptive management', but only within the broader five year strategic objectives of the plan. In addition the SCF has just adopted an overall five year strategic plan, within which the Mt. Scenery national park management plan fits.

13. **Name of the protected area for which the presentation report was submitted and country:** *The National Natural Reserve of the Amana – French Guiana, France*

Summary of the SPAW-RAC's preliminary comments on the presentation report.

The report is well completed. No mandatory information missing (Admissibility)

Six ecological criteria proposed: Representativeness, Conservation value, Rarity, Critical habitats, Diversity and Connectivity.

All three of the cultural and socio-economic criteria proposed: Productivity, Cultural and traditional use, Socio-economic benefits.

External review by the experts :

Name of the expert consulted: *Lloyd Gardner*

Country: *U.S. Virgin Islands*

Position: *Environmental Planning Consultant*

Email contact: *LSG_JR@hotmail.com*

Date of review: *November 12, 2018*

Name of the expert consulted: *Georgina Bustamante*

Country: *U.S.A.*

Position: *CaMPAM Coordinator*

Email contact: *gbustamante09@gmail.com*

Date of review: *November 2nd, 2018*

According to you, did you find in the report mandatory information missing for the adequate evaluation of the conformity of the proposed site with the Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be Listed under the SPAW Protocol ? If you did, which elements are missing ?

(Content of the report: (I) Identification of the Proposed Protected Area, (II) Executive Summary, (III) Site Description, (IV) Ecological Criteria, (V) Cultural and Socio-Economic Criteria, (VI) Management, (VII) Monitoring and Evaluation, (VIII) Stakeholders, (IX) Implementation Mechanism, (X) Other Relevant Information).

LG : Information on key issues, such as management strategies and stakeholder engagement is missing, even though the dossier identifies communication and engagement deficiencies with some communities. Without access to the management plan, it is impossible to determine whether the management strategies are appropriate, and therefore likely to protect the integrity of the reserve.

GB : The nomination documents includes information for I, II, III, VI, V, VIII, IX.

VI- The nomination documents include good habitat and zoning maps, and some sporadic management measures (despite a large management budget, ca. €4000,500) such as outreach activities, information on the Facebook page (the website is outdated), enforcement, environmental surveys. Two thirds of the reserve was leased for agriculture, although there is no information of the kind of crop and its effect on the natural habitats.

VII – There have been environment surveys, but not monitoring and evaluation (which is the case for most protected areas in the Caribbean). Sea turtle nesting, one of the main conservation values of the reserve is not effectively protected: the local community consumes turtle eggs, and the few warnings mentioned have not contributed to reduce it.

There is little information, if any, on the 2016-2018 period.

CRITERIA SATISFIED:

Ecological criteria

According to you, does the PA proposed satisfy at least one ecological Criteria? If you don't, please justify. If you did, which ones? (Proposed criteria for the PA listing process : Representativeness, Conservation value, Rarity, Naturalness (level of disturbance), Critical habitats, Diversity, Connectivity/coherence, Resilience)

LG: Ecological criteria satisfied are: representativeness, conservation value, rarity, critical habitats, and diversity.

GB: It satisfies the following ecological criteria: important and unique wetland habitat in the Guianan ecoregion, nesting sites for endangered sea turtles and birds. No information on the impact of agriculture in the terrestrial habitats.

The Reserve is proposed because its representativeness, critical habitats, rarity and conservation value of emblematic species (sea turtles, migratory birds, the jaguar, the ocelot the manatee and the cabiai) and habitats ("an exceptional coastal sedimentary dynamic and among the most important in the world due to its variations of coastline". There is no information on Naturalness (the effect of illegal fishing, turtle egg poaching and agricultural land).

Cultural and socio-economic criteria

According to you, does the PA proposed satisfy at least one cultural and socio-economic benefits Criteria? If you did, which one? (Productivity, Cultural and traditional use, Socio-economic benefits)

LG: The site proposed for listing satisfies all of the cultural and socio-economic criteria.

GB: The area has cultural and socioeconomic value for the community since it receives many tourist visitors. There is no information on the economic benefits of this activity in the local community.

Global assessment of the proposal

According to you and given the comments made in the above section, do you recommend the listing of the proposed Protected Area under the SPAW Protocol ? Please provide a brief statement supporting your position with respect to the listing or not of the proposed Protected Area.

