

PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS FOR THE CARIBBEAN

WORKSHOP REPORT



25-27 June, 2018
Bay Gardens Hotel
Rodney Bay, Saint Lucia

Donors & Implementing Partners



Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations	2
1 Introduction	3
2 Workshop Summary.....	3
Day 1 – Protected Areas Management Effectiveness	3
Day 2 – Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas	7
3 Recommendation/Next steps	9
ANNEX 1 – PARTICIPANTS	10
ANNEX 2 – AGENDA	13

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACP	- Africa, Caribbean and Pacific
BIOPAMA	- Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management
CARICOM	- Caribbean Community
CBD	- Convention on Biological Diversity
CCI	- Caribbean Challenge Initiative
CERMES	- Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies
C-PAME	- Caribbean-Protected Areas Management Effectiveness
NCTF	- National Conservation Trust Fund
EAGL	- Expert Assessment Group for the Green List
EOH	- Enhancing Our Heritage
GEF-SGP	- Global Environment Facility Small Grants Program
GL	- Green List
IMET	- Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool
IUCN	- International Union for the Conservation of Nature
JRC	- Joint Research Centre
ME	- Management Effectiveness
MER	- Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting
METT	- Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MPA	- Marine Protected Area
NGO	- Non-Governmental Organisation
OECS	- Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
PA	- Protected Area
PAME	- Protected Areas Management Effectiveness
RAPPAM	- Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Area Management
SIDS	- Small Island Developing States
SDG	- Sustainable Development Goals
TNC	- The Nature Conservancy
UN	- United Nations
UWI	- University of the West Indies
WCPA	- World Commission on Protected Areas
WHS	- World Heritage Site
WHL	- World Heritage List

1 Introduction

The Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Programme aims to improve the long-term conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries, in protected areas and surrounding communities. Specifically, BIOPAMA is working to reinforce the management and governance of the ACP countries' protected and conserved areas through better use and monitoring of information and capacity development on management and governance. Towards this end BIOPAMA hosted a regional workshop on protected area management effectiveness (PAME) in Saint Lucia from 25-27 June, 2018.

Thirty-five (35) persons from government and non-government organisations (NGOs), regional and academic institutions participated in the workshop. The general workshop objective was to document and promote the implementation of PAME primarily in the 15 BIOPAMA Caribbean countries¹. Specific objectives included:

- a. Introducing the protected area management effectiveness framework, the tools and their implementation in the Caribbean.
- b. Discussing opportunities to promote the implementation of management effectiveness in the protected areas of primarily, the 15 BIOPAMA Caribbean countries.
- c. Introducing the Green List of Protected Areas Standard and its implementation i.e. Standards, Expert Assessment Groups (EAGL), adaptation of indicators, etc.
- d. Discussing opportunities to identify pilot cases for the implementation of management effectiveness and the Green List.

The workshop agenda and participant list are in the Annex. This report is a summary of the discussions and outcomes of the workshop. Presentations given over the course of the workshop along with supporting resource materials are available [here](#).

BIOPAMA is an initiative of the ACP Group of States financed by the European Union's 11th European Development Fund (EDF), jointly implemented in the Caribbean by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission (JRC) and the University of the West Indies (UWI).

2 Workshop Summary

Day 1 – Protected Areas Management Effectiveness

The workshop opened with **welcoming remarks** from Augustine Dominique of the Department of Sustainable Development of Saint Lucia. Mr. Dominique spoke of the relevance of PAME with respect to the contributions of the environment to the sustainable development of Caribbean economies.

Following participants' introductions, Hyacinth Armstrong-Vaughn, Protected Areas Officer with the IUCN and BIOPAMA Regional Coordinator provided an overview of the BIOPAMA

¹ Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & the Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad & Tobago

Programme and context for the PAME workshop. Some relevant points highlighted include the following:

- Phase 1 focused on identifying and capitalizing on resources and networks that already exist, partnering to grow from local actions where and when possible. Phase 2 builds on this and includes an Action Component that will introduce \$20million Euros to support direct actions on the ground across the 79 ACP countries.
- Capacity building and assessment tools will better connect on-the-ground actions with reporting responsibilities.
- The Green List (GL) is a voluntary standard developed in order to improve the long-term biodiversity conservation in protected areas.
- Engagement with regional bodies such as the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat and the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) Commission were initiated in phase 1 and will be built upon in this second phase.

