

**REPORT OF THE MEETING**  
**ICRI Co-ordinating and Planning Committee**  
**Gland, Switzerland**  
**8<sup>th</sup>- 9<sup>th</sup> May, 2003**

### 1. Opening

In his opening address, **Mr. Delmar Blasco**, the Secretary General of Ramsar, the Convention on Wetlands, highlighted that, because of the definition used by Ramsar to define wetlands, it might be one of the only international conventions that recognises the conservation of coral reefs. In addition, he expressed concern over the progress of Ramsar in securing wetland sites around the world. He informed the CPC that, at present, Ramsar has recognised 35 sites around the world. He added that at the recent Conference of the Parties to Ramsar, guidelines for the incorporation of wetlands issues into integrated coastal zone management frameworks and also for the incorporation of coral reefs within the Ramsar Convention were adopted. Furthermore, **Mr. Blasco** expressed his hope that UK would fulfill its offer to host the ICRI Secretariat for the next biennium. In conclusion, he apologised for not being able to attend the entire meeting but expressed his hopes for a productive meeting.

After a brief introduction of everyone present at the meeting, the Chair, **Mr. Olof Lindén** of the Swedish ICRI Secretariat, informed the CPC that apologies had been received from Chou Loke Ming of Singapore, Alessandra Vanzella-Khoury of the UNEP Caribbean RCU, Gregor Hodgson of Reef Check, Paul Holthus of the Marine Aquarium Council, Arthur Patterson of NOAA, Laretta Burke of the World Resources Institute - Reefs at Risk Program, Robin South of International Oceans Institute - Australia and Ed Green of the UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre. In addition, the Chair informed the CPC that the Philippines ICRI Secretariat was unable to send a representative to the meeting because appropriate travel authorisation from the Philippine Government had not been obtained on time.

Afterwards, the Chair requested Mr. Stefan Hain, the new Head of the UNEP Coral Reef Unit, to introduce himself to the CPC. **Mr. Hain**, presented a brief history of the Coral Reef Unit and proceeded to describe his scientific and professional background and the goals and objectives of the Head of the Coral Reef Unit. In particular, he highlighted the need to analyse coral reef policies in order to develop both policies and on the ground activities and strengthen the relationship between them.

**Ms. Margarita Astralaga** of Ramsar informed the CPC that her personal assistant, **Julio Montes de Oca Lugo**, would assist with logistical arrangements during the meeting and highlighted the importance of his role in the organisation of the meeting.

### 2. Adoption of the Agenda

**The Chair** called for comments on the Agenda (*CPC Doc 2*). **Mr. Nicholas Polunin**, the President of the International Society for Reef Studies (ISRS), requested a brief presentation of the ISRS under Item 15. The Chairman proposed to merge Items 5 and 13 as they both dealt with the ICRI Forum and **Ms Marea Hatziolos**, of the World Bank, informed the CPC that Mr Francis Staub, the administrator for the ICRI Forum, was unable to attend the meeting and that she would be conducting the presentation on his behalf. **Ms Nyawira Muthiga** of Kenya drew the attention of the CPC to several other conventions, particularly the Nairobi Convention, and regional bodies that were dealing with coral reefs and requested to make a presentation under Item 9. The Agenda was adopted with the proposed amendments

### 3. Adoption of the report of the previous meeting

The Chair introduced the report of the previous CPC meeting held in Cancun, Mexico on the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> of June, 2002 (*CPC Doc 3*) and called on the CPC for comments and amendments. **Ms Barbara Best**, of the USAID, highlighted a statement under item 18 and proposed that she would submit a suitable amendment to the Secretariat for inclusion into the report. Afterwards, the report was adopted noting the proposed amendment.

### 4. Adoption of the workshop report from regional workshop in Cancun

**Mr Robert Cudney**, of Mexico, drew the attention of the CPC to the report of the ICRI Regional Workshop in the Tropical Americas held in Cancun and informed them that the report had been distributed as *CPC Doc 4*.

**Mr Clive Wilkinson**, the Global Co-ordinator for the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN), motioned to accept the report and congratulated the Government of Mexico for hosting the meeting. **Ms.**

**Barbara Best** seconded the motion and **Mr Tom Praster**, of the US State Department, expressed his opinion that the meeting was very well run and highlighted that there will be a “White Water to Blue Water” meeting in March 2004 and encouraged the Mexican Government to participate.

## 5. Report from ITMEMS 2

**Mr. Richard Kenchington**, the Chair of both the organising committee of the Second International Tropical Marine Ecosystems Management Symposium (ITMEMS 2) and the Board of the International Coral Reef Action Network (ICRAN), informed the CPC that although the meeting was held in a time of worldwide political instability, the success of the meeting was ensured by the focus and dedication of those who were courageous enough to attend. The Symposium was successful in its objective to have each workshop dedicated to discussion and exchange of experiences among participants. **Mr Kenchington**, informed the CPC that the report arising from the Symposium contained nothing new but that it reinforced the fact that existing priorities for tropical marine ecosystems management were still appropriate and that the ICRI *Framework for Action* remained valid. **Mr. Kenchington** highlighted some of the key issues raised during the Symposium, particularly concerning the proportion of programme or institutional budgets that should be devoted to various management activities. He expressed his confidence that the condition of the world’s coral reefs had not improved during the last 10-15 years and illustrated this with an example from the Sulu-Sulawesi Sea where SIF terrorists wanted exclusive rights of access to their traditional inshore fishing grounds as part of their demands. **Mr Kenchington** emphasised that the ICRI *Framework for Action* gives ICRI and its partners the mechanisms to identify both human and environmental priorities.

In addition to the general workshops and plenary sessions at the Symposium, **Mr Kenchington** informed the CPC that several regional caucuses were held to give participants the opportunity to highlight issues of particular interest in their region to ensure that those issues would be included in the report of each workshop session. He informed the CPC that the recommendations arising from these caucuses were directed first, within the regions to promote collaboration between communities and governments and second, to provide advice to external people and agencies on how to help with management and that, in order to be fully effective, they would have to be adopted by governments and regional organisations. He concluded by stating that the regional caucuses assisted in ensuring that management issues and priorities were regionally driven, which is a priority of ICRI. (*ITMEMS Action Statement- CPC Doc 5.1; Regional Caucuses Recommendations- CPC Doc 5.2-5.5*)

### *Comments of the CPC*

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** expressed the opinion that there was good representation of countries and projects, such as CORDIO and the WWF ecoregion, from East Africa and that the regional caucuses were valuable. In addition, she considered that the recommendations describing the amount of money required for various management activities, particularly enforcement, were valuable.

**Mr Bernard Salvat** of France thanked **Mr. Kenchington** for his efforts to organise ITMEMS 2, particularly considering the political situation, and asked for clarification regarding the timing of the next ITMEMS, who will be responsible for its organisation and how will the subjects be distributed between ITMEMS and ICRS. He proposed that these issues should be examined some time during the next biennium. **Mr Nicholas Polunin** offered some clarification by explaining that the ISRS is responsible for the ICRS and that the 10<sup>th</sup> ICRS Meeting would be held in Okinawa and would be organised by the Japanese Coral Reef Society in order to ensure that there is a local flavour to the topics addressed in the meeting. **Mr. Kenchington** recalled the address that Terry Done gave at Bali during the 9<sup>th</sup> ICRS highlighting several of the issues that scientists felt were important for managers to address and likewise, ITMEMS will identify issues that managers feel important for scientists to address in order to assist in management.

The Chair informed the CPC that ICRI had a major role in the organisation of ITMEMS 2 but asked if that was the case at the inaugural ITMEMS. **Mr Kenchington** explained that, at the time, Australia was hosting the ICRI Secretariat, and that ITMEMS 1 was an initiative of the Australian ICRI Secretariat. He proposed to defer any further discussion on the relationship between the ICRS and the ITMEMS to the next Secretariat.

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** highlighted the fact that scientists were able to attend the ICRS because they had projects or grants that cover expenses for their attendance but it was more difficult for managers to attend the ITMEMS and expressed the opinion that it was important that a source of money was found to ensure participation of managers at ITMEMS. **Mr Nicholas Polunin** informed the CPC that, in the past, the ISRS had a grants scheme to assist students to attend the ICRS but that the success of this scheme was largely dependent on the dedication of members of the Board of the ISRS to raise funds for those students. He declared that, while the Packard Foundation had expressed some small scale interest in supporting this scheme, additional support was needed

and appealed to the partners of ICRI for support. **Ms. Muthiga** informed the CPC that the Western Indian Ocean Marine Science Association (WIOMSA) also provided a limited number of grants for people to attend conferences and workshops.

**John Baldwin**, of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority (GBRMPA), enquired how much the CPC and ICRI was engaged in setting the agenda for ITMEMS and whether this was a worthy item for discussion during the term of the next Secretariat. Mr. Kenchington explained that ITMEMS 2 was on the ICRI agenda even at the time of the transition between the French and the present Secretariat. The Chair reminded the CPC that ITMEMS had been discussed several times during past CPC meetings.

**1. ACTION:** The ICRI CPC requests all ICRI partners especially organizations and nations funding coral reef projects to include specific funds in project and aid budgets to permit the attendance of scientists and managers to attend ITMEMS and ICRS every two years.

## 6. Welcoming of new ICRI partners

### Germany

**Prof. Venugopalan Ittekkot**, Director of the Centre for Tropical Marine Ecology in Bremen, Germany, informed the CPC that he was present at the meeting as a representative of the Federal Ministry for Research and Education (BMBF, Bonn) and was expected to report the outcomes of the meeting when he returned to enable the relevant departments to make appropriate decisions concerning participation in ICRI. He then gave a brief presentation of the Centre for Tropical Marine Ecology and explained that it had been established 11 years ago by the Government of Bremen and supported by the Federal Ministry of Research and Education in its development to conduct projects in partnership with tropical countries. He informed the CPC that the Centre had several different duties that focussed on research projects on tropical marine ecosystems and associated resources, capacity building in the field of tropical marine ecology and the co-ordination of activities within the maritime sector by bringing together scientists, policy makers and private sector. Finally, he stated that the Centre was active in South and Central America, the Middle East, Indonesia, Vietnam and was working toward new projects in Cuba and Madagascar and that projects were being funded by the German Federal Ministry of Research and Education, the German Research Council (DFG, Bonn) and the governments of each partner country.

The Chair welcomed Germany's participation and hoped that their attendance at this meeting would be the beginning of a long and fruitful partnership.

### The Convention on Biological Diversity

**Ms. Marjo Vierros**, Programme Officer at the Secretariat for the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), expressed her pleasure to be a part of the meeting and reaffirmed that coral reef issues were a high priority within the CBD, particularly after the coral bleaching event of 1998 and the impacts it had on human livelihoods. She informed the CPC that, as a result of the recent work done on coral bleaching, the parties of the CBD decided that CBD should collaborate with ICRI when dealing with coral reef issues. She concluded by asking for clarification regarding the formality of this new relationship.

