Capacity building for Protected Areas Management: The CaMPAM Approach

LLOYD GARDNER[1] and ALESSANDRA VANZELLA-KHOURI[2]
[1]*P.O. Box 306332*
St. Thomas, USVI 00803-6331
[2]*United Nations Environment Programme*
Caribbean Environment Programme,
Regional Coordinating Unit
14-20 Port Royal Street
Kingston, Jamaica

ABSTRACT

Fisheries in the Caribbean are dependent to a large degree on relatively small areas of coral reefs, seagrass beds, and wetlands. Fisheries management in the Caribbean has evolved to address not only the fishing practices and management of specific species, but also the protection of the habitats vital to the maintenance of said fisheries. However, these important habitats are under increasing threat from natural and anthropogenic factors. The primary mechanism developed to protect such critical habitats, and by extension the associated fisheries, is the establishment of marine protected areas. Yet the pace of establishment of marine protected areas has not produced the level of habitat protection and fisheries enhancement projected. The main reason for this lower than expected return from marine protected area management, in addition to resource inadequacies, is inadequate management capacity. This paper provides an overview of how protected area networks in the Caribbean have facilitated, not only improved management effectiveness for marine protected areas, but also increased linkages between marine protected areas and fisheries management. The paper focuses on the Network of Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers (CaMPAM), presenting it as a viable mechanism to enhance the capacities of Caribbean professionals involved in marine protected areas and fisheries management. This also includes potential linkages between CaMPAM and the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute (GCFI).

KEY WORDS: Capacity, management, Marine Protected Area

INTRODUCTION

Traditional approaches to fisheries management have focused primarily on regulation of fishing effort and catch levels. Such approaches generally target single species, and assume the presence of homogenous stocks. While the efficacy of conventional fisheries management paradigms may be debatable (National Research Council 2001), those approaches were always less applicable to Caribbean reef fisheries.

Management of Caribbean fisheries has for a long time recognized the need to protect relevant ecosystems. The utilization of coral reefs and wetlands as critical habitats by multiple species meant that fisheries management had to maintain a multiple-species focus in the regulation of fishing effort, as well as protection of habitats.

Unfortunately, the focus on regulation of fishing effort far outweighed the focus on habitat protection. However, there is increasing attention being given to the need to establish marine protected areas (MPAs) for the purpose of fisheries management.

A large number of benefits from MPAs have been identified (Sobel 1996 and Salm et al. 2000). Those benefits most relevant to fisheries include:

i) Reduced fishing gear impacts;
ii) Maintenance of high quality feeding areas for fish and wildlife;
iii) Protection of spawning fish stocks;
iv) Increased spawning stock biomass;
v) Increased spawning density;
vi) Improved stock fecundity;
vii) Provision of undisturbed spawning conditions, habitats, sites;
viii) Increased egg and larval production;
ix) Enhancement of recruitment;
x) Provision of spill over of adults and juveniles to areas outside MPAs;
xi) Reduced chances of recruitment overfishing;
xii) Reduced overfishing of vulnerable species;
xiii) Protection of diversity of fishing opportunities;
xiv) Protection of intra-specific genetics from fishery selection;
xv) Enhancement of recovery from stock collapses and management failures;
xvi) Reduced bycatch fishing mortality;
xvii) Reduced conflicts among users;
xviii) Maintenance of recreational fisheries;
xix) Reduced variance of yield;
xx) Facilitation of stakeholder involvement in management;
xxi) Provision of fishery management data to improve fisheries;
xxii) Increased understanding and acceptance of fishery management; and
xxiii) Provision of controlled natural areas for assessing anthropogenic impacts, including fishing and other impacts.

More importantly, demonstration of the positive impacts of MPAs on fisheries (Appendix 1) has resulted in greater efforts being made to establish and have effective management of MPAs.

