

29 September to 3 October 1997
Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia

TOOLS



6th South Pacific Conference

on

NATURE CONSERVATION

&

PROTECTED AREAS

VOLUME 2 CONFERENCE TOOLBOX





Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas

South Pacific Regional Environment Programme



6th South Pacific Conference

on

NATURE CONSERVATION

&

PROTECTED AREAS

29 September — 3 October 1997
Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia

Volume 2

Conference TOOLBOX

Compiled and Edited by Sue Miller, SPREP



Foreword

The Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas held in Palikir, Federated States of Micronesia, on 29 September – 3 October 1997, continued the series of nature conservation conferences held in New Zealand (1975), Australia (1979), Western Samoa (1985), Vanuatu (1989) and Tonga (1993).

Government, non government agencies, local communities and SPREP working in the Pacific islands region had made significant progress for nature conservation in the four years since the Fifth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas in Tonga, particularly in community-based conservation initiatives. The Pohnpei Conference recognised that it was timely that lessons learnt of *what has worked and what has not* were drawn out to benefit the conservation and sustainable use of the region's biodiversity.

Four key nature conservation TOOLS were focused on during the Pohnpei Conference with the overall objective of producing a "TOOLBOX" of practical, solution-orientated guidelines for use. TOOLS focused on were:

- Protected Areas - marine protected areas and community-based conservation areas
- Enterprise Development as a Conservation Incentive
- Conservation Trust Funds
- World Heritage Convention

This was the first time the conference series had been held in Micronesia and this provided a special opportunity to celebrate and focus on conservation initiatives in the Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Kiribati, Nauru, Northern Mariana Islands, Marshall Islands and Palau during the Micronesian Celebration.

In addition the Pohnpei Conference provided the opportunity to review the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation in the Pacific Islands Region and set priorities for the coming four years. The Pohnpei Conference has called upon the international conservation community to "*share responsibility for implementing, monitoring and evaluating the regional and international actions of the Action Strategy*". SPREP will convene a roundtable meeting of these organizations with the hope to foster greater coordination, closer partnerships and more effective action for conservation in the region.

There was a tremendous feeling of goodwill and cooperation amongst all present and an amazing energy that pervaded the entire conference week. In the weeks following the conference SPREP received feedback that reinforced my own belief that the Pohnpei Conference is an achievement that will reap success for Nature Conservation actions for the Pacific in the new millennium.

The Pohnpei Conference innovative design began as Sue Miller and Barry Hogg's dream of doing a conference in a more 'Pacific style' that maximised participation from within the region. The key to success was the - faces of the conference - the Pacific Team of Facilitators. I acknowledge with gratitude this team's hard work and dedication.

The Conference reports comprises three volumes:

- Volume 1 Conference Proceedings
- Volume 2 Conference TOOLBOX
- Volume 3 Conference Papers

The Conference Proceedings includes the Opening and Closing Plenary, Resolutions, Recommendations and summarises all work done during the meetings. Volume 2, the Conference TOOLBOX, summarises



work done before and during the conference on the focus TOOLS for Conservation: protected areas (marine protected areas and community-based conservation areas), enterprise development, conservation trust funds and the World Heritage Convention). Volume 3 comprises the Conference Papers presented to the Sixth Conference.

On behalf of all conference delegates I wish to express our sincere appreciation to the partner agencies and sponsors of the Pohnpei Conference, and especially to the Government and peoples of the Federated States of Micronesia for hosting the conference.

To all conference participants - your dedication and sheer hard work made the Conference both a productive and very enjoyable event. I congratulate you on setting a new standard for meetings in the region.

The more than 170 participants to the Sixth Conference, by far the largest yet, indicates that the importance of, and interest in, nature conservation issues has grown in the region in recent years. Unfortunately this increase in activity is also an indicator of the increased need for nature conservation work due to unsustainable resource use, habitat degradation and biodiversity loss becoming all too common across the region.

From Tonga to Pohnpei the Sixth Conference built on the previous conference through revision of the Action Strategy for Nature Conservation and Protected Areas and kept faith with the strong emphasis of community involvement and partnerships in conservation initiatives. In the four year journey from Pohnpei to the Cook Islands, the venue of the Seventh Conference, I urge you to keep that faith and renew your energy and commitment for the work ahead.

Tamari'i Tutangata

Director

South Pacific Regional Environment Programme



Acknowledgements

SPREP gratefully acknowledges its Partner Agency for the Pohnpei Conference – NZODA – New Zealand Official Development Assistance.

SPREP also gratefully acknowledges its key sponsors for the Pohnpei Conference; the UNDP/GEF/-AusAID South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Programme, the World Heritage Fund, the Government of Australia and The World Conservation Union (IUCN).

SPREP sincerely thanks the Government and peoples of the Federated States of Micronesia and particularly the State of Pohnpei for their gracious hosting of the Pohnpei Conference. SPREP also thanks the traditional leaders of the State of Pohnpei, particularly the Iso Nahnken, for their tremendous support for the conference. SPREP notes with deep appreciation the untiring hard work of the FSM Organising Committee, particularly FSM's Department of Resources and Development, Department of External Affairs, Pohnpei Visitors Bureau, and the Pohnpei office of The Nature Conservancy. Furthermore SPREP thanks FSM Committee members Francis Itimai, Okean Ehmes and Bill Raynor for their personal commitment to ensuring the success of the Pohnpei Conference. SPREP also gratefully acknowledges the participation and sponsorship of the private sector in Pohnpei, via the Pohnpei Tourism Association.

Approximately 70 percent of participants were funded by their own agency or secured their own funds to attend the Pohnpei Conference. These agencies and funding sources are too numerous to mention here, however, SPREP gratefully acknowledges this tremendous network of support.

SPREP acknowledges with deep appreciation the Conservation TOOL Facilitator Team and their respective agencies whose commitment ensured the success of the new 'Pacific-style' Conference; Russell Nari (Environment Unit, Government of Vanuatu), Noah Idechong (Palau Conservation Society), Francis Tarihao (Solomon Islands Development Trust), Emensio Eperiam (Pohnpei Historic Preservation Office, State Government of Pohnpei, FSM), Wep Kanawi (TNC), Isoa Korovulavula (SPACHEE), and SPREP officials Joe Reti, Lucille Apis-Overhoff, Michael McGrath, Sam Sesega, Tiare Holm, Sue Miller, and consultant Barry Hogg.

SPREP thanks Sebastian Anafel (FSM) and Seva Tabua (Fiji) for their expert leadership as Chair and Vice Chair respectively of the Pohnpei Conference. SPREP notes with appreciation the work of Audrey Newman (TNC) and Sam Sesega (SPREP) as co-Chairs of the Action Strategy Review Committee. SPREP also thanks Seva Tabua, Chair of the Resolution Committee. SPREP thanks the coordinators of the Sixth Conference Special Sessions; Jeremy Harrison (WCMC) and Tom Moritz (IUCN) who organised the South Pacific Conservation Areas Resource Centre Technical Session and Mick Clout (IUCN), Jean Yves Meyer (French Polynesia) and Lu Eldredge (Bishop Museum) for the Invasive Species Technical Session and Dianne Russell (BCN) for the NGO Partnership Session. SPREP thanks the Chairs of the Pohnpei Conference Paper Sessions; Bill Raynor (TNC), Dianne Russell (BCN), Seva Tabua (Native Land Trust Board, Fiji) Trevor Sankey (UNESCO), Bing Lucas (IUCN), Kathy Fry (FSP) and Chris Bleakely (GBRMPA). SPREP thanks Wren Green and David Sheppard from IUCN for convening the Pacific Regional meeting of the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) during the conference. SPREP also thanks the Pohnpei Watershed Project and particularly Bill Raynor for organising the preconference field trip to this community-based conservation area.