LG: I recommend that the application for listing the National Natural Reserve of the Amana under the SPAW Protocol be approved. The protected area is of local and national importance for environmental, economic, and social development.

GB: The Reserve is an important conservation area for the local community, French Guiana and the Guianan Marine Ecoregion, but there is some reservations on the effectiveness of protecting the sea turtle nesting sites and the impact of agricultural land. I recommend to approve it if more information is provided on these two aspects.

Other Comments:

LG : The management structure (http://reserve.amana.free.fr/gerer_1.php) does not reflect the human resources required to implement the stated management objectives. This is demonstrated in part by the gaps between the reserve management efforts and permitting processes (e.g. for farming).

Regarding these comments the French Focal Point provided the following contents:

Name of the Focal Point: *Jean Vermot*

Country: *France*

Position: *European and international coordinator for marine habitats*

Email contact: *jean.vermot@developpement-durable.gouv.fr*

Providing date: *November 19, 2018*

- Types and impact of agriculture in the reserve:

The areas to the southeast and southwest of the reserve are historically agricultural. The decree of the reserve took into account this point by authorizing the continuation of the traditional agriculture on plots already exploited. RNA therefore allows the continuity of historical agricultural activities, provided that the plots do not expand. The agents of the reserve regularly follow the footprint of the farms. The checks carried out showed no new clearing. In addition, monitoring of agricultural pressure in the Javouhey and Mana sector has been ongoing since 2016, the results obtained will have to be monitored.

- Illegal fishing:

The RNA team initiated a collaboration with the various services coordinating or participating in the fishing police in French Guiana. These missions proved particularly effective with the boarding of 30 tappers (fishing boats) and the destruction of more than 60 km of nets between 2013 and 2016.

- Protection of sea turtle nesting sites:

Nest monitoring and control is one of the reserve's priorities. Currently two reserve guards and ONCFS agents regularly patrol the spawning season and verbalize the infractions observed.

In addition, the consumption of sea turtle eggs is highly symbolic and identity-based for the Kali'na population living in or near the reserve. For the majority of scientists working on sea turtles in French Guiana, a limited egg harvest is not incompatible with species conservation. However, the process of allowing a derogation from the ban on marine turtle specimens for traditional consumption remains unfulfilled.

- Naturalness / state of conservation of the environments:

A priority issue of the RNA is "the environments and their natural dynamics". Indeed, the main characteristic of the reserve is its permanent, important and rapid evolution, even outside human activities. This dynamic of the world's unique coastline creates difficulties in apprehending and planning the preservation of natural environments. Existing methodologies are poorly adapted to such a dynamic territory.

14. **Name of the protected area for which the presentation report was submitted and country:** *The National Natural Reserve of Kaw-Roura - French Guiana, France*

Summary of the SPAW-RAC's preliminary comments on the presentation report.

The report is well completed. No mandatory information missing (Admissibility)

Four ecological criteria proposed: Representativeness, Diversity.

All three of the cultural and socio-economic Criteria proposed: Productivity, Cultural and traditional use, Socio-economic benefits.

External review by the experts:

Name of the expert consulted: *Lloyd Gardner*

Country: *U.S. Virgin Islands*

Position: *Environmental Planning Consultant*

Email contact: *LSG_JR@hotmail.com*

Date of review: *November 12, 2018*

Name of the expert consulted: *Paul Hoetjes*

Country: *Netherlands*

Position: *Policy coordinator Nature*

Email contact: *paul.hoetjes@rijksdienstcn.com*

Date of review: *November 7, 2018*

According to you, did you find in the report mandatory information missing for the adequate evaluation of the conformity of the proposed site with the Guidelines and Criteria for the Evaluation of Protected Areas to be Listed under the SPAW Protocol ? If you did, which elements are missing ?

(Content of the report: (I) Identification of the Proposed Protected Area, (II) Executive Summary, (III) Site Description, (IV) Ecological Criteria, (V) Cultural and Socio-Economic Criteria, (VI) Management, (VII) Monitoring and Evaluation, (VIII) Stakeholders, (IX) Implementation Mechanism, (X) Other Relevant Information).

LG : Information on key issues, such as management strategies, monitoring and evaluation of public (extractive) use and visitor management, is inadequate. Maybe these issues are covered in the 2015-2020 management plan. While the site is important for national conservation purposes, there is little information regarding the regional significance of the site, except that it is part of a local network of protected areas.