CARIBBEAN PROTECTED AREAS NETWORKS AND FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

Simply designating MPAs cannot be enough, by itself, to improve the state of fisheries and other marine resources, as those resources are affected by a wide range of factors, actors, and processes (Natural Resources Institute 1999). For

effectiveness, MPA design and management must address the full range of factors affecting marine resources. However, as several studies have shown, the human resources in the Caribbean are inadequate and insufficiently trained to deal with the full range of design and management issues.

One of the more effective mechanisms developed in the Caribbean to address this inadequate management capacity is the protected area network. Sharing of information, experiences and resources is strategically effective in a region where ecological realities are interconnected, resources are limited, management issues transcend local and regional boundaries and needs are common to many MPAs.

The first "Caribbean Parks and Protected Areas Network" was established in 1989 through the collaborative efforts of the Regional Coordinating Unit of UNEP-Caribbean Environment Programme, (UNEP-CEP/CAR) the Caribbean Conservation Association, and the Caribbean Natural Areas Institute, with additional support from the IUCN's Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas (now World Commission on Protected Areas). One of the main objectives of this network was the strengthening of protected areas management by enhancing the skills of its personnel (van't Hof and Gardner 1991).

One of the more notable achievements of the Caribbean Parks and Protected Areas Network was the preparation of a regional marine park project in 1990. The project, which was funded by the International Centre for Ocean Development (ICOD) and coordinated by the Caribbean Conservation Association (CCA), was titled "Marine Parks and Protected Areas Management Network". Under this project, ten pilot projects were implemented in ten different Caribbean countries. Of these, four projects were directly related to fisheries management. Three of these four (Barbados, Dominica, and St. Lucia) focused on establishment of MPAs by the relevant fishery management agency, while the fourth (Jamaica) was aimed at assessing the impact of the Montego Bay Marine Park on the fishing industry.

The efforts of the CCA-ICOD project to support a protected area network resulted in the formation of the Caribbean Marine Parks and Marine Protected Areas Managers Network (MPANET) in 1995. Though MPANET was focused primarily on the project activities taking place in the ten participating countries, it replaced the wider, and more informal, Caribbean Parks and Protected Areas Network.

In addition to providing much of the training under the CCA-ICOD project, MPANET also provided confirmation of the information on the training needs and priorities of MPAs in the Caribbean. The network also facilitated interaction among protected areas and fisheries personnel from a number of non-project countries, providing for information sharing on topics such as marine archeology. One factor that serves to confirm the value of MPANET to fisheries management is the agreement reached by CCA and the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States, Natural Resources Management Unit (OECS-NRMU) to provide joint secretariat support to MPANET.

Unfortunately, the structured support to MPANET ceased with the completion of the CCA-ICOD project in 1996, and with the cessation of funding support, MPANET went into a period of dormancy. However, this period of dormancy did

not last long, as MPANET was absorbed into the Network of Wider Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers (CaMPAM), when this latest form of the Caribbean protected areas network was formed in 1998.

THE CaMPAM NETWORK

The Network of Wider Caribbean Marine Protected Area Managers (CaMPAM) was initiated in December 1997, during a meeting of more than fifty (50) persons from twenty two (22) countries of the Wider Caribbean Region and as an initiative of MPA practitioners, organizations such as NOAA, the US Fish and Wildlife Service and UNEP's Caribbean Environment Programme (Appendix 2).

The meeting was held to discuss ways to strengthen coastal and marine protected areas management in the Wider Caribbean, in particular through sharing and networking as this remained a priority need for all MPAs in the region. The discussions highlighted the fact that the main beneficiaries of CaMPAM would be MPAs and MPA managers, fisheries officers, and partner institutions (such as IUCN, CCA, FAO, etc.).

The participants agreed that the main activities for CaMPAM would be sharing of experiences and addressing management challenges through:

i) Training opportunities;
ii) Information exchange;
iii) Communication; and
iv) Problem solving.

The Regional Coordinating Unit of the Caribbean Environment Programme (UNEP-CAR/RCU) agreed to provide technical support to the CaMPAM Network, in keeping with the objectives of the Protocol on Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) for the Wider Caribbean Region. The 1990 SPAW Protocol to the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean (Cartagena Convention, 1983) is the only legal instrument for the region on biodiversity conservation and became international law in 2000. SPAW places emphasis on the ecosystem approach for the conservation of biodiversity and protects habitats and species of regional concern, including entire group of species such as coral reefs.