Jose Courrau (IUCN) presented the **Management Effectiveness Framework**. Attention was given to the fact that PAME analyses shed light on what isn't working and why, but also what *is* working and why, from which lessons can be learned and momentum capitalized. PAME supports progress toward global agreements and commitments such as Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Aichi Target 11. Furthermore, though lack of funding is often cited as a/the main reason for ineffective management, in fact sometimes the need for improvement lies in strategizing, planning, and critical evaluation as integral and regular aspects of PA management.

A question was raised about plans for how to support the Caribbean to reach a competitive level for the Action Component. There was concern that the Caribbean could get left behind due to capacity gaps at the level of preparing and submitting proposals. Assurance was made that there would be support through regional workshops; local NGOs and National Conservation Trust Funds (NCTFs) with capacity and experience would be linked to support the grant awardees in their project implementation, and more support would come when the Action Component's operations manual is published.

In response to a question about how to start 'seamlessly' improving monitoring, evaluation and reporting (MER) and evaluating PAME, Marc Hockings (WCPA) suggested that PAs align their activities with national policies and systems to streamline efforts and resources. It was noted that results that feed directly into existing institutional processes for planning and development elevate the visibility and justification for funding and supporting PA interests. Marc provided Mexico as an example of a country that did this, as the nation adopted the Green List protocol with a national mandate for all PAs to complete. This allows for tracking and improving management over time and the ability to compare across and amongst sites. Jose said it is time for PA practitioners to re-engage in management effectiveness (ME), be consistent, analyse results and use them.

Julian Walcott (UWI-CERMES) presented his **Review of Management Effectiveness Assessments in the Caribbean**. Biodiversity continues to decline despite the growth in the number of protected areas which highlights the lack of, but importance of, effective management beyond PA declaration, he pointed out. For example, studies show that sufficient staff and budget positively correlate with MPA performance, measured by fish biomass. Key findings about PAME in the Caribbean include that: accessibility to assessments that exist is low, (accessible) information is hard to find, and there is very

little in terms of validation. Gaps exist at country and site level. Even where assessments were completed, there was a lack of continuity or repetition and the information was often not shared. Recommendations include a PAME data repository, standardization of methodologies, and a sustainability plan for funding, time management, and trained individuals.

Mariagrazia Graziano (JRC) shared a visual representation of how management effectiveness assessments can be showcased within the Caribbean Protected Areas Gateway. The results obtained from the PAME assessment review conducted by Julian Walcott were represented in a Story Map. The Story Map has since been updated to incorporate PAME assessment data gathered from the Global Database on PAME (GD-PAME) and can be viewed [here](#). The GD-PAME is being compiled and managed by the United Nations Environment World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC).

Giselle Hall (TNC) presented on **Management Effectiveness: Visual Representation**. She discussed the need for visualizations of PAME to facilitate and increase the uptake and impact of PAME data. There is currently no coordination of ME information and results are poorly understood by stakeholders and decision-makers. Examples of successful visual representations of PAME information that were shared included coral reef health report cards (available on [CaribNode](#)) and ArcGIS story maps.

The limited time available for the workshop did not facilitate a review of the many tools available for conducting ME assessments. However, the opportunity was taken to share three recently developed tools of interest – a nationally evolved tool for assessing Mexico’s protected areas system, the Enhancing Our Heritage (EOH) tool, and the Integrating Management Effectiveness Tool (IMET) which was developed in the first phase of BIOPAMA and used extensively in Central Africa.