SPREP thanks the delegates from Nauru, Marshall Islands, Kiribati, Guam, Palau, Northern Marianas, Yap, Kosrae, Chuuk and Pohnpei and the cultural groups from Kiribati, Yap and Pohnpei who provided an unique insight into the conservation issues and culture of Micronesia through special presentations,



music, song and dance. SPREP also thanks Okean Ehmes (FSM) for organising the Micronesian Celebration.

SPREP thanks Patrick Delhaye, Françoise Martineau and Emy Watt from Language Professionals Ltd for translation and interpretation services.

SPREP especially thanks conference delegates; Nina Eejima (FSM), Dion Ale (Samoa), Toni Tipama'a (Samoa), Chris Bleakely (GBRMPA) and Kathy Walls (NZ) for volunteering and helping the Conference Coordination Team with all the last minute preparations that kept the conference running smoothly.

Finally, SPREP wishes to express its sincere appreciation to Sixth Conference Consultant Dr. Barry Hogg. Dr. Hogg was a key part of the innovative and successful participatory design of the Sixth Conference's format and trained the Sixth Conference Facilitator Team, even while recovering from treatment for cancer. Unfortunately Dr. Hogg could not come to FSM to see the success of the work he helped to create due to his illness.

Obituary

During preparation of these Conference reports Dr Barry Hogg passed away October 1998. Our deepest condolences extend to Barry's family and friends – he will be sorely missed.

Also, the Pacific lost a great friend and supporter when Mr Bing Lucas died suddenly in December 2000. Bing was a tireless worker for conservation and protected areas throughout the world, yet the Pacific always held a special place in his heart. As mentor, adviser and friend, Bing was always ready to serve.

Our deepest condolences to the families of Barry and Bing and to their many friends.

SPREP Conference Team

The SPREP Conference Team was led by SPREP's Director Mr Tamari'i Tutangata and consisted of Mr Joe Reti, Ms Ruta Couper, Ms Sarena Stanley, Ms Saunoa Matau, Ms Tiare Holm, Ms Lucille Apis-Overhoff, Mr Micheal McGrath, Mr Sam Sesega and Ms Sue Miller (Conference Coordinator).



CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| TOOLBOX Introduction | 1 |
| <hr/> | |
| TOOL 1: Protected Areas- Marine Protected Areas and Community-based Conservation Areas | 2 |
| <hr/> | |
| Introduction | 2 |
| Pacific island working definition | 2 |
| Background - MPAs and CBCAs | 2 |
| Use and issues - MPAs and CBCAs | 3 |
| Advice compiled from Sixth Conference working group sessions for both MPAs and CBCAs | 4 |
| Table 1. Number and distribution of MPAs in the Pacific islands region. (from IUCN Global Marine Protected Areas report). | 7 |
| Table 2. The benefits and associated issues in using CBCAs in the Pacific islands region. | 8 |
| <hr/> | |
| TOOL 2: Enterprise Development as a Conservation Incentive | 10 |
| <hr/> | |
| Introduction | 10 |
| Pacific island working definition – Enterprise Development as a Conservation Incentive | 10 |
| Key characteristics of EDCIs: | 10 |
| Use and issues | 11 |
| Advice compiled from Sixth Conference Working Group Sessions | 11 |
| <hr/> | |
| TOOL 3: Conservation Trust Funds | 14 |
| <hr/> | |
| Introduction | 14 |
| Pacific island working definition – Conservation Trust Funds | 15 |
| Advice compiled from Sixth Conference Working Group Sessions | 15 |
| Table 1. Conservation Trust Funds – use and issues arising | 17 |
| <hr/> | |
| TOOL 4: World Heritage Convention | 19 |
| <hr/> | |
| Introduction | 19 |
| Pacific island working definition – World Heritage Convention | 19 |



| | |
|--|-----------|
| Criteria for listing | 19 |
| World Heritage in the Pacific | 19 |
| Use and Issues | 20 |
| Advice from Sixth Conference Working Group Sessions | 21 |



TOOLBOX Introduction

Volume Two of the Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas Report forms the 'Conference TOOLBOX' and contains the results of TOOL Working Group Sessions. The overall objective of the Working Group Sessions was to draw out practical, solution-orientated advice and information for use in the region.

Conservation TOOLS focused on were:

- TOOL 1 – Conservation Areas (marine protected areas and community-based conservation areas)
- TOOL 2 – Enterprise Development as a Conservation Incentive
- TOOL 3 – Conservation Trust Funds
- TOOL 4 – World Heritage Convention

The TOOL Facilitator Team consisted of Noah Idechong (Palau), Lucille Apis-Overhoff (SPREP), Russell Nari (Vanuatu), Joe Reti (SPREP), Francis Tarihao (Solomon Islands), Isoa Korovulvula (Fiji), Wep Kanawi (PNG), Michael McGrath (SPREP), Emensio Eperiam (FSM) and were supported by Barry Hogg (Trainer), Sue Miller, Tiare Holm, Sam Sesega and Ruta Tupua (all of SPREP).

The Team was chosen on the basis of their experience with one or more of the Conservation TOOLS. Prior to the Conference the Team finalised the Conference design, drafted discussion stimulant papers for each TOOL, trained in techniques of facilitating working groups, and built a strong and functioning Conference TOOLS Team.

The facilitated TOOL Working Group Sessions aimed to bring a more discussion-focused, lessons learnt, Pacific-style of conference session. Feedback from Conference participants indicated that this was well received and remarkably successful. Lessons learnt from this conference style were:

- The importance of investing in facilitator training and team building. Confident and able facilitators that were clearly part of a supportive team were the fundamental ingredient of success for this approach.
- The importance of preparing common-sense discussion stimulant papers and well planned working group sessions for each TOOL.
- The importance of well-crafted and targeted questions.
- The value of Pacific island working definitions rather than technical definitions of approaches to conservation.
- The high productivity of working group sessions and the need to manage the feedback resulting from them both during the conference and post conference.
- The fun and comradeship generated by this conference approach.

Each TOOL profiled in Volume Two has an agreed Pacific island Working Definition, background information, current use and issue summary, and importantly advice from the Sixth Conference based on questions posed in the discussion stimulant papers and additional information raised during working group sessions. The information presented provides a snapshot of both the status of the use of these TOOLS in the region and the advice on how to use these TOOLS from those who practice their use. It is not written as an academic treatise for each TOOL but rather has kept faith with the words and concepts as gathered in the Working Group Sessions.