UNEP-CAR/RCU, as part of its continued support to the CaMPAM Network and in keeping with the objectives of the SPAW Protocol, subsequently established in 1999 a small grants fund (SGF) for MPAs within the SPAW programme of the Caribbean Environment Programme of UNEP.

The goals of the SGF are as follows:

i) To strengthen the management capability of MPA managers in the WCR;
ii) To strengthen the capacities of institutions managing MPAs;
iii) To develop and implement strategies for increased involvement of stakeholders in MPA management;
iv) To develop and implement training programmes, strategies, and tools for improved management of MPAs;

v) To act as a catalyst in attracting funds from other bilateral and multilateral initiatives for the purpose of addressing stated priority problems and issues;
vi) To promote "best management" MPAs sites to serve as sites for demonstration, training, and internship; and
vii) To promote horizontal exchanges of all types among MPAs, including twinning and mentoring programmes.

Appendix 3 contains additional information about the SGF of CaMPAM, including eligibility criteria and procedure for application.

Additionally, in an effort to respond to capacity building needs of MPA managers, the SPAW programme developed a comprehensive Training of Trainers programme on MPA management, organized through 2-week regional courses and followed by local training sessions developed and conducted by the trained MPA managers. The course modules cover all aspects of MPA management, including communication and training skills to allow for the multiplication and dissemination of the acquired knowledge. The course and accompanying manual are unique to the region. The manual has been made available by UNEP-CAR/RCU in CD-Rom format in both English and Spanish and it is also available from UNEP-CAR/RCU Webpage (www.cep.unep.org).

CaMPAM AND FISHERIES MANAGEMENT

The importance given to fisheries issues in CaMPAM is underscored by the following:

The same level of effort is expended in recruiting both MPA managers and fisheries officers, and the proportion of each is fairly similar.

i) The network has facilitated the discussion and information exchange of a number of fisheries-related topics/issues.
ii) IUCN, UNEP-CEP/CAR, and The Nature Conservancy collaborated with GCFI to organize a session on MPAs and fisheries during, and immediately following, the 1998 GCFI conference.
iii) There have been several attempts to integrate the fisheries officers participating in the OECS fisheries programme and the CARICOM Fisheries Resource Assessment and Management Program into CaMPAM. Individual fisheries officers are added to the network on an ongoing basis, but full programme linkages have not been established.
iv) A number of fisheries officers have received training under the Training of Trainers Courses in Marine Protected Areas Management conducted under the framework of SPAW by UNEP-CEP/CAR in collaboration with partners such as TNC. Of the nine (9) persons participating in the 1999 session, three (3) were fisheries officers, one (1) was a director responsible for MPA and fisheries, and a fifth was an administrator in a coastal protected area with responsibility for dealing with issues related to the

fishermen in the area. In the 2000 training session, 10 of the 15 participants were either fisheries officers or dealt with fisheries issues as part of their jobs.

v) The local training activities that followed the Training of Trainers courses included several sessions targeted at fishermen and/or fisheries issues.

vi) Projects funded through the CaMPAM small grants fund have also involved fisheries issues.

CaMPAM and SPAW programme activities for the 2002-2003 biennium that are of relevance to fisheries include the following:

i) Continued implementation of the small grants fund for MPAs.

ii) Implementation of the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN) project. A major component of this project in the Caribbean is the development of four (4) demonstration sites, three (3) of which will deal with an aspect of fisheries (conflict resolution, alternative livelihoods, and multiuse areas involving fisheries).

iii) Implementation of projects dealing with mapping and assessment of coral reefs and other critical ecosystems (possibly including spawning aggregations areas), under the ICRAN project as well,

iv) Socio-economic valuation of coral reefs in the Wider Caribbean to be implemented under ICRAN.