The EOH tool, presented by Marc Hockings, is a management effectiveness tool for World Heritage Sites (WHS). The tool provides qualitative and quantitative data and establishes a standard of evidence-based actions and responses through self-assessments with stakeholders. The results of the evaluation can be incorporated into management and work planning and the design of monitoring and evaluation of systems. The Sangay National Park in Ecuador used this tool and the results led to the re-writing of the management plan, implementation of effective management and eventual removal of the site from the WHS risk list.

Paolo Roggeri (JRC) presented on the **IMET** tool. Acknowledging a history of unstructured, unavailable information and results stemming from extensive international funding, he said IMET offers a two-way street of PAME information sharing from the field to head office and vice versa. The stakeholders engaged are decision-makers from national agencies. The process takes as little as three days and the financial costs are not onerous.

Following this series of presentations, it was asked how the tools presented are relevant to the Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) context. Many sites lack the resources to carry out METT assessments and struggle to complete other regular monitoring and evaluation programs called for in order to meet the PA goals and objectives.

What are the benefits of adopting global tools for sites that are just implementing that which is applicable and feasible? In the case of the IMET the time and financial costs are actually quite low and success has been achieved in other resource and capacity-strapped places. In the case of the GL, it is adaptable to regional and site contexts and using the GL allows for comparison with oneself and others over time and raises international visibility. It can be utilized as a method for improving PAME even if GL certification is not the end goal. Managers can use the GL system to guide priorities, actions, strategic and operational plans to improve PAME at the site level.

The group work focused on getting detailed information on the ME environment in the countries. The following questions were used to guide the discussion and a summary of the responses are provided.

Conducting assessments - Questions

- Who conducts assessments in your country?
- When was the last set of assessments done?
- Were recommendations from assessments implemented?
- What tools do you use? What influences your use of the tool?
- If more than one is there a preference for one over the other?
- What resources are needed to support site level/country level implementation of assessments?

Response Summary

- Combination of site-level and national level management authorities conduct assessments i.e. government authority, NGOs
- Most known assessments are from within the past 1-5 years, some in the past ten years
- METT and RAPPAM seemed to be the most frequently used tools; with METT being strong for site level and RAPPAM for the system level;
- Tool selection was partially influenced by donors, past usage and resources available
- Frequency of assessments are mostly opportunistic and based on project /reporting cycles; dependent on funds, project goals, etc.
- *Belize and Guyana appear to have rigorous national level assessment programs*
- Resources needed to support regular assessments and follow up on recommendations of assessments included time, money, staff, building skills and technical capacity at national/site level to conduct assessments. It was stressed that national level budgets should include provisions for PAME evaluations.

Accessibility to assessments

- Who is responsible for ME reporting in your country?
- How can we increase/improve access?
- Is there a database of ME assessments for your country? Would it be useful to have central repository of ME assessments?
- Based on visualisation presentations what did you like/not like? What would you like to see?

Response Summary

- Reporting on management effectiveness is the responsibility of the government
- Uptake of recommendations from assessments was low or nil, due in part to restricted budget and resources (human, technical capacity) to act

- In the case of Belize and Guyana: assessments are required by government and considered in national budgets
- Availability/ access to assessment varies but is mostly limited
- There is great interest in having a central repository for this information, but consideration is needed as to who would manage this (time, money, staff...); using the Caribbean Gateway as hub was suggested
- Formal data-sharing agreement(s) and protocol(s) need to be in place
- Visualisation is desirable and appealing; the story map seems easier to develop from a technical perspective but all options should be considered

Day 2 – Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas

The Introduction to the Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas was presented by Mark Hockings in which he noted that the IUCN approved the revised standard for the GL in 2017. There was a lengthy question, answer and discussion session following in which the points asked and clarified included:

- Eligibility to register for GL compliance is at the site level rather than system level, but government bodies responsible for managing the PAs or conservation areas are the agencies eligible to apply.
- The GL can be used as a mechanism to improve PA management and help countries measure progress toward United Nation Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), CBD, and Caribbean Challenge Initiative (CCI) goals and commitments.
- The GL does not provide support in the form of funding. However, committing to the GL as a standard and tool for improvement can be attractive to donors. International donors are interested in the GL to measure the success of their investment and progress toward goals and commitments. Furthermore GL-oriented projects will be eligible for the upcoming BIOPAMA Action Component.
- Some felt the criteria are ‘onerous’ for SIDS already struggling to meet some basic and consistent MER standards. It was repeated that the GL can be used as a journey towards more effective management, not just a destination of GL certification.
- Queries into the specifics of GL de-listing were met with the response that if site managers or others with responsibility for the site believed that circumstances had changed and that the standards could no longer be met then the Expert Assessment Group for the GL (EAGL) would review the cause or event and decide if the site was impaired for the long-term and if it needed to be delisted or if it could be rehabilitated.
- Potential benefits of commitment to the GL include: increased investment from donors, internal improvement for managers, international visibility and recognition, and indicators to measure progress toward international agreements.
- Request to clarify how the GL is different from existing efforts toward effective PA management. Response was that the indicators provide a focused, streamlined outline of how to engage in the PAME process. Again, suggestion that aligning with institutional system of reporting and planning improves the use and outcome of management resources. Sites and governing agencies have to decide if they are willing and able to commit resources to new processes/procedures in expectation of getting closer to meeting conservation goals.
- Comment that the Caribbean context requires sensitivity to and prioritization of social and economic impacts surrounding PA management, programming and

resources. Indicators/evidence of these shared priorities need to be part of the marketing of the GL to politicians. The Caribbean GL adaptation must include more prominent presence of socio-economic benefits. The IUCN believes the GL standards adequately account for this; Component 1 is *good governance*. Regional EAGLs will also be able to adapt the criterion for local priorities and realities.

- Some participants wondered how much time and resources it would take to get Caribbean PA systems and culture prepared for GL-level standards. Again, response was that the GL can be a mechanism for improvement without reaching certification. Basically sites and nations have to decide if new and different management protocols aimed at improved productivity and outcomes are worth the time and effort to organize.
- Concern was raised that in the Caribbean where natural disasters are a frequent risk, there was no compensation mechanism for PAs that had put a lot of resources into GL compliance and then had their efforts destroyed by a natural hazard. The response was that the IUCN is very interested in Ecological Disaster Risk Reduction in the Caribbean and there were opportunities to link this with the GL.
- The question was raised as to whether compliance with the World Heritage List (WHL) standards could be used to meet GL standards but the response was that the WHL does not measure effective conservation and the GL was not concerned with how culturally important a site is but whether it was effectively managed for conservation purposes.

Participants were given the opportunity to review components 1-4 of the GL standard in detail and provide feedback on whether the criteria presented were reasonable and achievable. Following is a summary of the feedback received from the group discussions.

Regarding Component 1:

Groups found Component 1 mostly applicable but some suggested language adjustments to be less absolute and more flexible. Belize has similar criteria in play already. Specific feedback includes:

- 1.1.2: 'participate' needs definition; 'involvement' means active
 - choice of words should be inclusive of governance structure (multiple levels of governance)
- 1.1.3 Definition of 'legitimate' rights: legal or historical/traditional
- 1.1.5: equity for other marginalized groups (youth, disabled)
- 1.2.1: not just physically accessible founding documents but also accessible by local context (language, location);
 - not just accessible but encourage/promote access
- 1.3: measure if procedure is in place and also if it is being complied with
- 1.3.3: multiple knowledge sources → use of 'collective wisdom' to be inclusive

Regarding Component 2:

Groups found that Component 2 requires more data (and more resources, time) to prepare than Component 1. Challenges in meeting this component are real for many sites because some information simply doesn't exist.

- 2.1.1.: IUCN definition of PAs: modification to reflect SIDS context
- 2.1.4 depends on 2.1.3 and maybe that can be clarified

Regarding Component 3:

Groups found some specific concerns with language in component 3 as it relates to the Caribbean SIDS context.