The Sixth South Pacific Conference on Nature Conservation and Protected Areas was significantly different in its design and delivery and provided an alternative way to run this series of conferences in the region. Both congratulations and a sincere thanks go to the TOOLS Facilitator Team and to all those who participated.

Sue Miller

Sixth Conference Coordinator



TOOL 1: Protected Areas- Marine Protected Areas and Community-based Conservation Areas

Introduction

TOOL 1 Protected Areas - specifically marine protected areas and community-based conservation areas were the focus of the Sixth Conference. The special TOOL focus on Marine Protected Areas was in honour of the 1997 Pacific Year of the Coral Reef. Community-based conservation areas were the focus in recognition of the progress made in this form of protected areas in the last four years. Participants agreed to combine the outputs of these two protected area TOOLS for reporting purposes.

Pacific island working definition

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

A MPA is any area of sea with a defined boundary together with its associated resources and habitats, that has been designated as a protected area by a partnership of stakeholders through any effective means. MPAs can generally be created solely by a government or as a combined effort between communities and government.

Community-based Conservation Areas

A community-based conservation area (CBCA) is an area (land, sea or combined) which is recognised locally, nationally or internationally as important for the conservation of ecological/cultural features while at the same time allowing for the sustainable use by local communities of natural resources. CBCAs are owned and managed by local communities according to their needs and priorities.

Background

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

The conservation and wise use of the marine environment is vital to the well being of Pacific island countries (PICs). Marine areas provide food, medicine, minerals, construction materials and a whole host of resources valued by PICs. More than 65 MPAs have been established in the Pacific islands region to date (see Table 1.). MPAs used in the region have ranged from strict 'no access' nature reserves, single species 'no take' zones to the more recent community based conservation area initiatives. Such marine areas often include coastal land, which can be the key for successful catchment management. A recent GBRMPA/IUCN/World Bank global assessment of both existing and proposed MPAs has renewed the focus on this conservation tool.

Community-based Conservation Areas

The main characteristics of CBCAs are:

- They must be owned and managed by local communities.
- The planning and implementation process is driven by local communities.
- They are of direct benefit to local communities.
- There is active participation by local communities; and local communities are fully supportive of the projects.
- Of course a community-based marine protected area is covered by both definitions above.

Use and issues

Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)

Table 1 displays the number and distribution of MPAs in the Pacific islands region. The information in the Table has been taken from two studies by Holthus and Maragos (1991, and 1992) as reported by Bleakley in the IUCN Global Review of MPAs.

Marine Protected Areas are used for a range of purposes including the following:

- Protection of marine biodiversity.
- Protection of natural, historical and cultural features.
- Generation of sustainable income opportunities.
- Provision for sustainable traditional needs of communities.
- Provision of incentives for conservation through creation of income earning opportunities.

There are many issues relating to MPAs, some of the key issues include the following:

Establishment process:

- Length of time it takes.
- Consultations between stakeholders.
- Level of community involvement.
- Surveys, inventories, size and boundary limits.

Ownership and user rights

- Number of owners.
- Clarity of ownership.
- Conflicts of claim/uses.
- Cost-benefit sharing.

Status/type of MPA

- Legal status and related policy and regulations.
- Traditional status.
- Mixed attributes.

Management

- Funding.
- Compliance.
- Monitoring.

Community-based Conservation Areas

The CBCA concept and approach may not be the perfect answer but it is proving to be much more effective in getting communities to support conservation initiatives in the region. Time will tell whether this support will remain with the CBCAs in the face of what is expected to be mounting pressure on the commercial exploitation of natural resources. A wide range of questions remain to be answered before one could say that CBCAs would ensure the long-term sustainability of resources in the region. Table 2 summarises the use and issues arising with CBCAs in the region.



Advice compiled from Sixth Conference working group sessions for both MPAs and CBCAs

Note advice largely applies to both unless otherwise stated. The broader conservation area term is used below.

Type of process recommended for establishment of conservation areas

Transparent with the following key elements:

- Participatory, with community involvement at every step.
- Builds capacity of all stakeholders.
- Flexible and adaptive processes used.
- Integrates traditional/contemporary conservation approaches.

Experience indicates that this process takes 2-5 years to establish a conservation area that has the greatest chance to succeed in our region eg. Arnavon Marine Conservation Area.

Suggested steps and guidance to be considered in the process of establishing a conservation area

- Initial realisation from resource owners, local communities that resources are declining and community willingness and shared vision for the conservation area.
- Seek government support and sanction.
- Seek experience, technical advice and information from governments, NGOs, private sector eg. tourism, fishing and other agencies.
- Hold community meetings to develop and agree on process, goals and objectives, and to clarify concepts.
- Gather necessary information.
- Refine goals and objectives and develop concept into a conservation area plan.
- Develop management structure, stakeholders review process and seek stakeholders approval for the plan.
- Once a conservation area plan is in place, recruit local support staff (conservation officers) and provide training and resources.
- Develop strategy for securing long-term funding hence sustainability of marine protected areas (MPAs) and community-based conservation areas (CBCAs) using mechanisms such as income generating activities, user fees, trust funds, budget allocations and others.
- Document, disseminate, and promote methodologies (awareness raising).
- Develop and implement a monitoring programme for key indicators.
- Where appropriate, revise plans to take into account monitoring results.

Recommended criteria for measuring success in conservation areas

When developing criteria for measuring success, the following factors need to be taken into account:

- Criteria must be measurable and directly related to goals and objectives of conservation area.
- They must also measure what the community perceives as important.
- They must measure both short (2-3 years) and long-term outcomes.

Criteria for measuring success should also include

- Degree of equitable sharing of both effort and benefits
- Extent of compliance with rules
- Degree to which identified threats to the conservation area are alleviated
- Are the resources more or less abundant than when the conservation area started?
- Is there adequate community participation in decision making (empowerment of communities)
- The extent to which the conservation areas contributed to community well being eg. did the conservation area generate employment and by how much?
- Degree of ongoing participation and satisfaction of all stakeholders involved
- Degree to which the conservation area is self funded
- Have others copied this conservation area process?



- Use of local languages and customs in materials produced and actions taken
- Ability of plans to be adaptive in response to review recommendations

Things to watch out for

- That the process carefully takes in to account views and that the needs of all community groups are addressed ie. as traditional power structures may not give the chance for women/youth/other resource user input.
- Government may or may not be the prime mover but should be included and supportive eg. in the provision of necessary legislation, policy.
- The initiative has the necessary political support.
- Arrangements and responsibilities need to be clearly stated, agreeing to a conflict resolution process.
- Use supportive laws, policies, and action plans from national, regional, international levels to support the conservation area.
- Monitor/evaluate using traditional knowledge and skills and local people to meet their information needs to manage their resources.

How/Can traditional and contemporary conservation approaches be effectively merged in the form of conservation areas?