v) "Reactivation" of the CaMPAM network, including additional Training of Trainers courses on MPA management.

vi) Fundraising for activities concerning sustainable fisheries, in particular; (a) inventory and no-take areas and determination of their effectiveness; (b) development of guidelines for determination of socio-economic impacts of no-take reserves; and (c) increased dialogue between fishers, fisheries, and MPA managers.

vii) Continued work with relevant regional and international organizations to develop turtle recovery plans, regional conch and spiny lobster management plans, regional action plans for marine mammals, and collection of information on spawning areas.

viii) Continued collaboration with relevant institutions in data collection, monitoring, data management, and preparation of educational materials.

ix) Continued training activities in all areas related to marine resources management.

CaMPAM AND GCFI

CaMPAM and the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute (GCFI) share similar genesis, both being founded as non-formal entities through the support of a more established institution. More importantly, both share a number of similar objectives including:

i) Promotion of information exchange on the use and management of marine resources in the Wider Caribbean Region,
ii) Interaction between a wide range of governmental, private, and civil society institutions, and
iii) Research on areas of relevance to marine resource management.

Although it appears that GCFI has concentrated on fisheries issues, its objectives suggest a potentially larger remit to deal with other marine resources. The benefits of both institutions collaborating on a more systematic basis include the following:

i) Access to a large network of professionals, whose research and work is complementary.
ii) Both institutions have institutional support, with CaMPAM probably bringing more to that arrangement through the Secretariat to the SPAW Protocol at UNEP's Regional Coordinating Unit (CAR/RCU) and other collaborating institutions.
iii) CaMPAM provides increased potential for fundraising for fisheries research and management, for training of fisheries officers and support staff, as well as a large potential support system for field research.
iv) The GCFI annual conference provides a forum for meeting, for sharing innovations, and potentially a mechanism for improving the scientific and technical quality of the research and work related to MPA and wildlife management.

Potential linkages between the two institutions could be established in the following areas:

i) Information Exchange
   Information exchange through the CaMPAM internet list,
   Establishment of discussion/working groups to deal with specific topics,
   Using the GCFI annual conference as a forum for peer review of technical work and network building.
ii) Research
   Designs to guide MPA design management options,
   GCFI members to provide more assistance with research on MPA and species management issues,
   MPAs to provide support at the site level for fisheries research, particularly where long-term monitoring is required,
   MPAs can provide support in testing fisheries management techniques.

iii) Training

CaMPAM will continue to provide training relevant to marine resources management,

MPAs provide opportunities for attachment of trainees to established sites.

iv) Publications

The Proceedings of the GCFI conference are usually published, and CaMPAM provides a mechanism and opportunity for wider distribution of that body of technical work,

UNEP-CAR/RCU, and its collaborating institutions, produces a large number and wide range of material relevant to MPA and fisheries. Collaboration should also take place on the preparation of articles for newsletters etc. and on the publication of materials.

v) CaMPAM Small Grants Fund

The small grants fund is available to support a wide range of activities relevant to MPAs and fisheries.

LITERATURE CITED

National Research Council. 2001. *Marine Protected Areas: Tools for Sustaining Ocean Ecosystems*. National Academy of Sciences. Washington, D.C. USA.

Natural Resources Institute. 1999. *Proceedings of the Caribbean Workshop on Marine Biodiversity*. Montego Bay, Jamaica, 27-29 October 1998. United Kingdom Government and Government of Jamaica.

Roberts, C.M. and J.P. Hawkins. 2000. *Fully-protected Marine Reserves: A Guide*. WWF Endangered Seas Campaign and University of York, UK.

R.V. Salm, John Clark, and Erkki Siirila. 2000. *Marine and Coastal Protected Areas: A guide for planners and managers. IUCN. Washington, D.C. USA.*

Sobel, J. 1996. "Marine Reserves: Necessary Tools for Biodiversity Conservation?" in *Global Biodiversity*. 1996:8-18.