### Comments of the CPC

**Mr Richard Kenchington** explained that, in the past, sufficient interest in ICRI and clear indications of wanting to implement the *Framework for Action* had been enough to be considered a member. He indicated that, in some cases, this informality had been a problem but in some cases it provided the freedom to speak freely.

**Mr Bernard Salvat** highlighted several points. First, he recalled that the CBD had been invited to CPC meetings on several previous occasions. Second, he emphasised the importance of representatives at the CPC to have the authority to speak on behalf of their government and exemplified his statement by referring to Prof. Ittekkot's presentation in which he explained that he had been sent as the representative of the Government of Germany. Finally, he recalled when France hosted the ICRI Secretariat and had failed to secure the involvement of the European Union in ICRI and expressed happiness to see more European countries participating in ICRI. The Chair informed the CPC that the current Secretariat had also experienced difficulty getting the European Commission involved in ICRI.

**Mr Iouri Oliouline** Executive Director of the International Oceans Institute (IOI), asked if ICRI would consider entering into a formal MoU with the IOI and explained that such an agreement would give greater leverage for obtaining funds for joint activities and would provide a legal basis for activities.

**Ms Margarita Astralaga** explained that the Ramsar Convention had been dealing with coral reef and coastal issues since 1971 but without much success. She informed the CPC that Ramsar have been irregularly attending ICRI meetings over the years but doubts if the Convention has been officially admitted as a partner, despite the fact that, unofficially, Ramsar has always felt that they were a partner. Nevertheless, **Ms. Astralaga** welcomed some formality in the future.

**Mr Bernard Salvat** welcomed Ramsar as a partner of ICRI but also highlighted that ICRI must also be prepared to recognise other conventions such as World Heritage Convention and the Man and the Biosphere Programme (MAB) of UNESCO. He enquired from the representative of IOC/UNESCO if ICRI should agree to have Ramsar as a partner. **Ole Vestergaard** informed the CPC that, while he thought these conventions and programmes should be here as partners, IOC/UNESCO could not represent the UNESCO Man and Biosphere Program (MAB) or the World Heritage Convention without a special decision of the Directors of the two programs respectively, but explained that ICRI could have separate agreements with each convention or programme and recommended that ICRI communicate directly with each additional convention.

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** asked if a mechanism existed to encourage new partners to join ICRI and highlighted several regional initiatives such as WIOMSA that would be suitable partners. Robert Hepworth, the Deputy Director of the Division of Environmental Conventions of UNEP, drew the attention of the CPC to the Draft Resolution on the Organisation and Management Procedures for ICRI tabled under Agenda item 7.1.1 and called for a more detailed discussion of these issues under that agenda item. **Mr Rolph Payet**, the Director of the Division of Policy and Planning within the Ministry of Environment, Seychelles, concurred.

**2. ACTION:** a. The ICRI CPC welcomes the participation of Germany, the Secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention to their first meeting of ICRI CPC as members and wishes that these organisations will play an active role in ICRI activities. ICRI requests these organisations to endorse the ICRI Framework for Action, the Plan of Action and the Renewed Calls prepared during the ITMEMS meetings of 1998 and 2003.

b. Recognising that a number of international conventions and regional conventions are involved in coral reef activities, ICRI CPC invites representatives of the CITES, World Heritage Convention, and Man and the Biosphere Programme of UNESCO as well as regional organisations such as WIOMSA to become ICRI Members.

## 7. ICRI Structure

**Mr Tom Praster** introduced the Draft Resolution on the Organisation and Management Procedures for ICRI (*CPC Doc 7.1.1*) and proposed that instead of reviewing each line of the resolution the CPC should engage in a general discussion of how ICRI should be organised in the future and then, after a general framework has been determined, the CPC can review the resolution in detail. He emphasised that there was a need to clarify some of the procedures to streamline ICRI but indicated that the US does not have strong opinions on how ICRI should be organised or how it works but warned against establishing a burdensome bureaucracy with complicated procedures. **Mr. Praster** observed that it seemed to be the consensus of the CPC that the ICRI Secretariat should be hosted by a State and informed the CPC that the US was seriously considering hosting the Secretariat after the next biennium. In addition, he highlighted the importance of retaining institutional memory during the transition of the Secretariat and that, in order to ensure the effectiveness of the Secretariat, there might be a need to draw on expertise from outside. Finally, he called upon the CPC for comments on the draft resolution.

The Chair reiterated some of the statements made by Mr Praster and emphasised the need to make some decisions on these issues to assist the incoming Hosts.

### *Comments of the CPC*

**Bernard Salvat** provided a brief historical perspective of ICRI indicating that the progressively greater involvement of governments had required more formal proceedings. He indicated that France generally agreed with the proposed draft and would like to see ICRI remain as informal as possible. In addition, he urged ICRI to retain consensus when adopting resolutions and decisions and to try and avoid voting as this presents difficulties for government representatives.

**Mr Tom Praster** stated that the US agreed completely and that, when drafting the resolution, they kept in mind the non-binding nature of resolutions and decisions of ICRI. In addition, he highlighted the fact that the CPC is not formally mentioned in the ICRI and that it implied a smaller group of the broader membership and, as a consequence, the term CPC is not mentioned in the draft resolution.

**Mr Richard Kenchington** congratulated the US on the production of this draft and explained that initially, ICRI was intended to work at a regional level and the CPC was developed to assist that process and the name has simply stuck.

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** expressed the opinion that resolutions should be framed in a more directed manner and thought that ICRI could use the fact that many countries had ratified a number of other conventions dealing with coral reefs to encourage those countries to meet their responsibilities under those conventions.

**Ms Marea Hatzios** proposed that partners submit reports outlining how they are implementing the *Framework for Action* and meeting their obligations to these conventions and that this might offer a mechanism to review the performance of partners.

**Mr Clive Wilkinson** highlighted the absence of a representative of the Philippine ICRI Secretariat and drew attention to their poor performance in this regard. In order to prevent a similar situation occurring in the future, he proposed a model in which the ICRI Secretariat was a separate permanent entity that was headed by a rotating Presidency. He explained that the Secretariat would be responsible for organising meetings and the general activities of ICRI and the President/s would set the political agenda of ICRI during their term. He envisaged that this might avoid problems associated with lack of continuity between Secretariats and would ensure greater follow up on decisions and resolutions. **Mr Tom Praster** explained that the draft resolution recognised such a model as a possibility and concurred that it would secure institutional memory but warned that the creation of a separate secretariat might promote the creation of an unwanted and cumbersome bureaucracy and that it might also stifle the opportunity to revitalise the secretariat every two years.

**Mr Robert Hepworth** also thanked the US for addressing this issue and offered support to the reform process. He proposed trying to establish a working framework at this meeting and retain the option to review the operation and organisation of ICRI in a few years in the light of experience gained during the next biennium.

**Mr Rolph Payet** also thanked the US and alerted the CPC to the fact that financial contributions needed to establish and maintain a permanent secretariat might pose a problem. In addition, he suggested there was a need to examine the membership of ICRI and their performances. Finally, he expressed the opinion that the documentation of ICRI should explain more clearly how partners and regional bodies should collaborate to ensure the successful implementation of the *Framework for Action*.

**Mr Robert Canning**, of the UK DEFRA, agreed generally with the paper with a few drafting modifications and endorsed a review of the operation and organisation of ICRI in 12 months time.

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** explained that because the ICRI had no clear structure it was hard to justify participation in ICRI meetings to her government.

**Mr Bernard Salvat** requested clarification of the term of the presidency and the secretariat. **Clive Wilkinson** explained that he envisaged the secretariat being one or two people permanently attached to another independent body that would perform a purely administrative function. The Secretariat would then be governed by a president that would change every few years and they would set the agenda of ICRI and drive the political process. **Mr Wilkinson** proposed that at the end of the UK's term the secretariat might stay where it is but the Presidency would change.

**Mr Salvat** explained that it was unlikely that any government would be able to dedicate funds to run a secretariat for more than two years at a time. **Mr Clive Wilkinson** proposed that the secretariat should be funded by contributions from the membership.

**Mr Rolph Payet** expressed the opinion that the administration of contributed funds is a tremendous task and that the establishment of permanent secretariat would require an in-depth analysis of the cost implications before such a move could be made. **Ms Marea Hatzios** reiterated Mr Wilkinson's proposal that the Secretariat could be funded by contributions from the membership and housed in the offices of an intergovernmental body or another convention that was supporting the implementation of the *Framework for Action*.

**Ms Marjo Vierros** alerted the CPC to the fact that the Jakarta Mandate was in line with the ICRI *Framework for Action* and the parties of CBD have endorsed a decision encouraging CBD to work closely with ICRI. She explained that, in order for the CBD to host the ICRI Secretariat, she would have to discuss it with the Executive

Secretary of the CBD and find out the practical details for such an arrangement. However, she expressed concerns that hosting the ICRI secretariat at the CBD would bury it in layers of UN bureaucracy.

**Ms Margarita Astralaga** explained that Ramsar possessed the capacity and resources to host the ICRI Secretariat and also has a mandate to work with coral reefs. She stated that she would explore the possibilities for hosting a small secretariat here in Gland among some of the partners.

**Mr Bernard Salvat** observed that if a permanent secretariat was established in a country other than that of the president, then an agreement would have to be established between the two countries for this to work and, considering the current global political climate, this might restrict the number of potential partnerships that might govern ICRI.

**Mr Tom Praster** returned the discussion to the draft resolution and explained that for the purposes of this resolution only a president or secretariat would be specified and then it would be left to the UK to determine if it was necessary to delegate tasks to other organisations and engage in a longer-term relationship in the future. Alternatively, he stated that another approach would be to contract the secretariat to an organisation and allow every new president to maintain that relationship or move it somewhere else but warned that this might be disruptive, although it also means that whoever takes on the secretariat wouldn't be permanently burdened with it. **Ms Marea Hatziolos** proposed a five-year term with the option for review.

**Mr Tom Praster** also encouraged the CPC to find some appropriate terminology for the various components of the ICRI.

**Mr Chris Tompkins** of the UK noted the tasks and approach outlined for the next secretariat.

**The Chair** of the CPC emphasised the importance of refining the current draft resolution but also felt that it was valuable to discuss the option of establishing a separate secretariat.

**Mr John Baldwin** also congratulated the US for producing the draft resolution and explained that a decision to establish a separate secretariat could only be made if the secretariat had permanent home. He liked the potential that a permanent secretariat offered in terms of institutional continuity but also recognised that it would need funding. In addition, he expressed the opinion that there was eloquence in having a rotating president that determined the political agenda of ICRI and led the secretariat, which supported the president in undertaking the tasks set out in their work plan.

**Ms Barbara Best** recalled that this discussion arose from concern about continuity between secretariats and proposed an alternative model in which the current secretariat would be assisted by an advisory council that was comprised of peoples from previous Secretariats that have experience in the roles of the secretariat and other members with experiences from other areas to develop a pro-active approach to achieving continuity and progressive thinking. She explained that the involvement of people from previous secretariats would provide continuity between secretariats. **Mr Rolph Payet** endorsed Ms Best's proposal and reiterated the need to ensure continuity between secretariats. **Mr Richard Kenchington** explained that an informal continuity between secretariats existed in the past and expressed the opinion that ICRI should continue with the current model during the next year and then review the organisation and operations of the ICRI based on the experiences of the UK.