YES! -

- Ensure that traditional knowledge and practices are retained and applied eg. traditional approach to 'doing business' is respected in developing management action.
- Traditional law must be acknowledged (not written into national law).
- Education and awareness are vital as a first step and ongoing activity.
- Use of resources, ie. expertise, equipment easily accessible to the community.
- Use appropriate methods requiring minimal training.
- Real involvement with communities, not just 'consultation'.
- Appropriate training and education programmes for all parties covering traditional and contemporary approaches to conservation.
- Need for international recognition of community-based conservation.
- Expert scientists must have talent and sensitivity to amalgamate local and scientific knowledge and techniques.
- Management structure based on traditional knowledge as opposed to western concepts of management.
- Enactment of local rules and regulations using traditional tabus and management practices.
- Incorporating national and local regulations while having traditional leaders as the custodians.
- Traditional healing practices into medical bio-prospecting.
- Usage of theatre groups to educate villages on conservation.
- Pacific islanders' leaders to include traditional conservation practices into school curriculums.
- Documentation of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR).
- Donor agencies should understand and respect traditional conservation approaches when approving projects.

What information is needed to set up a conservation area?

- List of stakeholders and their objectives.
- Areas of conflict (potential and actual).
- Strategic information about resources and resource owner/users.
- Any previous information (oral, written, projects eg research, documents, relevant laws, polices).
- Potential sources of funding and assistance (including best practice).
- Social and cultural/traditional values.
- Proposed boundaries, size, location.



Who are the stakeholders?

Primary stakeholders are the local community supported by other stakeholders as appropriate:

Local communities

- Traditional leaders,
- Resource owners and users (direct, indirect),
- Religious groups,
- Youth,
- Women,
- Community NGOs,

Government

- Local,
- Provincial,
- National.

NGOs

- Local,
- National,
- International levels,
- Media.

Private sector

- Local banks,
- Business eg tourism, commercial fishing, logging,
- Polluters.

Donors

- Local,
- National,
- Regional,
- International.

Researchers

Who pays for these conservation initiatives?

- Costs will be project specific but likely to be beyond the capacity of communities and lead agencies - need donors.
- Government vs community - who pays initially.
- Costs will change as project develops.
- Need to carefully facilitate equitable benefit and cost sharing.
- Need recognition of true costs to the community of protected areas.
- Polluter pays principle used.

Other issues raised by working groups:

- Importance of education/awareness programmes in conservation area development. Particularly using the following approaches; train trainers, NGOs, popular media, appropriate cultural themes, village outreach, curriculum development.
- Importance of well-planned and executed research that ensures that data ownership and copies are retained by the community.

Table 1. Number and distribution of MPAs in the Pacific islands region. (from IUCN Global Marine Protected Areas report).

| Pacific island country or territory | MPA number | MPA names |
|-------------------------------------|------------|--|
| American Samoa | 3 | Fagatele Bay National Marine Sanctuary, Rose Atoll, American Samoa National Park |
| Cook Islands | 3 | Aitutaki Trochus Sanctuary, Palmerston Trochus Sanctuary, Manuae Trochus Sanctuary |
| Federated States of Micronesia | 2 | Trochus Sanctuaries in Pohnpei, Utwa Conservation Area |
| Fiji | 0 | |
| French Polynesia | 2 | Atoll de Taiaro Biosphere Reserve, Reserve territoriale de Scilly (Manuae) |
| Guam | 4 | Haputo Ecological Reserve Area, Orote Ecological Reserve Area, Guam Territorial Seashore Park, War in the Pacific National Historical Park |
| Hawaii | 25 | (refer to Bleakley report) |
| Kiribati | 1 | Kirimati (Christmas Island) Wildlife Sanctuary |
| Marshall Islands | 0 | |
| Nauru | 0 | |
| New Caledonia | 4 | Reserve Speciale de Faune et de Flore de l'Ilot Maitre, Reserve Speciale Tournante de Faune Marine, Reserve Speciale Marine Yves Merlet, Parc Territorial du Lagon Sud |
| Niue | 0 | |
| Northern Mariana Islands | 0 | |
| Palau | 3 | Ngerukewid Islands Wildlife Reserve, Ngerumekaol Grouper Spawning Area, Trochus Sanctuaries |
| Papua New Guinea | 6 | Talele Islands Nature Reserve and Provincial Park, Nanuk Island Provincial Park, Bagiai Wildlife Management Area, Long Island WMA, Maza WMA, Ndrolowa WMA |
| Pitcairn Islands | 0 | |
| Samoa | 1 | Palolo Deep Marine Reserve |
| Solomon Islands | 1 | Arnavon Islands Marine Conservation Area |
| Tokelau | 0 | |
| Tonga | 6 | Fanga'uta and Fanga Kakau Lagoon Marine Reserves, Haatafu Beach Reserve, Hakaumama'o Reef Reserve, Malinoa Island Park and Reef Reserve, Monuafe Island Park and Reef Reserve, Pangaimotu Reef Reserve |
| Tuvalu | 0 | |
| US unincorporated territories | 4 | (refer to Bleakley paper) |
| Vanuatu | 2 | President Coolidge and Million Dollar Point Reserve, Narong Marine Reserve |
| Wallis and Futuna | 0 | |

Table 2. The benefits and associated issues in using CBCAs in the Pacific islands region.

| Uses | Positive Issues | Negative Issues |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Protect biodiversity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protects resource from over-exploitation. • Increases community capacity to manage their resource. • Retains resource ownership within communities. • Revives traditional resource management practices. • Encourages community participation in resource management and conservation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas may not be large enough to be effective • Could be seen as stumbling block for other development work • Level of resource use allowed may not be enough for community needs. • Uncertainty about community capacity to manage resources. • Risk of changing land use without a legal framework to formally establish CBCAs. |
| 2. Generate income for local communities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improves earning capacity of local communities. • Promotes community support for project. • Creates employment opportunities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May create unrealistic expectations of communities. • Might cause friction over benefit distribution. • Uncertainty about capacity of resources to sustain economic activities. • May result in degradation of resource base. |
| 3. Improve well being of local communities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting some of communities basic needs • Further enhance support for projects. • Link communities to other sectors of government and industry. • Ensure long-term viability of projects. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some community needs may be outside scope of project. Not meeting these needs may cause disappointment. • Risk of seeing CBCAs as community development project rather than a conservation project. • Could make conservation extremely expensive. • Could be seen as encroaching in to mandate of others. |
| 4. Protect endangered species. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Serve as breeding ground for endangered species. • Protect species and habitats considered endangered and/or threatened. • Serve as study area on endangered species. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area may not be large enough for revival of species. • Species survival may also depend on what goes on outside CBCA. • Area may not be representative. |
| 5. Creating partnerships. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enables better coordination between communities, government agencies, NGOs etc. • Enables communities to access | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be seen as interference from outside. • May conflict with community decision-making processes. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>expertise and resources of others.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps resolve community conflicts. • Ensures local ownership of projects. • Increases participation by local communities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of process being driven by others, not by the community. • May create dependence on outside advice. |
| <p>6. Contribution to global efforts/initiatives.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase international recognition and support for community efforts. • Helps attract other sources of support. • Contributes to international efforts to protect biodiversity. • Potential model for others to follow. • Raises country and regional profile. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invites outside interference. • Increases dependency on outside support. |



TOOL 2: Enterprise Development as a Conservation Incentive

Introduction

The challenge of conserving natural resources under circumstances of resource-poor communities with increasingly cash-driven economies has led to innovative approaches based on the integration of conservation and profit-based objectives. The dilemmas of ‘all or nothing’ that communities are often faced with in the debate between conservation and development are increasingly resolved by profit-orientated enterprises that are based either directly or indirectly on ecosystems or species being preserved or sustainably managed. Thus expectations of profit and other benefits are becoming a strong source of motivation for the protection and conservation of biological diversity.