Van't Hof, T. and L. Gardner. 1991. Enhancing the Skills of Protected Area Professionals in the Caribbean. *Parks* 2:1, 28-31

APPENDIX 1
EXAMPLES OF EFFECTS OF MARINE RESERVES ON FISHERIES
(Roberts & Hawkins 2000)

Reserve Name and Location	Years of Protection	Habitat Type	Effects Reported
Leigh Marine Reserve, New Zealand	21	Warm-temperate rocky reef	The most common predatory fish, *Pagrus auratus*, was 6 times more common in the reserve than outside, while the spiny lobster, *Jasus edwardsii*, was 1.6 times more abundant, and had a bigger carapace (a part of their horny outer skeleton: average size=110mm in reserve, 94mm outside). In 18 years, sea urchin densities declined from 4.9m^2 to 1.4m^2 in the reserve, while urchin cover rose from 14% to 40% in unprotected areas (Babcock 1999).
Tawharanui Marine Park, New Zealand	14	Temperate rocky reef	The most common predatory fish, *Pagrus auratus*, was 9 times more common in the reserve than outside, while the spiny lobster, *Jasus edwardsii*, was 3.7 times more abundant, with a carapace about 16mm bigger (Babcock 1999).
Mayotte Island, Indian Ocean	3	Coral reef	Total numbers of species present did not differ between protected and unprotected areas. However, most large carnivores were more diverse and abundant in the reserve. The mean biomass of commercial species was 202g/m^2 in the reserve, compared to 79g/m^2 outside (Letourneur 1996).
Looe Key, Florida, USA	2	Coral reef	15 species that were targets of spear fishers increased in abundance after spearfishing was banned: snappers by 93%, grunts by 439% (Clark et al. 1989).
Cousin Island, Seychelles	15+	Coral reef	Groupers, emperors, and snappers were more abundant and diverse within the reserve than in fished sites (Jennings 1998).
Sainte Anne, Seychelles	11	Coral reef	Despite the fact that a few families retain fishing rights and poaching is fairly common in this reserve, the diversity of target

Reserve Name and Location	Years of Protection	Habitat Type	Effects Reported
			species and total fish biomass was higher than in heavily fished areas. The biomass of prey did not increase when predators were removed by fishing (Jennings et al. 1995, Jennings et al. 1996).
Merritt Island Wildlife Refuge, Florida, USA	28	Sub-tropical estuary	Experimental catch per unit effort (the amount caught for every unit of fishing effort) was 2.6 times greater in the reserve for all game fish combined, 2.4 times for spotted sea trout (*Cynoscion nebulosus*), 6.3 times for red drum (*Sciaenops ocellata*), 12.8 for black drum (*Pogonius cromis*), 5.3 for snook (*Centropomus undecimalis*), and 2.6 for striped mullet (*Mugil cephalus*). Fish in the refuge were larger and more abundant, and anglers were preferentially targeting the reserve boundary (Johnson et al. 1999).
Kisite Marine National Park, Kenya	5	Coral reef	Snappers, emperors, and groupers were more abundant in the park and appear to be spilling over into fishing grounds. Protection did not affect species number of diversity (Watson et al. 1996).
Punta El Lacho, Chile	2	Temperate rocky intertidal	The commercially important marine snail, the Loco (*Concholepas concholepas*), increased in density from 5 to 14 times, and doubled in body size following protection (Castilla & Duran 1985).
Barbados Marine Reserve	11	Coral reef	Large, trapable fish were approximately twice as abundant in the protected area, and 18 of 24 species were bigger (Rakitin & Kramer 1996, Chapman & Kramer 1999).
Exuma Cays Land and Sea Park, Bahamas	36	Tropical seagrass meadow	The average density of adult queen conch (*Strombus gigas*) was 15 times higher in the reserve, and late stage larval densities were 4-17 times higher (Stoner & Ray 1996).