**Mr Robert Cudney** proposed an alternative solution might be to concentrate on the transition between the secretariats and develop a formal process for transition.

**Mr Tom Praster** suggested that ICRI should find a new term to describe the Secretariat under the current model and that the UK could make some recommendations concerning the organisation and operation of a secretariat based on their experiences. In the mean time, he encouraged ICRI to explore options with Ramsar, CBD and to form an advisory council that can assist the secretariat.

**Mr Robert Canning** informed the CPC that the UK would make a statement describing the logistics of the UK chairmanship and the role of the secretariat during their term. In addition, he proposed conducting the review of the operations of the secretariat through the advisory council.

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** expressed the opinion that a chairmanship of 2 years was short and enquired why. **Mr Richard Kenchington** explained that the term was simply a matter of money and that obtaining a long term commitment from any government was difficult, despite the fact that rotating the Secretariat every four years at

the ITMEMS would have some benefits. **Ms Marea Hatzioles** indicated that financial contributions from the membership would alleviate the economic burden from the president, allowing them to concentrate more on co-ordination of ICRI activities.

**Mr Nicholas Polunin** drew attention to the fact that if you have a term for each role, then you have to describe the function of each role.

**Mr Magnus Ngoile**, Director of the National Environment Management Council of Tanzania, explained that the co-hosting arrangement established during the last two years offers hope for developing nations to participate in the ICRI and expressed the opinion that this spirit should be maintained in the future. **Mr Robert Canning** stated that the UK looked forward to co-hosting during their term.

**Mr Tom Praster** also drew attention to the frequency of meetings and explained that holding meetings annually instead of every 6 months would confer cost savings. However, he added that the advantage with bi-annual meetings was that they could be held in conjunction with regional meetings enabling the direct input from regional bodies and scientists. **Mr. Praster** explained that one of the limitations of a rotating secretariat was that the opportunity to host it was restricted to countries that had the financial capacity to do so rather than those that had significant amounts of coral.

**Mr Bernard Salvat** explained that the term president invoked diplomatic status and we should choose a name that does not impede the political agenda of the ICRI. He expressed the opinion that the term host is passive and co-ordinator is too technical. **Ms Margarita Astralaga** also highlighted the need to consider the translation of the term selected.

#### **Review of the text of the resolution**

**Mr Tom Praster** led the discussion of the review of the text of the resolution. The outcomes of the discussion have been incorporated into the revised version of the draft resolution.

Several additional points primarily concerning the administration of funds for the secretariat were raised during the discussion. **Mr Kristian Teleki**, Acting Director of ICRAN, assured the CPC that no costs would be associated with managing funds through the UNEP-WCMC if the ICRI funds were to be managed under existing agreement which ICRAN as with UNEP-WCMC to manage the funds under its control and in addition, this agreement would extend any funds given to ICRI. In addition, UNEP-WCMC would be able to provide quarterly financial statements that would provide an informal auditing mechanism.

**Mr Rolph Payet** called for an audit of current ICRI expenditure. The Chair informed Mr Payet and the CPC that Sida had called for an external audit of the current secretariat and the auditors are waiting for an invitation from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources of the Philippines to begin.

**Mr Tom Praster** explained that the host could manage their own money themselves. The establishment of a treasury would enable the administration of funds coming into the ICRI from external sources to fund other activities, such as participation in meetings.

#### **Decision on reviewing the operation of the ICRI Secretariat**

**Mr Clive Wilkinson** introduced the decision entitled Decision on Reviewing the Operation of the ICRI Secretariat of the Co-ordinating and Planning Committee of the International Coral Reef Initiative (*CPC Doc 7.1.2*) and explained that this decision was designed to provide the incoming secretariat with a historical perspective of ICRI and to assist them to navigate some of the problems that have arisen during the reign of the current secretariat. He informed the CPC that much of the content of this decision had been incorporated into the draft resolution (*CPC Doc 7.1.1*) and asked if the UK will find this decision useful. In reply, **Mr Robert Canning** concurred that many of the issues dealt with in this decision were also addressed in the draft resolution (*CPC Doc 7.1.1*) and all that was needed to combine the two documents was to incorporate the paragraph requesting a review of the operations of the secretariat and then outline the items to be reviewed by the ad hoc committee in order for it to present options to the secretariat for consideration.

### **8. Updates from the working groups**

#### **MPA Working group report**

**Ms Barbara Best** introduced the ICRI MPA working group report (*CPC Doc 8.1*) and informed the CPC that she was presenting the report on behalf of the co-chairs of the working group Arthur Paterson and Ghislaine Llewellyn. She reported that ITMEMS 2 conducted three workshop sessions that were successful in addressing

MPA issues. With regard to the CBD, the report of the Ad Hoc technical expert group on marine and coastal protected areas highlights the value and importance of these areas as a tool to conserve and sustainably use marine biodiversity. The report provides guidance for the development of a global network of no-take MPAs and multiple use areas, embedded within an overarching framework of integrated coastal zone management and ocean governance. In addition, the report emphasises the role of national and international networks of MPAs and presents a research and monitoring programme intended to provide the scientific foundation for planning, implementation and evaluation of MPA sites. She continued by informing the CPC that the World Parks Congress will provide an opportunity to disseminate the outcomes of ITMEMS and link them to the broader MPA agenda. A number of ICRI partners have been involved in the planning process and some of the key interests include: management effectiveness, adopting ecosystem approaches and establishing functional MPA networks, fisheries, MPA financing and developing resiliency guidelines for coral reef areas. The Nature Conservancy (TNC) was taking the lead on this final item by developing a tool kit for the application of resilience guidelines. Finally, the MPA working group requests guidance on the following issues:

- *Are there any procedures for finalising the products of working groups?;*
- *How to credit ICRI in the introduction of documentation;*
- *Access is needed to the ICRI logo to insert into documents produced; and*
- *ICRI Forum would need to host a web version of the document.*

### **Comments of the CPC**

The Chair informed the membership that the Secretariat had a copy of the logo that can be distributed to partners.

**Ms Barbara Best** enquired if advisory groups can use the logo. In response, the Chair expressed the opinion that if you are a committee formed by the CPC then you have the legitimacy to use the logo.

**Ms Marea Hatzioles** sought clarification of the mandate of ICRI working groups, particularly in relation to the individual mandates of the organisations from which the members of the working group originate and asked if some of the items outlined in the report of the working group were outside the terms of reference under which the working group was formed. **Ms Barbara Best** explained that the primary goal of the working group was to ensure that MPAs were on the agenda of ITMEMS and the World Parks Congress.

**Mr Stefan Hain** suggested that the authors of the report should be identified in order to determine the status of the document. **Ms. Best** informed the CPC that the co-chairs of the working group, Arthur Paterson of NOAA and Ghislaine Llewellyn of WWF, were primarily responsible for drafting the report, that incorporates comments from TNC and a number of other organisations.

**Mr Chris Tompkins** explained that he was searching for clarity on how to handle things where ICRI was taking a decision on several issues and warned that ICRI must be careful when naming one or two countries in these documents.

The Chair alerted the CPC to the questions at the end of the report and called on the CPC to provide appropriate advice on these issues. **Ms Barbara Best** simply asked how ICRI handle documents produced by ICRI working groups.

**Mr Robert Hepworth** referred to the minutes of the last CPC meeting in Cancun in June 2002 and concluded that there was no direct statement or decision giving the working group a mandate to plan for the MPA sessions at ITMEMS or the World Parks Congress. The Chair called on Richard Kenchington to provide clarification. **Mr. Kenchington** interpreted the wording of the report to mean that the working group should assist with these sessions and that, as the Chair of the Organising Committee of ITMEMS, he appreciated the work that they did for ITMEMS 2.

The Chair stated that he was not aware of any document addressing no anchoring zones available on ICRI Forum. **Ms Barbara Best** informed the Chair and the CPC that the document had been posted on ICRI Forum for comments by members for about one year and that the working group would now like to move it to the open forum to advertise to countries that there were now guidelines for establishing no anchoring zones.

The Chair proposed that, considering the amount of time the document has been open for review by members, ICRI formally endorses the guidelines for establishing no anchoring zones.

**Mr John Baldwin** expressed concerns that ICRI was now using the ICRI Forum as a surrogate to secure endorsement of ICRI documents and proposed that documents to be adopted should be included as part of the



documentation in the meeting, thereby allowing people to comment. He explained that the Forum could be used as a vehicle for receiving comments but that they should be incorporated into the documentation and then presented at the meeting for adoption.

**Mr Tom Praster** proposed two weeks notice be issued to members to review and comment on the document and that comments received within that time would be incorporated prior to the document being issued as an official ICRI document. He concluded by stating that this discussion highlights the need to review how to finalise outputs from working groups.

**3. ACTION:** The Working Group on Marine Protected Areas reported that the document on No Anchoring Areas has been tabled on the ICRI CPC Members section of ICRIForum for review. The Secretariat requests that CPC Members review and respond within one month to the Secretariat which will collate responses. The report will be considered as endorsed, unless substantial objections or clarifications are requested.

**4. ACTION:** Reports from Working Groups should be tabled on the ICRI CPC Members section of ICRIForum for review for one month and the Secretariat will inform ICRI Members of the submission. The Secretariat will collate responses from CPC Members and inform the Membership. The report will be considered as endorsed, unless substantial objections or clarifications are requested. After minor modifications have been processed the Secretariat is requested to advise the Membership of the endorsement. If there are major objections or problems with the report, the Secretariat is requested to present the report for consideration at the next General Meeting.

## 9. Report of the ICRI Networks

### ICRAN

**Mr Kristian Teleki**, Acting Director of ICRAN, informed the CPC that the report of ICRAN activities (*CPC Doc 12.4*) had been posted on the ICRI Forum and ICRAN websites. He highlighted that ICRAN is a global partnership and mentioned each of the partners. He explained that ICRAN is currently working in four regions: East Africa, East Asia, the Middle East and the South Pacific; with a view to including South Asia and the Middle East, and that ICRAN was building networks and partnerships both within and between regions. He informed the CPC that ICRAN had established 32 demonstration and target sites and that ICRAN was intending to add more. In addition, the ICRAN partnership was expanding and ICRAN was currently considering proposals from the Marine Aquarium Council, TNC and the International Marinelife Alliance.

**Mr Teleki** stated that ICRAN has had some limited success at fundraising with \$1.5 million USD (USAID for project work in the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef Region) and \$250 000 USD from the Goldman Fund and that this money will be matched by the UN Foundation. In addition, a \$70 000 USD donation had been received from a private individual.