- 3.4.1: 'Understanding magnitude of threat'- may be limitations in understanding due to limited data/evidence and resources
- 3.1.4: what is the verification/standard for 'staff being led effectively'
- 3.4: threats to site are addressed but what about threats posed by site to local community? Need for two-way threat management considerations.

Regarding Component 4:

It was mentioned that Caribbean EAGLs should consider *equitable sharing of benefits* as a measure of success.

Workshop closing remarks from participants included:

- Expression of a 'dramatic' lack of resources in the region.
- Concerns that this is a big ask remain at the end of the workshop.
- Deficiency in time and staff can be more limiting than financial resources.
- There is a programme of work for protected areas (POWPA) that these processes should aim to support and facilitate implementation at the national level.

3 Recommendation/Next steps

Workshop closing remarks from hosts included the following:

- BIOPAMA reminded workshop participants of the timely approach of the next COP meeting in November as an opportunity to approach national leaders with GL as a mechanism to measure progress toward Aichi 11 commitments and new targets of effectiveness to come. Post-2020 CBD Targets are predicted to be more qualitative with respect to effectiveness and equity. Caribbean SIDS governments will commit to them. COP is an opportunity to advertise GL commitment or preparations.
- There is more than one way to utilize the GL: apply for candidacy or use as method to improve management.
- PAME requires support from the top of governing/managing agencies, in order to prioritize and then liquidate the resources required for management. Committing to the GL forms a case for support and provides evidence of returns on investment.
- Reconsider time management. A commitment to the GL would require the reallocation of time and human resources to prepare, but it cannot be considered progress to just keep implementing programs and annual plans without taking the time to assess.
- BIOPAMA is keen to support the uptake of ME implementation at the national level and will be following up to receive expressions of interest by early September.

ANNEX 1 – PARTICIPANTS

No.	Name	Country	Organisation
1	Hyacinth Armstrong-Vaughn	Barbados	IUCN
2	Jose Courrau	Costa Rica	IUCN
3	Domenique Finegan	Costa Rica	IUCN
4	Marc Hockings	Australia	IUCN-WCPA
5	Julian Walcott	Barbados	UWI-CERMES
6	Giselle Hall	Jamaica	TNC
7	Mariagrazia Graziano	Italy	JRC
8	Paolo Roggeri	Italy	JRC
9	Carmel Haynes	Barbados	UWI-CERMES
10	Hilary Lohmann	Barbados	UWI-CERMES
11	Ruleo Camacho	Antigua & Barbuda	Ministry of Environment
12	Lindy Knowles	Bahamas	Bahamas National Trust
13	Marcia Musgrove	Bahamas	TNC
14	David Yawson	Barbados	UWI-CERMES
15	Alicia Leticia Eck-Nunez	Belize	Fisheries Department
16	Amanda Acosta	Belize	Belize Audubon Society
17	Agnes Esprit	Dominica	GEF-SGP
18	Yariela Marte	Dominican Republic	Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
19	Cristian Marte	Dominican Republic	Grupo Jaragua

No.	Name	Country	Organisation
20	Denise Fraser	Guyana	Protected Areas Commission
21	Jean Wiener	Haiti	Fondation pour la Protection de la Biodiversité Marine (FoProBiM)
22	Brandon Hay	Jamaica	Caribbean Coastal Area Management (CCAM) Foundation
23	Karen McDonald-Gayle	Jamaica	Caribbean Biodiversity Fund
24	Hyacinth Douglas	Jamaica	GEF-SGP
25	Luciano Eddy	St. Kitts and Nevis	Department of Marine Resources
26	Ryan Khadou	St. Kitts and Nevis	Department of Physical Planning & Environment
27	Joan Norville	Saint Lucia	OECS Commission
28	Shermaine Clauzel	Saint Lucia	CARPHA/CATS
29	Augustine Dominique	Saint Lucia	Department of Sustainable Development
30	Silas Nicholas	Saint Lucia	Department of Sustainable Development
31	Francilia Solomon	Saint Lucia	Department of Sustainable Development
32	Charlie Prospere	Saint Lucia	Fisheries Division
33	Rebecca Rock	Saint Lucia	Forestry Department
34	Joanna Rosemond	Saint Lucia	Saint Lucia National Trust
35	Ulrike Krauss	Saint Lucia	IUCN
36	Melissa Jackson	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	Forestry Department
37	Orisha Joseph	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	Sustainable Grenadines
38	Andrew Lockhart	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	National Park Rivers and Beaches Authority