Reserve Name and Location	Years of Protection	Habitat Type	Effects Reported
Exuma Cays Land and Sea Park, Bahamas	10	Coral reef	The reproductive output of Nassau grouper (*Epinephelus striatus*) was 6 times greater in the reserve (Sluka et al. 1997).
Hawaii Marine Life Conservation Districts	Not reported	Coral reef	Fishes were 63% more abundant in areas protected from fishing (Grigg 1994).
De Hoop Marine Reserve, South Africa	2	Warm-temperate rocky reef	Experimental catch per unit effort increased by up to five-fold for 6 out of 10 of the most commercially important species (Bennett & Attwood 1991).
Saba Marine Park, Saba, Netherlands Antilles	4	Coral reef	In the no-take zone the biomass of target species was over twice that in fishing grounds (Polunin & Roberts 1993).
Hol Chan Marine Reserve, Belize	4	Coral reef	Biomass of target species in the reserve was on average almost double that in fishing grounds, while in certain parts of the reserve it was 10 times greater (Polunin & Roberts 1993, Roberts & Polunin 1994).
Anse Chastanet Reserve, St. Lucia	2	Coral reef	Total biomass of commercially important species was more than double that in fishing grounds, and the reserve contained 3 easily caught species found nowhere else (Roberts & Hawkins 1997).
Ras Mohammed Marine Park, Egypt	15	Coral reef	Mean biomass of fish was 1.2 times greater on protected reefs, while differences for 7 target species were much greater. Individuals of the lunartail grouper (*Variola louti*) were 3 times larger in the reserve (Roberts & Polunin 1993).
Kisite Marine National Park and Mpunguti Marine National Reserve, Kenya	Kisite 20, Mpunguti 0 (open to fishing using traditional methods	Coral reef	Abundances of key commercial species (groupers, snappers, and emperors) were up 10 times higher in the fully-protected Kisite Marine National Park compared to the fished Mpunguti reserve. Furthermore, keystone species such as triggerfish (a predator of urchins) were also more abundant in the Kisite Park, while their urchin prey were much more abundant in the fished Mpunguti reserve (Watson & Ormond 1994).

Reserve Name and Location	Years of Protection	Habitat Type	Effects Reported
Three Kenyan Marine Parks: Malindi, Watamu, Kisite	Malindi 24 Watamu 20 Kisite 19	Coral reef	Reserves helped to support regional diversity by protecting species that were unable to persist in fished areas. Of the 110 species recorded on protected reefs, 52 were not found in fished areas (McClanahan 1994).
South Lagoon Marine Park, New Caledonia	5	Coral reef	Within protected areas the species richness of fish populations increased by 67%, density by 160%, and biomass by 246%, but the average size of most species did not increase (Wantiez et al. 1997).
Banyuls-Cerbere Marine Reserve, France	6	Warm-temperate rocky reef	18 target species were bigger in reserves (Bell 1983).
Shady Cove, San Juan Islands, Washington, USA	7	Temperate rocky reef	Lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*) were nearly 3 times more abundant in the reserve (Palsson & Pacunski 1995).
Edmonds Underwater Park, Washington, USA	27	Temperate rocky reef	The number of rockfish eggs and larvae originating from within the park is 55 times greater than outside. For lingcod (*Ophiodon elongatus*), the figure is 20 times as many (Palsson & Pacunski 1995).
Anacapa Island, Channel Islands, California, USA	20	Warm-temperate rocky reef	Densities of the commercially exploited red sea urchin (*Strongylocentrotus franciscanus*) were 9 times higher in the reserve than in nearby fished areas (Gary Davis, quoted in Fujita 1998).
Tsitsikamma National Park, South Africa	22	Rocky reef	Of the 3 species studied, 1 was 4 times more abundant in the reserve and another 13 times more. Bream (*Petrus rupestris*) were on average twice as large when protected. The biggest individuals for all species were found in the reserve, and maximum sizes in fished areas were depressed (Buxton & Smale 1989).
Sumilon Island Reserve, The Philippines	10	Coral reef	18 months after fishing was resumed in the reserve, catch per unit effort fell by a half, and the total yield of fish was 54% less, despite a greater area available for fishing (Alcala & Russ 1990).