**Mr Teleki** informed the CPC of some of the new activities of ICRAN, particularly the collaborative project on sustainable tourism with the Government of France and the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef Project which aimed to improve watershed modelling, as well as address sustainable fisheries and tourism. He reported that the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef Project was announced at the WSSD which had a high level of participation and media coverage. ICRAN produced brochures in several languages for the event (English, French, Spanish and Arabic versions are available on the ICRAN website) and emphasised to members the importance of doing this for information dissemination. In addition, ICRAN participated in the ICRI side event at WSSD, as well as in the Oceans group, the steering group of SIDS and the CSD. ICRAN also held a dedicated session at ITMEMS 2 where managers from the ICRAN sites were brought to Manila to discuss and share their experiences. ICRAN assisted with a WWF production of *The Economics of Worldwide Coral Reef Degradation* as part of WWF's ongoing coral reef initiative. Finally, ICRAN will be launching the Coral Reef Fund ([www.coralreeffund.org](http://www.coralreeffund.org)) that will allow individuals to donate money for coral reef conservation activities.

### Comments of the CPC

**Mr Richard Kenchington** explained that the fund raising environment was, at present, difficult and, in order to make ICRAN and also ICRI more attractive to donors, he emphasised the need to strengthen the co-ordination both within and between the networks so that ICRI appeared as a coherent, professional network implementing the *Framework for Action*.

**Mr Robert Hepworth** endorsed the report made by Mr Teleki and the statement made by Mr Kenchington and alerted the CPC to the hundreds of outputs that ICRAN had produced so far and demonstrated that ICRAN was delivering with the first installment of funds by highlighting the success of the project at Malindi/Watamu, Kenya. **Mr Hepworth** admitted though, that there were no other large donations on the horizon and explained

that it was vital that ICRAN secure the matching funds. **Mr Hepworth** informed the CPC that ICRAN would continue raising funds from the private sector and concluded by appealing to the donors present to consider contributing to the next phase of ICRAN.

**5. ACTION:** The CPC commended ICRAN partners for the tangible and substantial progress made during the first two years of the Action Phase, particularly through practical projects to assess, manage and raise awareness about coral reef resources in the existing target areas. The meeting noted the problems faced in mobilizing resources to match the US\$ 5M already made by the UN Foundation (UNF) to finance the continuation of the project. The CPC calls on all members, particularly those from developed countries, to engage actively with the partners through the ICRAN Board and Co-ordinating Unit in order to identify the necessary resources.

The CPC also suggests that UNF, in the light of the prevailing global economic downturn, to consider modifying the conditions attached to the second tranche of funding (US\$ 5M) to ensure that it can be fully utilized by ICRAN.

### GCRMN

**Mr Clive Wilkinson** introduced the GCRMN ICRI Progress report June 2002 – April 2003 (*CPC Doc 12.1*) and informed the CPC that the major activity during this period was the production of the GCRMN Status Report 2002, which was launched in conjunction with the CORDIO Status Report 2002 at Sida in Stockholm and again at IOC in Paris, the World Bank in Washington, UNDP in New York, the Great Barrier Reef Research Foundation in Brisbane and finally at a special coral reef event during the CBD SBSTTA meeting in March. **Mr Wilkinson** provided a brief description of the vital statistics of the report with over 80 countries covered and 151 contributing authors. He expressed his plans to update the special reports every two years to demonstrate the progress of those programmes.

He continued by stating that there had been a severe bleaching event in Kenya and Tanzania and that socio-economic monitoring was underway in South Asia. He informed the CPC that the funding for the South Asian node of the GCRMN had finished and that negotiations were being conducted with the UK, CORDIO, ICRAN and IUCN to support the node in the future. In addition, the World Fish Centre was planning a meeting to facilitate the storage of data collected by all the GCRMN nodes on Reef Base. Further, he highlighted the need to translate some of the products of the GCRMN into other languages.

**Mr Wilkinson** thanked the IOC for administering the GCRMN funds until now and informed the CPC that this responsibility was now being transferred to UNEP. In addition, he thanked the USA for their financial contribution to keep the GCRMN going. Finally, he emphasised the need to strengthen both parallel socio-economic and ecological monitoring.

### ICRIN

**Mr Kristian Teleki**, on behalf of Brian Huse, Executive Director of the Coral Reef Alliance (CORAL), gave a brief account of ICRIN's activities (*CPC Doc 12.3*).

CORAL has been successful in developing several coral reef educational tools and resources to help build local outreach capacity that continue to be improved. The outreach materials and directory databases are on-line, as is the photo bank, downloadable fact sheets, tourism guidelines and teacher's resources ([www.icrin.org](http://www.icrin.org)). The briefing papers for ministries of the environment and tourism are ready for production, as are the tourism guidelines in Spanish and Japanese. Distribution of tools and resources to increase local outreach in coral reef areas has already begun. Over 250 Dive In To Earth Day organizers received tourism guidelines and distributed them to thousands of local people.

Extensive training has taken place in two ICRAN sites (Bonaire, Netherlands Antilles and Old Providencia, Columbia). The Dive In To Earth Day program was a great success with over 255 events in more than 57 countries. Specifically, over 30 activities were conducted in ICRAN sites. CORAL have completed data collection for the ICRAN demo/target sites and completed Outreach and Management Needs Assessment, which ICRIN/CORAL coordinated with the UNEP regional seas offices (Caribbean, East Asia, and East Africa) and the South Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP). To raise awareness among tourists, CORAL has campaigned a Dive In pledge for divers and expect to collect 10,000+ signatures. CORAL and ICRAN contracted and completed a one and a half minute in-flight video segment for Continental Airlines. An educational tool for sustainable tourism, the segment will air during the months of May/June 2003 and reach 2.8 million travellers.

## CORDIO

**Mr David Souter**, assistant co-ordinator of CORDIO, thanked the institutions that have collaborated with CORDIO, particularly SACEP, UNEP, IUCN and WWF. He expressed his hopes that this co-operation would continue in the future. He informed the CPC (*CPC Doc 12.2*) that CORDIO's biggest undertaking since the last ICRI meeting was the production of the CORDIO Status Report 2002, which was launched in conjunction with the GCRMN Status Report at Sida in Stockholm in December, gave a brief outline of the contents of the report and highlighted that fact that the results generated by the CORDIO programme are one of the foundations upon which the GCRMN Status Report was built and that these data were also available on ReefBase.

In addition, **Mr Souter** reported that CORDIO had conducted a multidisciplinary scientific expedition to Cosmoledo and Aldabra during which baseline surveys of the condition of the marine, terrestrial and avian fauna were conducted. He stated that the expedition was funded by the Swedish Research Council and conducted in conjunction with the Island Conservation Society of the Seychelles and that report of the expedition would be published in the near future.

He continued by highlighting several of the major project activities that were being conducted in each of the regions within CORDIO, particularly the community based socio-economic monitoring project in the Lakshadweep Islands, the first baseline coral community surveys at Batticaloa on the east coast of Sri Lanka, several projects aimed at providing alternative livelihoods for families dependent on coral reef resources in Tuticorin, India, and finally, efforts to develop sustainable coral reef tourism at Hikkaduwa, Sri Lanka. Also, he reported that CORDIO had funded several participants, particularly from South Asia, to participate in the ITMEMS 2.

**Mr Souter** reported that the collaboration between CORDIO, IUCN and the GCRMN was being strengthened with negotiations to establish a joint IUCN/CORDIO/GCRMN office in Colombo, Sri Lanka. In addition, CORDIO and IUCN were planning a number of joint publications and CORDIO were also using the IUCN distribution network for disseminating CORDIO publications.

In addition, **Mr Souter** informed the CPC that the collaboration between CORDIO and Reef Base would also be strengthened. Reef Base was currently preparing a CORDIO website that will be hosted on the ReefBase server at the WorldFish Centre and would be available soon. He emphasised that downloadable versions of the CORDIO Status Reports and other information produced by CORDIO would be available on the new web site.

Finally, **Mr Souter** explained that CORDIO was coming to the end of its current funding period and was entering a new phase in 2004. He reported that a new proposal was currently being developed for Sida that incorporated projects in each of the 11 countries involved in CORDIO. He explained that, although a suite of new targeted research projects that were focussed on the thematic priorities determined during the ICRI East African Regional Workshop in Maputo in 2001, monitoring would still be the backbone of CORDIO and that CORDIO would still perform the role as the GCRMN node in East Africa and would contribute the majority of funding for monitoring in South Asia.

### *Comments of the CPC*

**Mr Stefan Hain** asked how the long-term sustainability of the activities conducted by the networks was ensured. **Mr Clive Wilkinson** informed **Mr Hain** that all the socio-economic and ecological monitoring was conducted by national governments, local institutions and scientists and that considerable capacity building and training had been conducted to ensure these activities would continue. **Mr. Ole Vestergaard** emphasised the importance of obtaining agreements from governments to initiate and support national monitoring programmes.

**Ms Marea Hatzios** informed **Mr Wilkinson** and the CPC that the Meso-american Barrier Reef project was now in the second year and could effectively act as a node for monitoring of coral reefs in the region. She recommended that GCRMN look at their recent report, that is available on the website, before any new programmes in the region to prevent replication. **Mr. Kristian Teleki** concurred and highlighted a potentially similar situation occurring in relation to newly established ICRAN pilot sites. **Mr. Clive Wilkinson** replied by assuring Ms Hatzios that the GCRMN would gladly use data that was generated by the Meso-american Barrier Reef project regardless of the methods used to gather the data. He emphasised the need to ensure that monitoring in the region was sustainable rather than highly scientific.

**Mr Rolph Payet** extended his support to the CORDIO programme and thanked ICRAN for their efforts to establish pilot sites in the Indian Ocean Islands region. He informed the CPC that the GEF project currently being implemented in the Seychelles is nearly complete but that there was still a great need to continue the work

in this region, particularly that which focuses on the socio-economic linkages, and concluded by calling upon donor countries to fund more research in this region.

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** emphasised the need to build partnerships in order to ensure that sufficient capacity is secured to monitor and manage coral reefs effectively and provided an example from Kenya where the Department of Fisheries, CORDIO and the Kenya Wildlife Service were collaborating.

**Mr Venugopalan Ittekkot** offered the support of German coral reef projects currently being conducted in the South and Southeast Asian region and suggested that these projects could ameliorate some of the funding burden that the network are facing.

**Mr Nicholas Polunin** drew the attention of the CPC to the likelihood that information generated by the networks would be complementary and could be assembled together in coherent outputs. He enquired if the CPC would consider developing a framework to conduct analyses and make comparisons based on the information arising from the activities of the networks. The Chair considered that ICRI Forum could be a vehicle that might facilitate such analyses.

