

Compilation of objectives – Groups B and E (Monday 22nd October 2007)

Objective three (invasives)

Criticisms

- Is the objective valid – one could also include other cross-cutting issues such as climate change

Objective one (protected natural areas)

- Consider maintaining existing sites – not just protecting new sites

General comments on all three objectives

- The current set of objectives will not mobilise communities and resource users. We believe that, in communicating objectives of the Action Strategy to players in the Pacific, emphasis needs to be placed on resource use, income and livelihood – the needs (empowerment) of the communities which are the theme of this conference. The present stated objectives would then become underlying principles – not objectives.

Principles

- Number one – widespread use
- Number two – many people do
- A new principle should include insisting on considering partnership, traditional knowledge and intellectual property
- Principle number two is really two principles – need to split
- Principle three needs to be clarified

BREAKOUT GROUPS DISCUSSION – DAY ONE
‘F’ TEAM 3
SUMMARY (Philip Tortell)

GROUP

Under each theme have 2 objectives, one of which will focus on Community Partnerships

Measurable objectives for Mainstreaming conservation within communities

Instead of “safeguard and conserve”, should read “enabling sustainable use while preserving environment”

Principles need active language – verbs

Theme 4 should be focussed on Communities

Objective 2 should add “economic” significance

Objective 3 – invasives are a threat – what about climate change, land use, waste management?

Should we have 5 objectives to include other threats like overfishing, land use, waste management, climate change

BREAKOUT GROUPS DISCUSSION – DAY ONE
‘F’ GROUP 2
SUMMARY (Philip Tortell)

GROUP

Objective 1 – too many activities implied

Who will implement? What about accountability? How will it be communicated to community?

As a regional policy, AS to be broad and implementation at lower level

Objective 1 hard to measure – broad and non-specific

Accountability is very important

Objectives 2 and 3 not objectives since they enforces Objective 1 – should be a strategy

Objective 1 should be a policy, with care for accountability.

Objectives 2 and 3 should be strategies within Objective 1

Society and Economy should be objectives on same level as Objective 1

BREAKOUT GROUPS DISCUSSION – DAY ONE GROUP 1
(Robert,Viola,Sandeep,etc)
SUMMARY (Philip Tortell)

Add economic value in Objective 2

Add new objective on networking/partnership between organizations, donors and organizations

Need capacity building through regional collaboration to avoid duplication

Make objectives exclusive to include monitoring

Objective 2 – “indigenous species” may exclude migratory species

Who decides priorities in Objective 1 ?

Who’s priorities are these? Who identifies priority areas

BREAKOUT GROUPS DISCUSSION – DAY ONE
GROUP ‘D’
SUMMARY (Philip Tortell)

Objective 1 – prefer first one since it applies to every island and each community can help conserve

Objective 2 – unhappy with “indigenous”

Objective 3 – what about sites which require rehabilitation?

Objective 1 – very broad – requires lots of work, needs priorities

Nothing on restoration, rehabilitation; “preserve” is missing

Not SMART

Requires partnerships

Objective 2 – no capacity building

Add “economic benefits”, add awareness

SMART criteria missing

Risk needs to be addressed

Missing link with protected areas

Culturally significance is of economic value depleting fast

Objective 3 – must capture scientific knowledge; involve local communities; dealing with invasives = part of PA management; capture SMART; partnership; database/baseline;

Awareness, regulating/compliance
GMO is new – more awareness required
Share country experience

Group R/S Terrestrial Species

Objective 1 IDENTIFY, SAFEGUARD and CONSERVE PRIORITY SITES, HABITATS & ECOSYSTEMS		Objective 2 SAFEGUARD AND RESTORE INDIGENOUS SPECIES OF ECOLOGICAL OR CULTURAL SIGNIFICANCE ESPECIALLY THOSE AT RISK		Objective 3 MANAGE PRIORITY INVASIVE SPECIES, PREVENT NEW INVASIONS, AND REGULATE GENETIVALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS		
Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Focused biodiversity objective ▪ Catch-all approach fore species ▪ Species factored into prioritization? ▪ Ecosystem / habitat = catchall ▪ Emphasis on prioritization ▪ 		Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cultural importance highlighted ▪ Captures local importance ▪ Captures safeguard through to restoration, ie full-range ▪ ▪ 		Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Good to recognize GMO's ▪ Good approach for islands ▪ Broad base for action 		
Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 'Priority' is unclear ▪ 		Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indigenous...native? ▪ Should prioritise 'safeguard' as more cost-effective than restoration ▪ Why just focus on species at risk? Why not currently important, yet common species ▪ 		Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why GMO? ▪ How to decide criteria for priorities? ▪ Complex / lack data ▪ Moves GMO issue out of invasives 		
Gaps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Encourage regional / national / local differentiation of priorities ▪ Criteria / guidelines for prioritisation 		Gaps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add 'economic' significance ▪ Add 'endemic' to indigenous ▪ Safeguard..MANAGE...and restore'? ▪ Promote safeguard, restore <u>KNOWLEDGE</u> ▪ 		Gaps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incentives for invasives management (ie economic) ▪ Eradication not mentiones 		
BIG Ideas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 						
PRINCIPLES						
Traditional Culture	IPR	Sustainable resource us	Financial sustainability	Local capacity-building	Good Governance	Resilience to CC
GROUP RESULTS NOT PRESENT: GEOFF LIPSETT-MOORE / JAMES SABI SCRIBES, MUST GET INFO TOMORROW am PRIORITY						