Reserve Name and Location	Years of Protection	Habitat Type	Effects Reported
Apo Island Reserve, The Philippines	6	Coral reef	The biomass of large predators increased 8-fold in the reserve. In fishing grounds, mean density and species richness of large predators also increased (Russ & Alcala 1996).
Kyoto Preture Closure, Japan	4	Temperate sand and mud bottom	The proportion of large male snow crabs (*Chionoecetes opilio*) rose by 32% in the closed area (Yamasaki & Kuwahara 1990).
Maria Island Reserve, Tasmania	6	Termperate rocky reef	The densities of rock lobster (*Jasus rubra*) and bastard trumpeter fish (*Iatridopsis forsteri*) increased by 1 and 2 orders of magnitude respectively within the reserve. The numbers of species also increased for fish, invertebrates, and algae, as did the densities of fish larger than 33cm (Edgar & Barrett 1999).

APPENDIX 2:
BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE CaMPAM NETWORK

The ecological realities of the marine and coastal environment are such that some of the management issues to be addressed transcend local and regional boundaries. Co-operation at the regional level, therefore, is critical to achieve goals of conservation and sustainable use of our coastal and marine environment. In this context, a group of more than 50 partners in marine protected area management, from 22 countries of the Wider Caribbean Region, attended a five-day workshop (Miami, 1-3 December 1997) to identify ways of strengthening marine and coastal protected area management. The participants proposed that a network be developed for marine and coastal protected areas (MPA) for the Wider Caribbean to achieve the conservation goals for which the areas were established (CaMPAM).

Mission Statement

Enhancement of marine and coastal area management in the Wider Caribbean Region through sharing and collaboration to strengthen our national and regional systems of existing and future marine and coastal protected areas.

Membership

The main beneficiaries of CaMPAM are MPAs and their managers. Membership is flexible to respond to national circumstances, and may include

existing, relevant networking efforts (such as those of IUCN, CCA, CARICOMP, FAO, etc.) institutions, and partners.

General activities agreed on to be carried out throughout CaMPAM membership include sharing experiences and addressing management challenges by facilitating:

i) Training activities
ii) Information exchange
iii) Ccommunication
iv) Problem-solving

General Principles

During the meeting, the following principles were identified to guide further development of CaMPAM:

i) Clear and realistic (not over-ambitious) objectives,
ii) Transparent mission,
iii) Adequate mechanism for communication and information exchange as a minimal requirement for effective operation,
iv) Determine own niche, complementing and involving (as appropriate) existing relevant efforts/mechanisms,
v) Active leadership,
vi) Define minimal level of organizational structure, not funding-dependent, to ensure co-ordination, communication and power to convene meetings,
vii) Balance between technical, scientific, political and institutional dimensions,
viii) Representative of regional and national groups,
ix) Active membership, identifying clear incentives and benefits and assuming ownership and responsibility,
x) Degree of flexibility and adaptability,
xi) Network-wide activities (horizontal) and activities a the national/local level (vertical), e.g. pilot activities, and
xii) Ensure sustainability.

Immediate Activities

Develop communication mechanisms, including:

i) Informal communication through e-mail, telephone and fax,
ii) News groups on specific issues/themes, such as conflict resolution, user fees, zoning, sustainability, and fisheries no-take zones in MPAs,
iii) Electronic list-server,
iv) Training needs and related announcements,
v) Enlisting other MPAs, relevant NGOs, and institutions etc., to participate in the networking effort and process of development,
vi) Preparation of a calendar of events,
vii) Developing a webpage,

viii) Utilizing existing newsletters, e.g. CEPNEWS, until CaMPAM newsletter is born (if necessary)

Facilitation

At the request of the participants, the United Nations Environment Programme's Regional Co-ordinating Unit (UNEP CAR/RCU) and Biscayne National Park agreed to assist with facilitation of the first phase. Biscayne National Park assumed the role of facilitator with the technical support of the UNEP/RCU, fully engaging CaMPAM participants in the development and leadership of the network. The participants agreed that a formal organization should not be established at this time, in order to allow the network to fully clarify its objectives and define its niche through a participatory process.