In the Pacific region, the use of enterprise development as a conservation incentive (EDCI) is now a recognised tool for nature conservation. Many threatened species and ecosystems of national or regional importance are receiving stricter protection not for their intrinsic and/or conservation values but for their ability to support income-generating enterprises.

The number of enterprises that can be considered appropriate for conservation purposes is far ranging. In the extreme, it can be argued that any enterprise, depending on how it is applied, can be a conservation tool. To use an analogy; a spade, used in terracing a hill, can be either destructive and used to make vertical furrows or constructive and used to create horizontal furrows. Thus any enterprise has the potential to be a positive or negative influence for conservation depending on how it is applied.

Pacific island working definition – Enterprise Development as a Conservation Incentive

Enterprise Development as a Conservation Incentive (EDCI) is any economic activity undertaken by a community that through its need to use natural resources, engenders community will and action to conserve and sustainably use those resources and at the same time improves the socio-economic wellbeing of the community. It is a process by which enterprises, which are community based and use natural resources from the local area, provide economic and conservation benefits for the local community without depleting the natural resources.

Key characteristics of EDCIs:

- They are owned and managed by the local communities.
- They are profit-making activities that simultaneously generate employment for the communities.
- There is equitable distribution of benefits and costs.
- They result in reducing the threat of loss or depletion of biodiversity.

The emphasis of EDCIs has been on creating or establishing environmentally friendly enterprises or enterprises that promote and facilitate the protection and conservation of natural resources. The involvement and participation of the community is crucial to the success of this kind of enterprise because they own the resources and they depend on it for their daily survival.

EDCIs could be divided in to two categories:

- Those enterprises based on having direct access to and use of the resource itself but in a non-extractive manner. These include the use of coral reefs and marine areas as tourist dive sites, and
- Those enterprises that are developed outside of areas having high biodiversity values and do not directly depend on the area’s biodiversity but contribute to its conservation by indirectly or directly reducing the threats to it. There are many examples of this type including the use of intensive cropping systems and other sustainable agricultural methods that lead to increased community income.



In addition, the following are examples of typical enterprises used to promote conservation in the Pacific: ecotourism, ecotimber production, production of nut oils, production of essential oils, bioprospecting, honey production, fibre paper making, wild yam cultivation, butterfly ranching, agricultural methods for site stabilisation, and marketing of native plants for horticultural purposes.

Use and issues

1. Socio-economic issues

- EDCIs can be an effective tool for conservation if the priority needs of the communities are provided for.
- It is important that there is a clear understanding about ownership of lands and resources.
- The functions and or the impact of existing political and social institutions within the community and their capacity to organise and manage any such enterprise (organisational and entrepreneurship skills) should be well understood at the outset. Hence training and the transfer of skills play a critical role in the sustainability of EDCIs.
- The use and distribution of cash income is properly managed; vis a vis accountability, transparency and equitability.
- The sustainability of any EDCI depends on full community support. Having a sense of community ownership of the enterprise and transparency in the distribution of benefits fosters this.
- Community expectations of the level of benefits to be made should be realistically pitched.

2. Conservation and resource management issues

- It is important that the community participate in all technical and scientific activities related to such an enterprise, such as resource surveys, resource-monitoring exercises etc. This is essential to give them a deeper understanding of the nature of the resource they are dealing with thereby facilitating their involvement and participation in the implementation of the enterprise. This will foster a greater sense of community ownership.
- Community members should be trained to monitor their use of the resource.
- It is important that traditional knowledge and technologies that are useful in the enterprise are used and protected.
- The linkages between the enterprise and conservation should be made very clear from the beginning. Awareness raising and educational activities for this purpose are important.

Advice compiled from Sixth Conference Working Group Sessions

Information needs about the capacity of the resource and the proposed enterprise before embarking?

Information needs for developing EDCIs depend heavily on the nature of the enterprise, noting that a range of information types are needed - biological, ecological, socio-economic baseline and can include:

- Current resource use/users (both commercial and subsistence) and clarity in relation to land tenure and user rights,
- Carrying capacity of the resource and supply/assessment of resource vulnerability,
- Projected quantities of the resource to make the enterprise viable (consumptive and non consumptive uses),
- EIA of proposed enterprise on resource,
- Market studies - demand, access, financial viability, long term projections, capital investment required,
- Information on the level of existing expertise in the community,
- Detailed information about the community's attitudes and obligations,
- Identification of biologically sensitive areas/species not suitable for enterprise development,
- Assessment of other commercial threats eg.- competing non sustainable commercial activities like logging,
- Government requirements eg. licensing, laws, incentive schemes,

- Assessment of infrastructure present versus infrastructure needed for the enterprise development,
- Knowledge of existing traditional management methods,
- Use of control sites for comparisons.

Are there any examples in the Pacific where such enterprises have resulted in both increased income and conservation?

Noted that these are “initial indicators” of success only and it is too early to confirm long-term success. There is a need to monitor and collate EDCI initiatives. Current examples include:

- Conservation of rare palms, Vanuatu.
- Ecotourism and sustainable agricultural system in Vatthe, Vanuatu.
- Small scale residential ecotourism in Koroyanitu, Fiji.
- Handicraft enterprise by women using pandanus in Niue.
- Diving Utuko reef, tabu area , Niue.
- Trekking linked with forest, Samoa.
- Wood carving linked with forest – Uafato, Samoa.
- Nature based mangrove protection in Saanapu – Sataoa, Samoa.
- Bioprospecting USP/BCN , Verata, Fiji.
- Tapa cloth production PNG.
- Bird-wing butterfly farming, PNG.
- Research station usage and lab/bench fees eg Crater Mountains, Kimbe – PNG.
- Vaitupu Island ecotourism in Tuvalu.
- Arnavon Islands fishing enterprise, Solomon Islands.
- Ngali nut enterprise -Solomon Islands.
- Trochus, under water monument, Chuuk FSM.
- Ecotourism sites in mangrove tour part of watershed projects, Pohnpei FSM.

Refer to Volume 3 for some case studies of these EDCIs presented to the Sixth Conference.

What are the necessary and sufficient conditions for EDCIs to work effectively in the Pacific context?