**Mr Bernard Salvat** alerted the CPC to the need to clarify the relationship between the ICRI CPC and the ICRI Networks and expressed the opinion that the networks existed solely because of ICRI and that the CPC should control and guide the activities of the networks. In order to emphasise his point, he highlighted several inadequacies in the relationship between the networks and the CPC. First, he indicated that there was no report from the ICRI Secretariat describing the activities of the networks. He informed the CPC that the French considered it to be the role of the ICRI Secretariat to report the activities of the networks rather than the networks themselves. Second, **Mr Salvat** recalled that there were two representatives of ICRI on the Board of ICRAN and that these representatives should also provide a report of the activities of ICRAN. Third, he expressed the opinion that it appeared that ICRIN seemed to exist only to service ICRAN and because ICRIN did not have a formal management structure similar to ICRAN, it was not possible to obtain a report from the Secretariat or the ICRI representatives on the ICRAN Board describing the activities of ICRIN. Fourth, **Mr Salvat** considered GCRMN to be functioning well but highlighted the point that, while the GCRMN has a management group which contains several unofficial representatives of the CPC, there was no formal representation of the CPC on the Board of GCRMN. Fifth, he drew the attention of the CPC to the fact that Mr Wilkinson had signed the report submitted by GCRMN which informed the CPC who was responsible for the report and indicated that this was not the case for the reports produced by the other networks. Sixth, he expressed the opinion that CORDIO was not a genuine ICRI Network because it was not implemented at a global level but was a regional programme funded primarily by one country that coincidentally happened to host the present ICRI Secretariat. He stated that if CORDIO was to be considered as an ICRI Network then it should also have a formal management structure, including representatives of the CPC, and is subject to the guidance of the CPC. He concluded by proposing it was time to restructure the relationship between the ICRI CPC and the ICRI Networks and that it should be the responsibility of the incoming UK Secretariat to establish the mechanisms that ensure that the ICRI Networks operate in a co-ordinated fashion.

**Mr. Wilkinson** informed the CPC that the recent review of the GCRMN was requested by IOC but was endorsed by the CPC. **Mr. Kenchington** expressed the opinion that the review of GCRMN was probably not formally recognised as an ICRI decision but it was certainly discussed by the CPC. **Ole Vestergaard** explained that the 5 year review of program objectives and implementation was required under the GCRMN Strategic Plan as of 1996, and commissioned by the IOC under its terms as the Chair of the GCRMN Management Group. The review team was composed by 5 international experts and chaired by Mr. R. Kenchington.

**Mr. Kristian Teleki** explained that there were two representatives of the ICRI CPC on the board of ICRAN and another position within the Steering Group.

**Mr. Wilkinson** added that ICRI had strong representation in the GCRMN management group but explained that ICRIN could not effectively conduct its activities until funding had been secured. He proposed that an action statement was required endorsing the restructuring of the ICRI Networks.

**Mr Tom Praster** reviewed the points made by Mr Salvat to assist with the redrafting of the resolution on the organisation and management procedures for ICRI namely that:

- ICRI would continue to provide general guidance to the networks;
- ICRI should define the distinct roles of the networks;
- Reports to the ICRI CPC should be signed in order to clarify who is responsible for the report; and

- Reports should address the financing of the Networks and, in particular, ICRI needs to secure funding for ICRIN.

He asked if each of the networks had a Board and, if so, did they contain formal representatives of ICRI. In addition, he stated that it seems unnecessary to have a report on the activities of the networks from both the representatives on the Boards and the Secretariat and proposed that the representatives write a report that is then distributed to the CPC by the Secretariat.

**Ms Marea Hatzios** endorsed the proposals of Mr Praster and Mr Salvat but expressed concerns that because many of the potential representatives of ICRI that might occupy seats on the Boards of the Networks also have roles within the Networks, they might lack objectivity. She proposed that representatives of ICRI on the Boards of the Networks should not be involved with the Network in order to ensure they are able to make objective decisions and reports to the CPC. **Mr Stefan Hain** endorsed the proposal from Ms Hatzios and expressed the opinion that the representatives on the Boards should be conveyors of information between the ICRI Secretariat and the Networks and the function of the CPC is to give advice on the activities of the networks.

**Mr Richard Kenchington** welcomed Mr Salvat's proposal and stated that there was clearly a need to establish a structure of governance for each of the Networks. He explained that there was a formal process for the appointment of two representatives to the Board of ICRAN but opined that the GCRMN Management Group was rather more elastic and might benefit from the formal appointment of two representatives from the CPC. He continued by expressing the opinion that the reports from the Networks should describe the activities recently undertaken by the Network, the anticipated programme and a financial statement that enables the CPC to make intelligent decisions in order to provide the necessary guidance and support to the Networks.

**Mr Magnus Ngoile** suggested that the CPC should consider the role of ICRI within each of these networks and reminded the CPC that ICRI itself was borne from a much larger process. In addition, he expressed the opinion that the CPC should define more clearly what constitutes a network under ICRI.

**Mr Ole Vestergaard** endorsed the comments encouraging greater collaboration between the networks, particularly highlighted the opportunity for interaction between GCRMN and ICRAN, and clarified for the CPC that some of the activities currently envisioned by ICRAN in South Asia have been implemented by the GCRMN South Asia. He expressed concern regarding the potential of duplication of efforts, but saw huge benefits from co-ordinating future activities of the Networks. In addition, he drew the attention of the Networks to the risks associated with raising expectations in a region by widely announcing the initiation of activities, prior the securing of funds and logistical support for those activities. He informed the CPC that it could lead to some problems for other programmes in a region if donor organisations were falsely under the impression that funding for proposed activities had already been secured from the Networks.

**Mr Kristian Teleki** expressed the opinion that it seemed there was widespread misconception about what ICRAN was trying to achieve in South Asia. He explained that ICRAN was trying to provide a mechanism for dissemination of information generated by existing projects between different regions. In addition, **Mr Teleki** explained that ICRAN was trying to take a graduated approach to work within a region. Further, he expressed the opinion that the CPC should provide guidance on activities or priorities but not necessarily approve the activities of ICRAN. He felt that ICRI representation on the Board of ICRAN would be enough to reassure the CPC that ICRAN was conducting activities that ensured the implementation of the *Framework for Action*.

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** concurred with Mr Teleki and emphasised the role of the CPC in ensuring that there was no duplication or competition between the Networks. She indicated that the lack of capacity in developing nations does not allow for competition between activities. Finally, she illustrated the problem related to the elevated expectations that people have of the contribution of ICRAN to a region alluded to by Mr Vestergaard by describing her own experiences trying to deal with the local fishers in Malindi, who were under the erroneous impression that \$10 million USD was going to be spent on improving their quality of life.

**Mr Bernard Salvat** added that it should be the task of the ICRI representatives on the Boards of the Networks to ensure that the guidance provided by the CPC is reflected in the activities of the Networks. In addition, he explained that, in order to prevent redundancy inherent in his previous proposal requiring reports of the activities of the Networks from both the representatives on the Boards and the Secretariat, he had no objection to having a single report signed by both the representatives and the Secretariat as long as the CPC was made aware of who was responsible for the report.

**Mr Robert Hepworth** expressed concern that the CPC was constructing a cumbersome bureaucracy. He explained that ICRAN was a global partnership with a Board that has representation from all the partners and that ICRI was simply another partner within ICRAN. He expressed the opinion that ICRAN should not report to ICRI because it was not founded under ICRI and that the key theme in the discussion was the representation of ICRI within the Networks and how their activities should be reported to the CPC.

**Mr Clive Wilkinson** proposed that the action statements arising from this discussion and the management structure of each of the networks could be incorporated into the draft resolution on the organisation and management procedures of ICRI.

**Mr Tom Praster** informed the CPC that hard copies of the draft resolution would be distributed once the suggestions arising from this discussion were incorporated. He explained that the draft resolution would be posted on ICRI Forum and the membership would have 2 weeks to provide comments and the Secretariat would subsequently finalise the resolution within one week.

**Mr Chris Tompkins** observed that there seemed to be a sense that the structure of ICRI was not working efficiently and expressed the opinion that the situation will probably improve if the Networks were willing to introduce the proposed management structures and a system of reporting and representation within the Networks was established. He concluded by asking for clarification regarding who nominates the representatives on the Boards of the Networks.

**Ms Barbara Best** recommended that the activities of ICRI and its networks should be implemented through partnerships and emphasised that all the members of ICRI have a responsibility to implement the *Framework for Action*. She proposed the formation of a working group to investigate the relationship between ICRI and its networks and clarified that, of the three networks, ICRIN was the only one established under ICRI and that both the GCRMN and ICRAN were borne from other processes and were subsequently incorporated into the ICRI partnership. In conclusion, she expressed concern regarding the use of the term “implementing arm” to describe the ICRI networks and alerted the CPC to the fact that, because all the partners of ICRI were implementing the *Framework for Action*, all the partners were, in fact, implementing arms and it was therefore unnecessary to single out the networks. **Mr Robert Hepworth** concurred and added that it was sensible to convene a working group to determine how ICRIN can be kick-started.

The Chair called for nominations for representatives of ICRI on the Board of ICRAN. **Mr Kenchington** assisted by providing clarification of the positions on the Board so that the CPC had sufficient terms of reference to identify suitable candidates.

As ICRI is the major coordination body for global coral reef activities and has encouraged the development of specific networks to fulfill the agenda developed by ICRI in the *Call to Action, Framework for Action and the Renewed Call from ITMEMS 1 and 2*. It is essential that the ICRI membership maintains a major role in guiding and reviewing the activities of the Networks and receive adequate reporting from the networks.

Thus ICRI should have adequate representation on the management boards of the networks and corresponding reporting from these ICRI delegates to the ICRI membership at General Members.

**6. ACTION:** ICRI is to ensure adequate representation on the management bodies of the ICRI networks of GCRMN, ICRAN, ICRIN to ensure strong communication and coordination between networks and with the ICRI Community. These ICRI representatives should provide reports to the ICRI Secretariat for inclusion of these reports into the Secretariat reports to ICRI General Meetings. ICRI is also encouraged to facilitate a review of progress at least at a 5-year basis to ensure that the networks are contributing to the ICRI agendas established in the *Call to Action/ Framework for Action/ Renewed Call to Action*.

**7. ACTION:** The USA is requested to revise the **Draft Resolution on the Organization and Management Procedures for the International Coral Reef Initiative** to incorporate comments from the ICRI CPC Members and to forward the revised resolution to the Secretariat. The Secretariat will circulate the document to ICRI Members on the ICRI Forum for a period of 14 days for revision. The Secretariat will collect and incorporate comments during that period and then issue a final resolution.

**8. ACTION:** The ICRI CPC endorses the establishment of a Working Group to clarify:  
1. The working relationship of current ICRI networks to the ICRI Secretariat and ICRI Membership;

2. What the role of the ICRI Hosts / Secretariat and the ICRI CPC / Members should be in the operation or guidance of networks;
3. The Working Group is also requested to examine how ICRI should be constituted;
4. How a network is to be designated as an ICRI Network or endorsed by ICRI.
- The Working Group will report to the next ICRI General Meeting

The members of the Working Group are – Representing the ICRI Members: USA, UNEP, France, Seychelles, ICRI Hosts / Secretariat;

And representing the Networks: CORDIO, GCRMN, ICRAN, [[CORAL to be invited]]

*The incoming UK ICRI Hosts and Secretariat are requested to provide Working Group members with the terms of reference and a mechanism and timetable for the working group to ensure that the report is available for the next CPC meeting.*

#### **10. The presentation of the incoming UK Secretariat.**

**Mr Robert Canning** thanked everyone in Gland for their hospitality and provided a brief presentation of the UK's vision for ICRI and the Secretariat during the next biennium. He explained that the UK's main interest in coral reefs lay in their overseas territories but they have a more general interest in protecting biodiversity. In addition, he informed the CPC that the UK had contributed extensive funding for poverty alleviation and food security and funds a wide range of coral reef projects. **Mr Canning** proudly informed the CPC that the UK did, in fact, have coral reefs comprised of *Lophelia* and they had recently called on the EU to make the Darwin Mounds where they occur a marine protected area. Further, he informed the CPC that last year the UK marine stewardship report, which mentions both coral reefs and ICRI, was published. He explained that the report endorsed the ecosystem approach and outlined a new range of initiatives and is available on the DEFRA web site.