The participants gave high priority to the early establishment of communication mechanisms (news groups, list servers, and routine e-mail communications) and agreed to work with the facilitator/Secretariat to implement this goal. For those without access to computer technology (e-mail and Internet access), participants agreed to communicate via facsimilie, telephone and mail.

Participants agreed to assume responsibility for, and play an active role in further developing this approach and continuing the networking begun at this meeting.

APPENDIX 3
STRUCTURE OF THE SMALL GRANTS FUND FOR MPAs

The CaMPAM SGF is designed to provide strategic inputs required to improve management of MPAs in the Wider Caribbean Region (WCR). Within this scope, the SGF will concentrate on the following areas of focus:

i) Development of management/administrative systems, with special emphasis on financial management systems. This includes preparation of management plans and development of cost recovery systems;
ii) Development of information, education, and awareness strategies and materials;
iii) Damage assessments and restoration;
iv) Development of legislation and enforcement procedures;
v) Staff training;
vi) Resource assessments of marine and coastal resources (organisms, ecosystems, etc.) within the MPA;
vii) Purchase and/or upgrade of selected equipment, including marker and mooring buoys and field monitoring equipment (equipment requiring extensive maintenance/support, such as computers, will not be considered); and
viii) Economic feasibility studies and/or development of strategies for alternative, non-destructive, sustainable economic activities.

Eligibility Criteria

Grants will not be made to individuals or international organisations. The project proponent (organisation that submits the project proposal) should have direct management responsibility for the MPA, and may include the following categories of institutions:

i) Government agencies;
ii) Community-based organisations and environmental non-governmental organisations;
iii) Caribbean universities and relevant research and/ or tertiary academic institutions; and
iv) Private sector entities (fund disbursement on a reimbursable basis only).

More specifically, the following criteria should apply:

i) The applying institution must be a MPA management institution.
ii) The MPA must be established by law, and must have a functional organisation structure in place.
iii) Only MPAs within the Wider Caribbean Region are eligible.
iv) Institutions must agree to submit a Terminal Report (based on the format prepared by UNEP-CAR/RCU) to UNEP-CAR/RCU within 3 months of termination of the project.
v) Priority will be given to MPAs that participate actively in the CaMPAM network;
vi) MPAs must agree to participate in the project evaluation exercise to be conducted by an institution or person unilaterally named by UNEP-CAR/RCU.
vii) MPAs must submit copies of their Institutional Development Plan, MPA Management Plan, and most recent Annual Report. Where funds are required for the purpose of preparing the management plan, the Institutional Development Plan and the Annual Report will suffice.
viii) Priority will be given to MPAs from countries that are Contracting Parties to the Cartagena Convention and its Protocols, and are current in their contributions to the Caribbean Trust Fund.
ix) Priority will be given to proposals that form part of a larger project, or will receive co-financing from the local institution or other donors.

Funding Requirements

The CaMPAM SGF can provide support as either financial assistance or technical assistance, up to a maximum of US$8,000.00. Where technical assistance is required, UNEP-CAR/RCU reserves the right of final approval of the consultant(s) to be used. Where financial support is to be provided, the SGF will cover only direct costs such as training, transportation (between islands/international), field equipment, and other similar costs.

Where the proposal to UNEP-CAR/RCU forms a part of a larger project, or

where projects are co-financed by other agencies, a copy of the project proposal submitted to, or approved by, the other funding agency should be submitted with the proposal to UNEP-CAR/RCU.

Application Procedures

Application forms are available from the UNEP-CAR/RCU website at: http://www.cep.unep.org/programmes/spaw/MPA/mpa.htm. Applications can be submitted to the UNEP-CAR/RCU at any time. Proposals will be subjected to a preliminary screening by staff of UNEP-CAR/RCU, which will provide feedback to the project proponent. Proposals that are deemed to be complete will be submitted to a Project Review Panel (PRP) for peer review.