- Community need to want income - want money.
- Community approval and support of proposed enterprise.
- Capital base for investment available.
- Marketing and feasibility analysis indicates a proven market.
- Infrastructure sufficient-ie goods to market.
- Equitable distribution of benefits.
- Locally appropriate technology available.
- Ecologically and culturally sensitive approach to business planning and implementation.
- Maintaining links between enterprise and conservation.
- Resource must be suitable to develop enterprise.
- Suitable training and skills support.
- Good management skills.
- Assessing risk - financial and biodiversity.
- Ensure that legal framework is clearly defined - ownership and tenure system.
- Transparency in business development, cost and benefit.
- Focus private sector input into building partnerships and supporting capacity of local communities eg develop skills to take over or manage projects in the long term.
- Expectation of all parties needs to be made clear.
- For the private sector and local community there needs to be security that has some backing through agreements or legislation eg. long term leases.
- Need information on EDCIs needs to be useable at the local level eg. by translating into local languages, interpreting technical information.



- Real need for assistance in this area and networking with others in PICs who have experience in EDCIs.

Should EDCIs be financial ventures within conservation benefits or a conservation activity with financial offspring or both?

- Depends on circumstances:
 - Eg if an imminent threat developed may be best to establish enterprise to head off threat.
 - Conservation goal primary –EDCI. Used to support CA – secondary goal
 - Conservation and income generating goals equal.
- Stakeholder’s perspective determines the relative importance or approach. For example - if the community is experiencing a threat/impact then an EDCI as a conservation activity with financial benefits may dominate however if there is no perceived threat/impact the financial venture mode will dominate.
- Many different types of conservation benefits that do not have dollar value (non-quantifiable) For example - water catchment protected area, personal/public health, coral reef MPA.
- Financial ventures with conservation benefits. For example - interpretive centres – videos, t-shirts, posters, Butterfly farming in PNG.
- Also the strengthening of traditional knowledge through conservation activities that in turn can create financial spin-offs.



TOOL 3: Conservation Trust Funds

Introduction

Conservation trust funds are increasingly looked at as a potential long term funding mechanism at the local site eg a conservation area, national and regional level. The main characteristics of conservation trust funds are:

1. They provide a long term, stable source of income for allocation to conservation activities. A well-managed trust fund will generate income in perpetuity (forever).
2. They have one or more clearly defined purposes, which can be as broad as promotion of the sustainable use and management of the resources of a defined region or as narrow as supporting the management of a particular protected area.
3. They may be established as a charitable trust under common law, as a company limited by guarantee or by shares, or as a statutory body. The country where it is legally domiciled (where it 'lives'), and the country where the funds are held, may be different from the country where the trust income is to be used.
4. The way in which a trust fund operates is governed by the trust deed, which is like the articles of association of a company.
5. A trust fund usually comprises:
 - One or more *trustees* who make sure that the trust is administered in accordance with the trust deed.
 - A *Board* who determine the strategy for investing the funds and for disbursing any income from investments.
 - (Optionally) one or more *advisory committees*.
 - A *custodian* (usually a bank), who actually hold the title to the trust investments.
 - A *fund manager*, who invested the funds on behalf of the trust.
 - A *Director and staff*, who are responsible for implementing the decisions of the Board.

A summary of the functions which can be performed by a trust fund and the positive and negative issues associated with their use are summarised in Table 1.

Conservation trust funds have been used extensively in Latin America, and to a lesser extent in Asia and Africa. There are as yet only a few examples of their use in the Pacific, although the general-purpose trust funds in Tuvalu and Kiribati are well known.

One example of an existing Pacific region trust fund, which supports conservation activities, is the Rainbow Warrior Trust Fund, which is administered by the New Zealand Ministry of Internal Affairs. Grants from this trust fund have been used to support the Kakerori (Rarotongan Flycatcher) Recovery Programme.

A trust deed has been drawn up for a Vanuatu Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund, although the deed does not have legal force until the first funds are committed. The primary purpose of this trust fund will be to fund the ongoing lease payments for the Erromango Kauri Protected Area (see Table 2).

One of the objectives of the UNDP/GEF PNG Integrated Conservation and Development Programme is the establishment of a trust fund for biodiversity conservation in PNG. UNDP has invited The Nature Conservancy to carry out a feasibility study for the establishment of such a fund. Work to date has included a study of the legal and administrative issues involved, and a yearlong consultative process culminating in a workshop in Port Moresby in May 1997.



Other area-specific trust fund proposals in various stages of development include those for the Pohnpei watershed forests, for the Sovi Basin in Fiji and for the Arnavon Islands in the Solomon Islands. Finally, SPREP has prepared a draft concept paper for a region-wide South Pacific Biodiversity Conservation Fund, which would provide ongoing financial support to the Conservation Areas established under the SPBCP.

Pacific island working definition – Conservation Trust Funds

A Conservation Trust Fund is a financing mechanism established to generate an ongoing or sustainable stream of funds to support conservation and sustainable development, whether on a local, national or regional level.

Advice compiled from Sixth Conference Working Group Sessions

Working groups discussed CTFs in general and then focused on the issue of a regional CTF based on the Draft SPREP Concept Paper (See Volume 3). The Working Groups agreed that CTFs were an appropriate tool for conservation in the Pacific islands region. It was recognised that there was little direct experience at the local, national or regional level in the development and use of CTFs. It was thought that the technical, complex and expensive process required to set up a CTF is the key reason for limited use in the region to date.

In regards to the goal(s) of a Pacific Islands Regional Trust Fund for Conservation, Working Groups concluded that:

- The primary goal of a regional trust fund should be very focused and should primarily target assistance to community-based conservation areas.
- A secondary goal could be to assist other related community conservation initiatives.

Further, Working Groups advised that Regional Trust Fund supported projects should focus on:

- Community based conservation initiatives.
- Demonstrate and integrated approach to conservation and development.
- Include a strong focus on capacity building.
- Include well-designed education/awareness programmes.
- Help build sustainable income generation activities, and
- Support to NGO initiatives in the above areas of work.

Working Group discussion of the concept of a South Pacific Biodiversity CTF as set out in the SPREP Concept Paper concluded that the concept was appropriate but noted that:

- A regional entity/fund should be established to achieve economies of scale in terms of fund-raising investments and management together with national small grant agencies disbursing grants based on local priorities rather than disbursement for initiatives at the regional level.
- There should be flexibility for the regional fund to disburse grants directly in countries with limited capacity.
- The regional fund should also disburse grants directly for projects that would benefit more than one country.
- There is a danger of turning a CTF into another bureaucracy.
- The cost to maintain the fund can disadvantage small funds because of administrative costs.
- Government participation in the control of CTFs has distinct advantages – it can give official support. However this can also be limited by politics, bureaucracy and a poor track record in this area.
- A regional fund should encourage and support the establishment, where appropriate, of national funds,
- There is scope for establishment of local CTFs for specialised projects/sectors.
- There is a need to evaluate very carefully the operational basis of the fund: ie. will it become a source of funds for new projects, or will it fund the ongoing needs of identified existing initiatives?
- That composition and function of the Board should be clearly defined, including the role of SPREP and its Member Governments. It should include representation from Polynesia, Micronesia and Melanesia and



should be autonomous with control varying from country to country as a partnership between government, NGOs, private sector, university, and scientists to professionally manage it.

- Mechanisms for transparency must be developed.
- To be effective, and to match current SPBCP spending of approximately USD \$1 million dollars per year, a trust would have to be capitalised in the order of USD \$20 million.
- SPREP should dialogue with regional stakeholders regarding the details of establishing the regional CTF.