**Mr Canning** outlined several of the paragraphs in the report of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) that highlighted coral reefs and explained that these gave the UK a clear framework within which to work and also, because 180 nations had signed onto the report, it will benefit coral reefs worldwide.

He informed the CPC that the UK wanted to focus on outcomes rather processes and help better protect coral reefs. In addition, he emphasised that it was essential to raise the awareness of the importance of coral reefs and also to promote greater co-ordination and collaboration between UN agencies, Regional Seas networks and donor agencies. Further, he explained that the UK would encourage participation of developing nations and would make every effort to ensure that this participation would occur at the right level. Furthermore, the UK would promote greater private sector engagement to support local development projects.

**Mr Canning** reported to the CPC that £100 000 has been secured to support the Secretariat during the financial year 2002-2003 and although they did not currently have money for the subsequent year they did expect to receive the same again for the next financial year. He informed the CPC that this money would fund the Secretariat, pay for work that would be sub-contracted to other parties and assist participation of representatives of several developing nations. **Mr Canning** added that the UK would like to initiate several small scale development projects or contribute to some other existing projects.

**Mr Canning** proposed that UNEP-WCMC would perform the functions of the secretariat from the 1<sup>st</sup> of July 2003 for 2 years and that, during that time, the UK, their co-hosts and the ICRI members would determine the policy and path that ICRI followed. The UK and their co-hosts would chair all meetings of ICRI. He explained that involving UNEP-WCMC brought prior knowledge and experiences of the working of ICRI and provided an opportunity for closer collaboration on coral reef issues. **Mr Canning** informed the CPC that the details of the assistance provided by UNEP-WCMC had yet to be worked out but they were very happy to assist. He explained that the Secretariat would perform administrative functions, such as the arrangement meetings, circulation of papers and preparation of agendas etc., while DEFRA would act as the contact point with the members and would maintain a database of members, receive and disseminate resolutions and decisions etc.

**Mr Canning** explained that the UK saw a co-hosting arrangement as a bonus and envisaged that a co-host would help chair meetings and that one of the meetings would be held in the co-host's country. He added that the UK was thinking of providing a secondment or scholarship to WCMC so that they can then transfer their experiences

back to their own country. He informed the CPC that the next step would be to develop a detailed work plan for WCMC and added that he looked forward to working with all members of ICRI.

He tentatively proposed that the first meeting of the CPC during the next biennium would be conducted in conjunction with the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office's (FCO) sponsored workshop on sustainable tourism in the Caribbean later in 2003, followed by Okinawa in June 2004 and then another in the country of the co-host. (*CPC Document 10.1*)

### **11. Potential partners to co-host the ICRI Secretariat**

The Chair informed the CPC that the Secretariat had received one proposal (*CPC Doc 10.2*) from the Seychelles to partner the UK in hosting the Secretariat during the next biennium. He drew the attention of the CPC to the draft decision entitled ICRI CPC Decision on the proposal to co-host the ICRI Secretariat in the documentation and called upon Mr. Rolph Payet to introduce the document and explain its implications.

**Mr Payet** began by providing a general background to the Seychelles describing the geography and the distribution of coral reefs in the Seychelles. He informed the CPC that the Seychelles currently had 13 MPAs and were planning to establish more in the future. Mr Payet informed the CPC that the Government of Seychelles had offered to co-host the Secretariat and that he had a letter from the Minister of Environment that he submitted to the Secretariat. In conclusion, he pledged to do everything possible to advance the issues raised during the current meeting.

#### *Comments of the CPC*

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** thanked the Seychelles for taking up the challenge and explained that Kenya had been interested in co-hosting but was unable to secure support from high governmental levels in time but, as the Chair of the East African Coral Reef Task Force, offered to collaborate closely with the Seychelles Secretariat. Magnus Ngoile also thanked the Seychelles and congratulated them on the expediency with which they were able to obtain governmental support and offered the close support of Tanzania. **Mr John Baldwin**, on behalf of the GBRMPA, thanked both the UK and the Seychelles for co-hosting the Secretariat during the next biennium and looked forward to working with both.

### **12. Working groups**

#### **ICRI Scorecard**

**Ms Marea Hatzios** informed the CPC that there had been very few comments forthcoming from the membership concerning the ICRI Scorecard. She explained that she understood that people had comments but that they simply had not contributed them to the discussion. She explained that the ICRI scorecard offered a mechanism to ensure more regular reporting by members in a more consistent and comparable format but that she required an indication of further support for the scorecard before doing any more work.

#### *Comments of the CPC*

**Ms Barbara Best** expressed the opinion that the Scorecard was an important initiative because it dealt with the implementation of integrated coastal management (ICM) within member countries, which was a key issue of ICRI.

**Ms Marjo Vierros** informed the CPC that the CBD was doing a lot of work in this area and that they also had a working group trying to determine mechanisms for improving the implementation of ICM. She explained that she saw potential synergies and the opportunity for collaboration.

#### **Coral Reef Fisheries**

**Ms Barbara Best** explained that there were two groups, one dealing with trade issues concerning coral reef organisms and the other dealing with sustainable fisheries. She provided a brief update of the last Conference of the Parties (CoP) for CITES and reported that there had been significant successes with regard to coral reef fauna, particularly all seahorses will be listed in appendix 2, a workshop will be convened to evaluate the need to list sea cucumbers, humphead wrasses were not listed but there was significant support for listing, and finally, whale and basking sharks were listed. In addition, an agreement promoting greater collaboration between the FAO and CITES was sought but a formal MoU was not agreed upon by both parties. She explained that it was necessary to secure such a MoU because the FAO was the body controlling fisheries and CITES was the body controlling trade in listed species.

**Mr Carl Gustaf Lundin** indicated that there was a strong interest within the FAO to secure this agreement but neither CITES nor IUCN was invited to participate in discussions at the recent COFI meeting. He expressed the



opinion that depleted species should be the focus of management efforts, in the first instance and that species listed on the CITES appendices could be regarded more as an indication of the failures of fisheries management.

**Mr. Richard Kenchington** highlighted the importance of having “demonstrable or identifiably” sustainable fisheries. Robert Hepworth expressed the opinion that ICRI must maintain their engagement with both CITES and FAO to facilitate future collaboration.

### **13. Election of representatives to the Board of ICRAN**

**Mr Kristian Teleki** provided a brief outline of the role and term of the ICRAN board members.

The Chair informed the CPC that Angel Alcalá of the Philippines had been nominated by WWF of the Philippines, that Richard Kenchington was willing to extend his term on the Board and that these were the only formal nominations received by the Secretariat.

**Mr Clive Wilkinson** provided a brief outline of the career of Angel Alcalá for the benefit of the CPC.

**Ms Nyawira Muthiga** queried the legitimacy of potentially electing someone from the Philippines considering the problems associated with the current Philippine ICRI Secretariat. The Chair reminded her that no other nominations had been received and called on the CPC to endorse the nomination of both candidates. **Mr Magnus Ngoile** seconded the nominations of Angel Alcalá and Richard Kenchington to the board of ICRAN

**Mr Bernard Salvat** alerted the CPC to the fact the Angel Alcalá was not a member of the CPC and asked if, as a consequence, he would require a special invitation from the Secretariat to report on ICRAN at CPC meetings.

Mr Richard Kenchington and Mr Angel Alcalá were elected unopposed.

**Mr John Baldwin** offered a standard mechanism for the receipt and processing of nominations to make elections such as this more efficient.

### **14. Decision on improving monitoring**

**Mr Wilkinson** introduces the draft decision entitled Decision on Improving Monitoring in MPAs (*CPC Doc 11.1*) and called on the CPC for comments.

**Mr Kenchington** stated that monitoring should be viewed as an integral component of management as recommended by the participants of ITMEMS. He thought it was distracting that people sought funding for monitoring and then requested additional funding for management.

**Mr Baldwin** requested that the letters encouraging monitoring should be tailored to reflect the current level monitoring undertaken in that country. In reply, **Mr Wilkinson** stated simply that this could be done.

**Mr. Stefan Hain** drew attention to the references to the World Heritage Convention and the Man and Biosphere programme and stated that if there were no specific comments from these programmes it would be much better to refer specifically to their reports otherwise ICRI might have to seek their formal approval to make such statements. **Ms Margarita Astralaga** concurred.

**Mr Canning** asked for clarification regarding what socio-economic monitoring entailed. In reply, **Mr Wilkinson** explained that it meant any activities that generated data describing how people were using coral reefs.

**Mr Lundin** alerted the CPC to the opportunity that the upcoming World Parks Congress provided to advance several issues on the ICRI agenda and expressed the opinion that this resolution was a perfect example.

**Ms Hatzioles** informed the CPC that the World Bank was developing a scorecard for MPAs and requested that this was considered as a possible contribution to the World Parks Congress.

**The Resolution was adopted with the amendments proposed by members**

### **15. Decision on Recognising the Regional Structure of the GCRMN**

**Mr Clive Wilkinson** introduced the decision entitled Decision on Recognising the Regional Structure of the GCRMN (*CPC Doc 11.2*) and provided a brief outline.

**Comments of the CPC**

**Mr Baldwin** cautioned against referring to the review of GCRMN as the “Kenchington” report. **Mr. Ole Vestergaard** explained that IOC referred to the review as the “5 year review of GCRMN”.

**Ms Muthiga** enquired how the co-ordinator in East Africa would tie in with the Coral Reef Task Force under the Nairobi Convention. In reply, **Mr Wilkinson** stated that they would be encouraged to collaborate and asked her to write some text for the decision that would address her concerns.

Japan requested that each of the co-ordinating centres was listed in the decision. **Mr Hain** indicated that they were mentioned in the second last paragraph of the decision and asked if they were based on the UNEP Regional Seas Units. **Mr Wilkinson** explained that the GCRMN was built on the Regional Seas units but in some areas they were combined in order to prevent the entire management structure becoming burdensome and in other areas, where there isn't a Regional Seas unit, nodes have been created to fill the gap.