No.	Name	Country	Organisation
39	Kaminie Tajib	Suriname	Ministry of Spatial Planning Land and Forest Management
40	Elizabeth Sumadh	Trinidad and Tobago	Environmental Management Authority (EMA)
41	Courtenay Parks	Trinidad and Tobago	Forestry Department
42	Candice Ramkissoon	Trinidad and Tobago	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)

ANNEX 2 – AGENDA

Monday 25 June, 2018		INTRODUCTION TO THE PA MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN THE CARIBBEAN
8:30 – 9:00	Registration	
9:00 – 9:10	Opening – Welcome Remarks	IUCN Dep't of Sustainable Dev.
9:10 – 9:30	Introduction of Participants Review – BIOPAMA Programme, Workshop Agenda and Objectives	Hyacinth Armstrong- Vaughn (IUCN)
9:30 – 10:30	Management Effectiveness Framework	José Courrau (IUCN)
10:30– 10:45	COFFEE BREAK	
10:45– 12:45	The Protected Areas Management Effectiveness in the Caribbean: Review of Management Effectiveness Assessments in the Caribbean Story Map: Occurrences of Management Effectiveness in the Caribbean on Caribbean Protected Areas Gateway Management Effectiveness: Visual Representation	Julian Walcott (UWI- CERMES) Mariagrazia Graziano (JRC) Giselle Hall (TNC)
12:45 -13:45	LUNCH	
13:45 – 15:15	Management Effectiveness Tools and associated outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management Effectiveness Tool for Mexico • Enhancing our World Heritage Toolkit • Integrated Management Effectiveness Tool (IMET) 	Jose Courrau (IUCN) Marc Hockings (IUCN) Paolo Roggeri (JRC)
15:15 – 15:30	BREAK	
15:30– 16:30	GROUP WORK: Discussion of PAME in Caribbean – confirm findings of assessment, identify gaps in information, etc.	Participants
16:30 – 17:00	Presentation of Group work	

Tuesday 26 June, 2018		THE GREEN LIST OF PROTECTED AND CONSERVED AREAS FOR THE CARIBBEAN
9:00 – 10:30	Introduction to the Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Implementation of the Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas in the world	Marc Hockings (IUCN)
10:30 – 10:50	COFFEE BREAK	
10:50 – 12:30	The Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Standard	Marc Hockings (IUCN)

	Q&A Session on Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas	IUCN
12:30 – 13:30	LUNCH	
13:30 – 15:00	Group work: test adaptation of the Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Standard	IUCN
15:00 – 15:15	BREAK	
15:15 – 15:45	Group work: test adaptation of the Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Standard	Participants
15:45 – 16:30	Presentation and discussion of results	Plenary
16.30 – 17.00	Plenary discussion – Review of day 1 group work; Next steps, opportunities and mechanisms for promoting implementation of PAME in Caribbean	IUCN

Wednesday 27 June, 2018		
FIELD TRIP – Pitons Management Area (PMA)		
7:00	Depart Bay Gardens Hotel	
9:30 – 10:15	Orientation to the Pitons Management Area	Augustine Dominique and SMMA/Fisheries Staff
10:00 – 12:40	Tour of PMA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sulphur Springs Park • Tet Paul Nature Trail 	
12:40 – 13:40	Boat tour of Soufriere Marine Management Area and the Marine Component of PMA	
13:40 – 15:00	LUNCH	
15:00 – 15:15	Wrap up	IUCN
15:15	Depart for Bay Gardens Hotel	