Beneficiaries of a Regional Trust Fund should be:

Any regional organisation, governments, NGOs, communities, etc., involved in community based conservation.



Table 1. Conservation Trust Funds – use and issues arising

| Functions | Positive Issues | Negative Issues |
|---|---|---|
| <p>1. Provide a stable source of funding allowing government agencies and NGOs to plan their work with confidence.</p> | <p>Recent years have seen dramatic changes in the levels of donor interest in Pacific island countries. Budgetary support for conservation from island governments has also been restricted in many instances. A trust fund can avoid this boon and bust syndrome, and allow for rational planning.</p> | <p>Ideally conservation trust funds should be established at a time when donor interest in the Pacific islands and in conservation is high. The late 1990s however, have seen declining interest in the Pacific and in conservation on the part of many donors. Trust funds will thus be competing for a declining pool of funds.</p> |
| <p>2. Provide support over a longer period than the three to five-year term of most donor-funded conservation projects.</p> | <p>Permits the type of long-term support that is essential to attitudinal and behavioural change</p> | <p>Risk that the bulk of the funds will nevertheless still be allocated, not for long-term support for a few projects, but for a large number of projects which are quick to implement but may have limited long-term value.</p> |
| <p>3. Greater flexibility as regards the scale and scheduling of funding.</p> | <p>Projects too small for major donor support can receive funding</p> <p>Funding can be phased in and out, staged and suspended in response to circumstances more easily than with projects supported by external donors.</p> | <p>Risk that the trust fund may allocate the bulk of the available funds to a plethora of small projects that are too small to have any significant impact on the overall problem.</p> |
| <p>4. Funding projects that might be too politically sensitive for donors to fund directly.</p> | <p>Projects which challenge politically powerful interest that threaten conservation values (eg the export timber industry, non-local fishing interests) can be funded.</p> <p>Organisations such as politically active local NGOs, which might be unpopular with their national government because of their environmental activism</p> | <p>Risk that the Board will channel support primarily or solely to high-profile NGO projects, which in some cases can have little impact outside the immediate project area, to the detriment of worthwhile government programmes.</p> |



| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | and thus unable to obtain funding from international donors, can receive support from the trust fund. | |
| 5. Building links between community groups, local and international NGOs, research institutes and government agencies. | <p>Working together on the Board and advisory committees can build greater trust and understanding between government, NGOs, community groups and researchers.</p> <p>The trust fund can actively promote the building of partnerships between the various sector of the community, by favouring cooperative projects.</p> | <p>Competition for funds can increase tensions between the various organisations.</p> <p>Risk that government agencies and high profile NGOs with grant application skills and experience can through the formation of bogus 'partnerships' with community groups, arrogate to themselves the bulk of the available funds.</p> |
| 6. Coordinating the activities of a range of donor agencies in the field of conservation and sustainable development. | To do its job effectively, the trust fund must develop a thorough understanding of the full range of activities being undertaken in the field of conservation and sustainable development. This knowledge base can be used by donors and government planners to identify gaps and focus on priority activities. | Donors may see the trust fund as 'covering the field' of conservation, and direct project funding support to other sectors. |
| 7. Tapping sources of funds that might not otherwise have been available for conservation and sustainable development, such as tourist taxes, environmental fees and charges, and tax-deductible donations by companies and individuals. | Linking potential sources of funding of conservation with worthwhile initiatives can be time-consuming. For small amounts, the effort can be barely worthwhile. A trust fund can provide an easy receptacle for such funds. | The importance of this should not be over-estimated. Governments are typically reluctant to part with revenues such as departure taxes, bed taxes etc. Local and multinational companies in Pacific island countries are not known for their generosity to environmental causes, and individuals are often unwilling to put their donations into a large fund where they cannot know how they will ultimately be used. |

TOOL 4: World Heritage Convention

Introduction

With 149 sovereign states, which are parties to the Convention and a total of 506 sites inscribed on the prestigious World Heritage List, the Pacific region remains the most under represented region in the world.

World Heritage sites are recognised, through use of the Convention's criteria and conditions, to have 'outstanding universal value'. Importantly, inscription on the World Heritage list is a matter for individual and national pride and fosters international awareness of a country's culture and nature. World Heritage status can increase tourism interest in a site and also may assist in focusing research efforts.

Proposals for site listings come from countries that are party to the convention and are considered for acceptance on the World Heritage List by the World Heritage Committee. Through the World Heritage Fund this Committee can direct financial, technical, training and other support to assist conservation of sites or to develop site nominations. Additionally, donors often regard World Heritage status as justifying priority for assistance. IUCN advises on listings of natural sites and undertakes monitoring of natural sites already on the list.

World Heritage members in the region are Fiji (1990), Solomon Islands (1992) and Papua New Guinea (1996). In addition Australia, New Zealand, France, United States, Chile (Rapa Nui) and the United Kingdom are World Heritage members. Thus territories in the Pacific can have sites nominated through these countries eg Henderson Island (Pitcairn, UK).

Pacific island working definition – World Heritage Convention

The WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION (1972) is a mechanism for international co-operation designed to identify and protect the cultural and natural heritage sites of sovereign states. Listed sites are considered so important that they form part of the world heritage for whose protection it is the duty of the international community as a whole to co-operate.

Criteria for listing

The Committee's Operational Guidelines include detailed criteria for both cultural and natural sites to assist it in determining if the site is "*of outstanding universal value*" and to determine if the site meets the "*test of authenticity*" in the case of cultural sites and the "*conditions of integrity*" in the case of natural sites.

Focussing on natural sites, the four criteria applicable (in summary) are that the nominated site is considered "*of outstanding universal value*" exhibiting:

- (i) Geological processes and geomorphologic features;
- (ii) Ecological and biological processes;
- (iii) Superlative natural phenomena/exceptional natural beauty and aesthetic importance;
- (iv) Biological diversity including threatened species

One classification in the cultural area of particular interest to those involved in the natural heritage and to the Pacific islands is that of "*cultural landscapes*". (From Bing Lucas' paper- Volume 3)

World Heritage in the Pacific

In the Pacific region covered by SPREP (the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme), only Australia and New Zealand have so far been active in implementing the Convention and the insular Pacific remains a largely unrepresented region on the World Heritage map.



In 1974, Australia became the seventh country in the world to ratify the Convention, New Zealand following suit in 1975. Among other states in the Pacific region, Papua New Guinea has just joined Fiji and the Solomon Islands as parties to the Convention while there is current interest in joining from Federated States of Micronesia.

Use and Issues

Limited convention use

Few Pacific island countries are party to this convention. Currently Fiji, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea are parties. There are currently no sites listed in Pacific island countries.

However, Solomon Islands has proposed East Rennell for site listing in 1997. This proposal has the agreement of local communities and assistance from New Zealand. The Solomon Islands is also investigating the possibility of listing Marovo Lagoon. Fiji is investigating site listings eg Levuka, Sigatoka sand dunes, however, no sites are currently proposed. Papua New Guinea has recently joined and there are drafted proposals for site listings (Kuk, Bobongara). FSM (Pohnpei) has recognised the importance of Nan Madol and is looking at the use of the World Heritage Convention to assist conservation of this site.