PH : Information was complete

CRITERIA SATISFIED:

Ecological criteria

According to you, does the PA proposed satisfy at least one ecological Criteria? If you don't, please justify. If you did, which ones?

(Proposed criteria for the PA listing process : Representativeness, Conservation value, Rarity, Naturalness (level of disturbance), Critical habitats, Diversity, Connectivity/coherence, Resilience)

LG : Ecological criteria satisfied are: representativeness, conservation value, critical habitats, and diversity.

PH : YES. Representativeness, Conservation value, Rarity, Diversity

Cultural and socio-economic criteria

According to you, does the PA proposed satisfy at least one cultural and socio-economic benefits Criteria? If you did, which one?

(Productivity, Cultural and traditional use, Socio-economic benefits)

LG : The site proposed for listing satisfies all of the cultural and socio-economic criteria.

PH : YES. All three criteria

Global assessment of the proposal

According to you and given the comments made in the above section, do you recommend the listing of the proposed Protected Area under the SPAW Protocol ? Please provide a brief statement supporting your position with respect to the listing or not of the proposed Protected Area.

LG: I recommend that the application for listing the National Natural Reserve of Kaw-Roura under the SPAW Protocol be approved. The protected area provides a range of ecosystem services, and the integrity of the site has implications for the integrity of the larger coastal ecosystem for the country. [Note: This statement is based on literature dealing with the mangrove ecosystems along the coastline of the Guianas.]

PH: As the area conforms to several ecological criteria as well as cultural and socio-economic criteria and it appears to have a sound management plan, this area is recommended for listing under the SPAW Protocol

Other Comments:

LG: The application dossier indicates that the areas of wetland are outside sovereign control. If the reverse is correct, that is, the wetlands are sovereign territory, it implies that not all of the terrestrial component of the site is publicly owned. Either way, the land tenure question should be clarified, as it has major implications for management of the reserve. The wetlands, particularly the coastal mangrove forests, are critical ecosystems along the Guianas, and effective management of those ecosystems should be one of

the main objectives for SPAW listing. The applicant should be asked to provide more information on the uses, vulnerabilities, and management of the wetlands in the reserve (assuming those issues are not addressed in detail in the management plan).

There is no indication of how climate change is to be addressed, although the application dossier mentions the importance of the riverine influences on the wetland systems. Again, maybe this is addressed in the management plan, but one would expect such an important issue to be included in the dossier.

Regarding these comments, the French Focal Point provided the following contents:

Name of the Focal Point: *Jean Vermot*

Country: *France*

Position: *European and international coordinator for marine habitats*

Email contact: *jean.vermot@deveoppement-durable.gouv.fr*

Providing date: *November 19, 2018*

- Land:

Most of the Nature Reserve is located on the Permanent Forest Estate which is part of the private domain of the State. Two private parcels, representing 6 km², straddle the west of the reserve.

A farmer has three agricultural concessions in the perimeter of the reserve.

- Climate change :

Guiana and the KR RNN will not be spared by some effects of climate change. A higher temperature for the same amount of precipitation may increase droughts in French Guiana. The sea level rose by about 10 cm between 1950 and 2010. Nevertheless, the habitats that RNN KR preserves, such as mangroves and marshes, have a high capacity for resilience and contribute to mitigating the effects of climate change. One of the issues of the reserve, identified in the management plan, is the maintenance of the good state of the wetland.

Climate change is identified as an important issue. Nevertheless specific studies have yet to be implemented to identify what will be the impact and the role the reserve.

IV. SPAW-RAC OVERALL CONCLUSION

For each of the proposals, the majority of experts have concluded with some non-insignificant reserves, most of them have been addressed by the concerned Parties through their Focal Points.

The RAC recommends the STAC to conclude with additional discussion if the elements provided by the concerned Parties within this report and during the STAC meeting are sufficient for the proposals to be submitted for approval at the COP10.

ANNEX I

**LETTER TO THE MEMBERS OF THE “PROTECTED AREAS WORKING GROUP” (29 OCTOBER 2018)
TO INVITE THEM TO REVIEW THE REPRESENTED PROTECTED AREAS FOR LISTING UNDER
SPA W**

October 29th, 2018
From: Marius Dragin for Sandrine Pivard
Executive Director
Regional Activity Center for the Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife
SPA W/RAC - UNEP

Dear Experts,

You all answered positively and very quickly to offer your support for this upcoming STAC preparation. We are very grateful of your support.