**16. Country reports****Tanzania**

**Mr Ngoile** informed the meeting about the work done to transform global initiatives like ICRI into national plans and programmes. In Tanzania, a process to develop a National Environmental Action Plan has just been completed. This Plan is relevant to coral reefs. Strategies have been developed for collaboration and coordination of coral reef activities in the country including research. More than 13 programs and initiatives have been brought together to interact with the government. Again, the scientific work is very important. Working Groups are focusing on policy and planning, implementation, and on research. In addition a Coastal Report has been developed. This report is similar to a scorecard. The National Environment Management Council (NEMC) is the coordinator for all this work. One important lesson that has been learnt is that conservation can only be successful if it is linking global ideas with local initiatives. The work in Tanzania in this field would never have succeeded if it hadn't been for partners such as USAID, Sida, Norad, France and Finida.

**Comments of the CPC**

**Ms Best** thanked Mr Ngoile personally for all his efforts over the years.

**Japan**

**Mr. Keisuke Takahashi**, Technical Officer of the Ministry of Environment, reported to the CPC that during the last year the Government of Japan had revised its national biodiversity strategy and, as a result, a programme to revitalise coral reefs and mangroves in Japan had been initiated. He informed the CPC that a research programme focusing on the transplantation of corals and the reduction of sedimentation through the development of better land use practices had been started to facilitate the rehabilitation programme. In addition, the participants at a recently conducted workshop held in Ishigaki resolved to build capacity to deal with coral reef issues in the east and Southeast Asian region. He also informed the CPC of the collaboration between Japan, the World Fish Centre and the GCRMN on database management.

**Mr Takahashi** outlined the preliminary programme for the next International Coral Reef Symposium (ICRS) and highlighted that the relationship between coral reefs and humans would be at the forefront of proceedings in Okinawa. He informed the CPC that more information was available on the web site, encouraged the participation of the members and welcomed a CPC meeting at that time. In conclusion, he mentioned that potential outbreaks of crown-of-thorns starfish in Okinawa were becoming a big issue.

**Comments of the CPC**

**Ms Best** thanked Japan for hosting the next ICRS.

**Mexico**

Mr. Cudney of the National Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP) reported (*CPC Doc 14.2*) about a Memorandum of Understanding between the Australian Ministry of the Environment and the Autonomous Environmental Protection Agency of Queensland, with the Secretary of Environment and Natural Resources and the participation of the CONANP which will be signed soon. The MOU is set to undertake sharing of experiences in identified areas of management.

At the national scale, Mr. Cudney reported a justificatory technical study done to back up the fourth polygon of the Cancun and a similar study to declare Tuxpan reefs as MPA is underway. A measure to boost financial resources and ecotourism use of MPAs currently imposes entrance fees for tourists. He informed that this

scheme has become a source of revenue to finance law enforcement and conservation programs of existing MPAs and will be used to finance start up phase of still unconsolidated MPAs in the country. In 2002, fees collected from 7 reef MPA s under this measure amounted to 13.5 million pesos and an estimated 18-20 million pesos (US\$1.8 to 2 M) will be collected in 2003. Through an agreement between the Federal Environmental Law Enforcement Agency (PROFEPA) and the CONANP, the inspection and vigilance, through legal procedures in reef MPAs has been strengthened at the Quintana Roo reef areas.

In addition, Mr. Cudney reported activities to regulate ecotourism that involved CONANP and MPA directors. He stated further progress in the operations of protected natural areas including the Sian Kaan Biosphere Reserve with a technical assistance and capacity building program supported by ICRAN, the Veracruz Reef System National Park that established cooperation with EPA and the State Government in its pilot project, the Ecological conditions of Veracruz estuaries, ; and the creation of advisory boards for Cabo Pulmo National Park and APPF Cabo San Lucas. Progress was also noted at Cozumel Reefs National Park and Huatulco Bay National Park.

Lastly, Mr. Cudney reported appointment of a new STACM (Scientific and Technical Advisory Council of Coral Reefs of Mexico) head and the expansion and renewal of membership. He informed the CPC that the II Mexican Coral Reef Symposium will be held on 5-7 November 2003 (Link: <http://www.umar.mx/arrecifes/index.html>). The STAC-M, he concluded, is initiating the creation of the Mexican Society of Coral Reefs and the first draft of national monitoring methodology.

#### *Comments of the CPC*

**Mr Baldwin** informed Mr Cudney that the GBRMPA has some experience on the issue of dredging and the development of transit lanes and that it might have some useful advice that could be passed on through an e-mail dialogue.

**Mr Lundin** recalled that the introduction of park entrance fees could be controversial and enquired if the Mexican Government had had any major breakthroughs in the policies governing entrance fees. In reply, **Mr Cudney** indicated that park entrance fees seemed to be working and they had even been introduced in a few selected terrestrial parks. He explained that protected areas in Mexico were often a part of communal lands so it was difficult to exert any control over the land. He continued by reporting that they were working closely with the communities to develop a mechanism to collect the park fees with their co-operation. Also, he stated that MPAs have faced a number of legal issues but these were slowly being resolved.

**Ms Best** thanked Mr Cudney for his presentation and was glad to see GBRMPA offer their assistance in addressing the dredging issues. She added that a request to coral list for advice on the matter might yield additional valuable information.

#### **Australia**

**Mr John Baldwin** reported two issues directly related to ICRI. The first was the development of the Representative Areas Programme (RAP), which he explained was an ambitious undertaking that aimed to protect biodiversity by identifying areas of high biodiversity and creating an integrated system of no take areas. He informed the CPC that this would increase the area of habitat type within the GBR incorporated into no take areas from ~4% to more than 20%. He explained that the RAP programme was based on a number of scientific principles and was developed with the assistance of GIS and decision based modelling software but would also reflect social and ecological requests. Mr Baldwin informed the CPC that GBRMPA had conducted the first round of public submissions on the proposed RAP programme and more that 10 000 submissions were received. The results of these submissions had been incorporated and the resulting draft zoning plan for the entire GBR would be launched in about three weeks. He reported that the final zoning plan would be delivered at the end of year to the Federal parliament for approval. Mr Baldwin informed the CPC that there was an enormous amount of information describing the RAP programme on the GBRMPA web site.

The second issue reported by Mr Baldwin concerned the quality of inshore waters of the GBR. He informed the CPC that this was now the subject of the a collaborative task force involving the GBRMPA, the Government of Queensland and the Federal Government of Australia that will develop a water quality management plan to address water quality issues across terrestrial and marine environments. He concluded by indicating that the importance of these issues were highlighted at the recent ITMEMS and would be dealt with further at the World Parks Congress and that the GBRMPA were working with NOAA and Environment Australia to organise the marine theme at the World Parks Congress.

## France

**Mr Bernard Salvat** reported the activities of the French coral reef initiative, IFRECOR, and informed the CPC that it was launched in 1999 and was under the control of the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of French Overseas Territories. He explained that the Steering Group of IFRECOR contained representatives of NGOs, Governments, other stakeholders and decision makers, and that each of the French overseas territories have a local IFRECOR committee. He stated that the next meeting of IFRECOR would be held in Paris in July. In the international context, **Mr Salvat** reported that the primary activity of IFRECOR was the contribution of each of the overseas territories to the GCRMN Status Report, what has been done along with the participation to three regional reports. In addition, he informed the CPC that IFRECOR was responsible for co-ordinating the GCRMN monitoring activities of 7 countries in the Pacific (Polynesia mana node). Furthermore, in conjunction with the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), a full time scientist would be appointed to help bolster the monitoring programme in Polynesia. Mr. Salvat mentioned that he published a book on all coral reef protected areas relevant to international conventions or programme (World Heritage, Man and Biosphere, Ramsar) in which each of these MPA is described. Finally, he reported that the French are developing an initiative in the southern Pacific that will be operational for 4 years.

### Comments of the CPC

**Mr Hepworth** expressed hopes that this new initiative in the south Pacific can help unlock some the frozen UN resources.

## Kenya

**Ms Muthiga** reported to the CPC that Kenya currently had 5% of their coral reefs protected within no take zone but that it was these areas that were posing the greatest problems in management. She regretted that the Diani-Chali Marine Park had no effective management but explained that some recent progress had been made through the formation of a local fishermen's committee and the use of the integrated coastal area management process to try and address the problems. She reported that one of the primary causes of conflict was that one of the landing sites had been occupied by another group and that, in an effort to address this issue, all landing sites had now been mapped and are currently being officially gazetted. In addition, she informed the CPC that beach seines have been removed which has resulted in improved fish catches. In addition, the fishermen have been educated on the degradation that this type of fishing gear causes and they seem to have accepted it.

**Ms Muthiga** highlighted the community monitoring project run in the area by CORDIO and indicated that it was one of a number of examples where the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) relied on partners to undertake monitoring and other marine assessments. She informed the CPC that the KWS had a marine education unit that was raising awareness and capacity through demonstrations at schools. Finally, she reported that WIOMSA conducted regional MPA managers and east African wetlands management courses and acknowledged ICRAN for assisting with the development of the capacity of the managers.

## 17. Organisations

### UNEP

**Mr Robert Hepworth** informed the CPC that the UNEP Coral Reef Unit had been situated at the UNEP-WCMC as a result of a directive of the Executive Director of UNEP where it will facilitate policy development and implementation. He explained that this would promote collaboration between UNEP-WCMC, ICRAN and the Coral Reef Unit. He reported that the recent UNEP Governing Council decision on coral reefs together with extracts had been circulated to members of ICRI and highlighted that it encouraged various aspects of ICRI, its networks and the WSSD Plan of Implementation with respect to coral reefs. Finally he highlighted the importance of generating the matched funding for ICRAN.

### ICRI Forum

**Ms Marea Hatziolos** reported (*CPC Doc 13*), on behalf of Francis Staub, that ICRI Forum had experienced a sizeable increase in the number of users over the last 9 months, which was primarily a result of the holding of ITMEMS and other significant fora. In addition, she showed the CPC two alternatives for the new design of the ICRI Forum website and asked members to vote on which alternative they preferred. Finally, **Ms Hatziolos** raised the issue of the future of ICRI Forum, its stewardship, residence and funding. She explained to the CPC that it currently costs the World Bank between \$22-24 000 USD per year to maintain and asked if it was possible that some of the funding from the US allocated to support the ICRI Secretariat could be used to support the ICRI Forum.

### Comments of the CPC

**Mr Baldwin** lent his support to ICRI Forum as a tool for communication and a repository for documents and data concerning the ICRI and thanked both Francis Staub and the World Bank for maintaining the forum.

**Mr Teleki** informed the CPC that ICRAN in the past two years had allocated \$30 000 USD to ICRI Forum and that Mr Staub had been of great assistance in maintaining the ICRAN website.

**Mr Hepworth** informed the CPC that UNEP currently had \$80 000 USD available for ICRI and indicated that, if the membership deemed it appropriate, this could be used to support the Forum but that it could not be used to cover any accumulated debts. He proposed that a MoU between UNEP and the ICRI Forum be developed to ensure that such a situation does not occur again in the future.

**Ms Hatzios** reminded the CPC that this was not the first time that support for ICRI Forum had been discussed and that a number of communications on this issue had been circulated, although perhaps not formally.