Note that the United Kingdom has listed Henderson Island (Pitcairn) as a World Heritage site. This assisted protection of a whole island ecosystem that was proposed for development by an American company. New Zealand, Australia and the USA (Hawaii) have successfully listed World Heritage sites.

Site listing process

There is concern that local community owners and resource users may become disenfranchised as only a Government Party can propose a site. Many potential sites in this region are likely to be in local customary tenure. This means that partnerships with local tenure holders are needed for site listing eg East Rennell proposal. In this case a long process was needed to build agreement, mutual understanding and partnerships between government and local site owners for site proposal. In addition, it was recognised that traditional management techniques are the key to maintaining the integrity of the area. The Marovo experience illustrates the difficulty in gaining consensus among diverse communities and the possibility of World Heritage status raised both fear and expectations among local people.

Documentation and information (eg. scientific) requirements for site listing appears to need a lot of information and are difficult, costly and time consuming to complete.

There is concern at “outsiders” influencing local control and/or management of sites.

Limited awareness and understanding of the Convention

There appears to be a lack of understanding and awareness of the use of the convention on both Pacific island non-Parties and Parties. There also seems to be a lack of confidence in using the convention by existing Parties. Combined these factors may have resulted in a lack of interest and political will in joining or using the convention. Cost of joining and using the convention may also be a factor in the region. In 1996 IUCN recognised the need to promote awareness of the convention in Oceania, which was adopted as a resolution at the First World Conservation Congress. Two recent initiatives have also sought to address this issue. In 1996 a training workshop for heritage managers was held in Pohnpei. In July 1997 UNESCO's World Heritage Centre held a strategy meeting in Fiji for Cultural Experts to look at issues of this convention's use in the region.

This meeting clearly recommended that:

- “Decisions on the access to, and use of, the knowledge and traditions associated with these sites must remain with the traditional custodians.... and requires a process of partnership building.”



- “Decisions about World Heritage conservation have to be formulated in partnership with, and the agreement of, local communities....”
- Assistance be provided to Pacific island countries that are considering accession to the convention

This meeting further requested that support be given to in-country education and awareness programmes on the convention and to support networking of cultural and natural heritage experts working on these issues in the region. The meeting also identified the possibility of using the convention to conserve serial sites eg. lapita and cultural landscapes.

There is clearly potential and opportunities to use the World Heritage Convention in the Pacific islands region. The question is how can this be done in a way that is driven by the needs and specific circumstances of Pacific island countries and territories.

Advice from Sixth Conference Working Group Sessions

Present constraints keeping Pacific island countries from joining the World Heritage Convention were identified by participants as:

- Lack of awareness, knowledge and understanding of the convention.
- Lack of support for countries to assess benefits and costs of joining.
- Lack of capacity in-country to assess benefits and costs of joining.
- Lack of clarity of benefits to existing parties of being convention members.
- Concern at documentation processes for site listing and believe there is a need for simple and regionally relevant documentation.
- Lack of political will in countries to join.
- Lack of NGO participation at an international level.

Benefits seen for a Pacific island government in joining the World Heritage Convention as identified by workshop participants:

- Focuses attention on heritage within national boundaries.
- Access to funding and technical assistance from WHC.
- WHC site listing as a possible tool to leverage funding from other donors.
- Capacity building for heritage conservation.
- Access to technical assistance.
- Networking regional/international.
- Learning from each other’s experience.
- Empowerment of NGOs on conservation efforts.
- Conservation of biodiversity (particularly target species).
- International recognition of Pacific island countries’ cultural and natural heritage.
- Helps to consider culture and nature conservation together.
- Increase conservation awareness among countries.

Costs seen for a Pacific island government in joining the World Heritage Convention as identified by workshop participants:

- Contribution US\$371 per year for membership fee.
- Staff time and resources.
- Dependence on external funding nature and resource.
- Loss of choices for natural resource exploitation.
- Potential cost of commitment, including opportunity costs.



Current constraints preventing Pacific island countries from using the World Heritage Convention were identified by participants as:

- They are not parties to the convention.
- Lack of knowledge on how the convention works, even among those who were party to the WHC.
- Lack of surveys and related information of potential sites.
- Conflicts between government and tenure owners/resource users.
- Conflicts within government agency mandates.
- A concern for not having the capacity to manage a WHC site in the future (eg. monitoring, surveillance, enforcement).
- Apparent separation of cultural and natural sites in the Convention's criteria.
- Special issue for conservation of serial sites eg. migration routes, lapita as these often involve more than one sovereign state making a nomination.

Perceived benefits for local site owners of allowing their government (assuming they are a World Heritage Convention Party) to list their site on the World Heritage List were identified by participants as:

- Pride of the local community and culture.
- Promotion of the area eg. for tourism.
- Gives additional protection that is recognised nationally and internationally.
- Provision of assistance (funding and technical) from the World Heritage Centre.
- Can assist co-operation and partnership building between all levels (government and communities).
- Assists evaluation and monitoring of a site.
- Site listing assists in accessing/leveraging resources and support from other donors.
- Provides mechanism for formal recognition of partnerships for cultural and natural heritage conservation.
- Increase appreciation for and recognition of, and may revive and strengthen cultural values and traditions.
- Increase tourism opportunities and employment.

It was noted that many of the perceived benefits could also be costs or negative factors if the fundamental process of partnership building and recognition of local tenure was not followed eg. tourism development

Perceived costs for local site owners of allowing their government to list their site on the World Heritage list were identified by participants as:

- Restrictions to future development options.
- Financial obligations – eg administrative.
- Reduce rights/choice to self-determination for areas.
- Potential loss/change of cultural/traditional integrity.
- Concerns about implementing a 'management plan'.
- Impacts to surrounding communities.
- Adverse effects of increased tourism opportunities and employment.

Effective uses for the World Heritage Convention that are driven by the needs and specific circumstances of Pacific island countries and territories were identified by participants as:

- Require in-country assistance for non-Parties to assess benefits and costs of joining the convention.
- Need to develop simple and regionally relevant documentation processes.
- Need to build political will for joining and using the convention as only government parties can nominate site.
- Need partnerships with local tenure holders/resource users in site selection and development of nominations.
- Identify potential revenue generation/employment opportunities of site listing.



- Require assistance to collect and review existing knowledge/information of cultural and natural history.
- Recommend monitoring assessment of the expected and realised benefits and costs of site listing.
- Note that WHC is not going to solve all issues for a site eg. conservation areas but it is another tool for conservation that can assist.
- Note that the Convention on Biological Diversity focuses on representative site conservation and the World Heritage Convention focuses on 'special' sites of outstanding value and provides direct linkages to cultural heritage conservation.
- Community driven approach to site and selection development.
- Used by countries to protect a site from any exploitation.

Recommended next steps by Sixth Conference participants focused on the need to build political will in countries to join and implement the World Heritage Convention and to incorporate the identification of potential revenue generation/employment opportunities of site listing early in the site listing process