The first part of the process (gathering, translating and pre-evaluating the proposals) has taken longer than expected for many reasons. But we are happy, although uncomfortable regarding the timeline, to finally share with you the reports to review.

Indeed, two of the Parties have submitted 3 annotated format presentation reports for proposed new protected areas to be listed under the SPA W Protocol:

- The Kingdom of the Netherlands proposed 2 new Protected Areas:
 - * Mt Scenery National Park of Saba Island
- The French Government proposed 2 new PAs:
 - * The National Natural Reserve of Kaw-Roura
 - * The National Natural Reserve of Amana

As you have done in 2016, we need your reviews before submission to the next upcoming STAC. Of course, involved Parties cannot review their own countries' reports but you are free to organize as you wish. We need at least one reviewer per report, and it could be good to have a re-reading.

To facilitate your work, we prepared a review grid with the main criterias of the guidelines (tested on Saba). Feel free to use it as a guide for your review or to give us feedbacks for the next STAC.

We did them- not as experts we are not- but only to pre-assess the “admissibility” of the proposals regarding the criterias and whether we need to ask some complements to the Parties.

You need to be aware that the French government sent a new version of their proposals, far more extensive regarding the ecological interest of the sites. Unfortunately they were completely out of delay and we had not the possibility either to translate them. Should you be interested, feel free to ask Marius for them, as information documents

As you already know, we are far beyond the theoretical deadlines for the biennial STAC preparation. Considering this pressured timeline, we have to set a deadline for the reviews as well. At this end, please notify us as soon as possible if you can intend to review your attributed report before Wednesday 7th.

At last, the affected documents were uploaded on the TeamWork platform on which you will be invited very soon through your e-mail address. You will be able to access the files, download them, upload new documents or upload new versions of one document while your work is on process.

Could you kindly acknowledge reception of this hereby e-mail and the corresponding attached documents please? We remain at your disposal for any further information.

Download files : <https://melanissimo.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/lecture.jsf?uuid=FF0219D78EAE21197771393EB716C30B>
Best regards,

Sandrine Pivard
Regional Activity Center for the Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife Executive Director
SPA W/RAC - UNEP
<http://www.car-spaw-rac.org/>

Attached documents in a separate mail:

- Listing under SPA W Protocol of RNN-Amana_translated.docx (15 Mo)
- Mt Scenery National Parc.zip (17 Mo)
- Listing under SPA W Protocol of RNN-KR_translated.docx (7 Mo)
- Listing under SPA W Protocol of RNN-KR.doc (7 Mo)
- Guidelines and criteria (final)-English.pdf (192 ko)

ANNEX II: LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE "PROTECTED AREAS WORKING GROUP"

- **Paul C. Hoetjes**, Policy Coordinator Nature, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (LNV), National Office for the Caribbean Netherlands (RCN), Kralendijk, Bonaire, Caribbean Netherlands
Contact: Paul.Hoetjes@rijksdienstcn.com
- **Georgina Bustamante**, Ph.D. Coordinator Caribbean Marine Protected Area Management (CaMPAM) Network and Forum The UN Environment-CEP capacity building program for MPA managers and stakeholders, Hollywood, Florida, USA
Contact: gbustamante09@gmail.com
- **Lloyd Gardner**, Principal, Environmental Support Services St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands
Contact: LGardner@ess-caribbean.com
- **Billy Causey**, PhD, Senior Policy Advisor, NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Marine Protected Areas Center, Key West, Florida, United States of America
Contact: billy.causey@noaa.gov
- **Kalli De Meyer**, Bonaire, The Kingdom of Netherlands
kallidemeyer@me.com
- **Susana Perera Valderrama**, Especialista del Centro Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (CNAP), Cuba.
Contact: susana@snap.cu
- **Elizabeth McLanahan**, Director (Acting), National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration NOAA/NMFS/International Affairs, United States of America
Contact: elizabeth.mclanahan@noaa.gov
- **Sandrine Pivard**, Executive Director of the Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife Regional Activity Center, Guadeloupe, France,
sandrine.pivard@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
- **Ileana Lopez**, Programme Officer for the Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife Sub-Programme, Cartagena Convention Secretariat, Ecosystem Division of the UN Environment, Kingston, Jamaica.
Ileana.lopez@un.org

ANNEX III: MAPS OF SPAW PROTECTED AREAS LISTED IN 2018

All maps are available at: <http://www.car-spaw-rac.org/?Protected-Areas-listed-under-the.715>