**Mr Praster** explained that the money held by UNEP was earmarked for the support of the ICRI Secretariat and that he saw the ICRI Forum as a logical extension of the Secretariat and therefore, using the money to support the Forum seemed appropriate. However, he warned the CPC that this money was also used to support travel and other ICRI activities, so using it to support the Forum would mean reducing the amount of support in other sectors.

**The Chair** proposed that the ICRI Secretariat, in conjunction with UNEP and the World Bank, develop a budget and a draft MoU to be circulated for the approval of members. **Ms. Marea Hatzios** emphasised that this should not be delayed because the debts of the ICRI Forum were accruing. **Mr. Robert Hepworth** stated that, in order to solve the problem as quickly as possible, UNEP would be able to use the draft MoU without having to wait for final approval of the members.

#### **International Society for Reef Studies (ISRS)**

**Mr Nicholas Polunin** informed the CPC that the ISRS was a society of long standing that encompassed all aspects of coral reef science. He explained the ISRS was a recognised charity in the USA (and in the UK) and that funds within the Society were currently held in the USA and accounted for under US law. He highlighted the primary products of the ISRS, the journal *Coral Reefs* and the newsletter *Reef Encounter*. **Mr Polunin** informed the CPC that the 10<sup>th</sup> ICRS would be held in Okinawa, Japan in 2004 and that in a couple of weeks, an announcement calling for bids for the 11<sup>th</sup> ICRS would be made. He informed the CPC that the Society had produced statements on bleaching, coral diseases and unsustainable fishing. He emphasised that the primary assets of the Society were expertise of the membership but that he wanted to establish a stronger professional basis for the ISRS. He expressed the opinion that the ISRS needed to strengthen its statements both in depth, number and comprehensiveness and highlighted a number of controversial issues that a scientific body such as ISRS could help to resolve. In conclusion, he invited suggestions from the membership regarding how these opportunities could be realised.

#### **CBD**

**Ms Marjo Vierros** explained to the CPC that the CBD was very broad instrument at the level species and ecosystems and that the Jakarta Mandate had support at ministerial level. She outlined the programme of work and the operational objectives of the Convention and highlighted in particular that ICRI was identified as the main partner for implementing the decision on coral reefs. **Ms Vierros** reported that the CBD had a coral reef work programme with two sections, one dealing with the physical degradation and destruction of coral reefs, and the second which dealt specifically with coral bleaching. She indicated that the numerous activities within this second work programme should be prioritised to make it more implementable. She highlighted the issues that were raised at the last SBSTTA meeting, particularly the need to review the work programme and to address mariculture, marine and coastal resources and marine bioprospecting. **Ms Vierros** outlined several results relevant to ICRI, including the incorporation of more specific activities relating to marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs), mariculture and bioprospecting, the results of WSSD, incorporation of enabling activities, incorporation of targets and the establishment of a new expert group on Integrated Marine and Coastal Area Management. Finally, **Ms Vierros** reminded the CPC of the goal of the CBD, which was to secure a significant reduction in current rate of biodiversity decline. (*CPC Doc 9*)

#### **Comments of the CPC**

**Mr. Kenchington** asked Ms Vierros how often the CBD reports results. In reply, **Ms Vierros** informed the CPC that the CBD reports every four years coinciding with the Conference of the Parties.

**Mr. Wilkinson** relayed an invitation on behalf of Jamie Oliver (WorldFish Center) to the SBSTTA to attend a meeting in Penang to discuss degradation of coral reefs.

### **IOC**

**Ole Vestergaard** reported to the CPC that the IOC had assisted the GCRMN South Asia in conducting 26 workshops during the last 5 years and had developed an extensive library and database of names of contacts from the South Asia region of the GCRMN. He informed the CPC that the GCRMN South Asia had received technical input from IOC and financial support from DFID during the last 5 years. He highlighted a document being produced by DFID, IMM and IOC that discusses the worldwide relationship between poverty and coral reefs. **Mr Vestergaard** then distributed a pamphlet describing the activities of the IOC and WorldBank Coral Bleaching Working Group, funded jointly by the IOC and World Bank/GEF. He informed the CPC that the Group has now developed a detailed draft work plan. He reported that the IOC, having stepped down as Chair of the GCRMN Management Group, will remain active in both the CPC and GCRMN. In addition, he explained that a workshop scheduled 9-12 April 2003 to be held jointly with ROPME and the Government of Iran to introduce monitoring methods in the Persian Gulf region, had to be postponed for obvious reasons. **Mr. Vestergaard** informed the CPC that IOC, jointly with University of Delaware and UNEP/GPA, will host a WSSD follow-up conference on oceans and coasts in Paris 12-14 November 2003 (Further info at <http://www.udel.edu/CMS/csmp/globaloceans>). Finally, on behalf of the World Heritage Convention, **Mr Vestergaard** highlighted the outcomes of the meeting in Hanoi to identify potential world heritage sites to conserve coral reef biodiversity.

### **Ramsar**

**Ms Margarita Astralaga** informed the CPC that the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands included coral reefs but that, unfortunately, this was not well known, particularly among governments. She reported that Ramsar had 35 sites worldwide, of which 11 -12 were adjacent to coral reefs, but that there was, as yet, not a single dedicated coral reef site among the 35. She highlighted though that nine new sites were added last year alone, which indicated that the message regarding the importance of wetlands was finally being heeded and, with the help of all the members, the number of Ramsar sites would increase. Finally, **Ms Astralaga** highlighted a new collaborative initiative between Ramsar and WWF to assist countries to identify wetland sites and to draft and implement management plans.

### *Comments of the CPC*

**Mr. Kenchington** related his experiences deciding which Convention the Great Barrier Reef should be recognised under. He informed the CPC that aligning a valuable ecosystem, such as the GBR, with one Convention often excluded benefits offered by other Conventions and that a unified approach among the Conventions is essential. In reply, **Ms Astralaga** informed the CPC that Ramsar now had a MoU with the World Heritage Convention and the Man and the Biosphere Programme to try and address this issue. She added that the criteria for accepting various sites as Ramsar sites have been developed to align with some of the other relevant conventions.

### **IUCN**

**Mr Carl Gustaf Lundin** highlighted the collaboration between IUCN, CORDIO and GCRMN and informed the CPC that negotiations were currently being conducted to define the scope of this collaboration, particularly in South Asia. Further, he stated, as chair of the Management Group, that the GCRMN had been productive during the last year. He reported that IUCN had been doing some work on involvement of the private sector concerning MPAs and marine resource conservation. Also, Mr Lundin informed the CPC that the Indonesia Coral Reef Rehabilitation and Management was entering its second phase, after completion of the IUCN evaluation report. A second evaluation was just concluded for the Indian Ocean Commission/GEF Coral Reef Monitoring Network in the Indian Ocean project. In addition, he explained that a lot of focus had been placed and that a number of publications were produced on the effectiveness of MPAs. He highlighted that an evaluation of Aldabra World Heritage Site had recently been conducted in conjunction with a number of partners that produced very useful recommendations. Finally, he emphasised that the upcoming World Parks Congress will provide a golden opportunity to push the ICRI agenda and that there was great potential to initiate several partnership activities among members.

### **IOI**

**Mr Clive Wilkinson** presented comments submitted with the apologies of **Mr Robin South**, IOI (Australia) regional director. Mr South reaffirmed the commitment to ICRI of the 25 IOI Centres, including many in

developing countries with coral reefs. IOI supports sustainable development of ocean and coastal resources, including education and training, research, ocean governance, Law of the Sea, fisheries and related areas. The IOI network has considerable expertise in marine science, marine affairs and ocean governance, and will work in partnership with ICRI CPC. Several of the IOI centres, including IOI- Australia, - Indonesia, - Fiji and -Thailand are actively involved in coral reef activities with a strong emphasis on improving governance and management. The IOI is developing the IOI Virtual University, to be jointly based in Townsville, Australia and Capetown, South Africa for Masters Degrees in Marine Affairs through web-based learning. IOI – Australia will host the 2005 ‘Pacem in Maribus’ meeting in conjunction with IMAREST (International Marine Engineering, Science and Technology) with a major focus on coral reef activities.

### **World Bank**

**Ms Marea Hatziolos** highlighted the Meso-american Barrier Reef project that had \$215 million USD worth of projects focusing on the conservation of coral reefs and that these projects were usually implemented in conjunction with the GEF. She informed the CPC that the project was in its second year and that it acted as the node for GCRMN in the region and contributed to the publication of the GCRMN *Status Report*. She reported that within this project many workshops to build capacity to conduct ecosystem monitoring and to develop a hydrodynamic model of the Meso-american Barrier Reef system drainage basin and oceanography had been conducted. She added that the MPA component is a significant part of the project. Ms Hatziolos reported that the World Bank was also developing projects in Mozambique and Tanzania and that a trust fund for sustainable fisheries had been established. In the area of research and capacity building, she informed the CPC that a 15 year targeted research project was being conducted in partnership with other organisations, particularly the IOC. She explained that the first phase of the project was five years and involved six working groups investigating areas where there are gaps in scientific knowledge. Ms Hatziolos emphasised that this project involved strong collaboration between scientists from developed and developing nations that will evolve into long term partnerships and yield policy advice at the highest level.

### **18. Upcoming meetings**

The Chair informed the CPC that ICRI had been invited to the next UNICPOLOS meeting and considered that participation in this forum had been valuable in the past and encouraged ICRI to continue its participation. The UK informed the CPC that they would attend on behalf of the Secretariat.

**Ms Muthiga** informed the CPC that the WIOMSA scientific congress would be held in October and asked if there was a procedure for speaking on behalf of the ICRI. **Mr David Souter** recalled that prior to the ICRI presentation at Oceans and Coasts at Rio +10, the content of the presentation was presented to the CPC for approval and was subsequently modified according to the advice of a small working group convened on the matter.

**Mr. Wilkinson** asked if it was not sensible to hold a special ICRI session at the ICRS in Okinawa to highlight the achievements of ICRI during the last 10 years and develop a direction for the future. In order to facilitate such a session, he called on each of the Secretariat, past and present, to review what they had achieved.

**Mr. Canning** proposed that members of ICRI attending meetings under the guise of their organisations could also act as a proxy for the Secretariat and ICRI in order to secure ICRI representation at other meetings.

### **19. Other matters**

**Mr. Praster** introduced one final decision thanking the Swedish and Philippine ICRI Secretariat for their hard work during the previous two years.

### **20. Closing**

The Chair offered sincere thanks to the CPC and to both Ramsar and IUCN for hosting the CPC and ensuring that the meeting was productive.

**9. ACTION:** Members of CPC sincerely wished to thank the Ramsar and IUCN Global Marine Program hosts of the May 2003 ICRI CPC meeting for a thoroughly well organised and hospitable arrangement. Special thanks are due to the Ramsar Secretary General Delmar Blasco and others from Ramsar: Achim Steiner, Margarita Astralaga and Julio Montes de Oca Lugo. The CPC also thanked the IUCN led by Carl Gustaf Lundin and his wife Stine, Cherry Sword and Kirsten Martin.

**ICRI Secretariat**  
08/07/03 (final draft)