



The Guyana Environmental Protection Agency

in collaboration with

Fauna & Flora International under the Darwin Initiative

and with support from

Demerara Tobacco

WORKSHOP REPORT

'MANAGEMENT PLANNING FOR PROTECTED AREAS'

August 9th to 12th, 2004, Georgetown

Report Prepared by
August 2004

CONTENTS	PAGE
1. WORKSHOP AGENDA	3
2. LIST OF INVITEES	8
3. PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORKSHOP	
Day 1	11
Day 2	20
Day 3	30
Day 4	38
4. SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP	44
APPENDIX 1: PRESENTATIONS	
APPENDIX 2: WORKSHOP EVALUATION	

1. AGENDA OF WORKSHOP

1.1 WORKSHOP TITLE

Management Planning for Protected Areas.

1.2 WORKSHOP DATES

August 9th to 12th, 2004

1.3 WORKSHOP GOAL

To examine the rationale and approach to Protected Areas Management Planning and Plan in relation to Guyana's Protected Areas system.

1.4 WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

- To define planning and models of planning.
- To identify approaches to planning.
- To identify the principles of Protected Areas Management and Planning.
- To examine Protected Areas management processes.
- To examine roles and Responsibilities in Protect Areas Management.
- To examine the four Management Planning Tools and reasons for using them.
- To examine the current approach to Protected Areas Management in Guyana, experiences and lessons learnt.

1.5 WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

Monday 9th August

1.5.1 Session 1: Opening

9:00 Registration

9:30 Introduction/Chair

Ramesh Lilwah, Chair
Protected Areas
Secretariat, EPA

9:35 Workshop Overview
Mike Harding
Protected Areas Planning
Expert, FII

9:55 Remarks
Dr. Indarjit Ramdass,
Director, EPA

1.5.2 Session 2: An overview and Rationale of Protected Area Planning

10:00 Introduction of Participants

10:15 Aims and Methods of Management
Traditional and Current Techniques
Mike Harding

10:45 Questions and Discussion

11:00 BREAK

11:15 Protected Areas Planning and Management
Shyam Nokta

11:45 Questions and Discussions

12:00 LUNCH

1.5.3 Session 3 Guyana's Experience in Protected Areas Planning and Management

1:00 Iwokrama approach to Protected Areas
Planning and Management
David Singh

1:20 Questions and Discussions

1:30 Managing Kaieteur National Park –
Experiences and Lessons Learnt
Inge Nathoo

BREAK

1.5.4 Session 4 Protected Areas Management Tools

2:15 The four tools of the South American Model of
Management Plans
Mike Harding

2:45 Questions and Discussions

3:00 Who Does What in Management Planning:
Lead Agencies and Their Mandate Ramesh Lilwah

3:30 Discussions

CLOSE

Tuesday 10th August

9:00 Review of Day 1 Mike Harding

1.5.5 Session 5 Technical Training on Management Tools

9:15 Tool 1 – Descriptive Compendium (Technical Dossier)
Mike Harding

9:30 Questions and Discussions
Introduction to Working Group Exercise Mike Harding

9:45 Working Group Exercise will focus on Kaieteur
National Park and Shell Beach to:

- Collate Existing Information
- Provide a synthesis of the main points
- Identify gaps in knowledge
- Assess which gaps must be filled with new work (1st priority) and which can be filled later (2nd priority)
- For 1st priority gaps, provide outline ToR for studies/data collation
- Provide an outline structure of the final Compendium, inserting key information already known
- Provide an analysis of how effective a Management Plan could be with the current Compendium

10:30 BREAK

10:45 Working Group Exercise continues

12:10 Plenary Session – Working Group Presentations

12:30 LUNCH

1.5.6 Session 6 Technical Training on Management tools cont'd

- 1:15 Tool 2 – Compendium of Laws, Norms and Agreements
Mike Harding
- 1:30 Questions and Discussions
Introduction to Working Group Exercise Mike Harding
- 1:45 Working Group Exercise will seek to
 - Collate all known (a) International Laws and Conventions which are relevant (b) PA Laws (c) Other national laws which are relevant (d) Agreements and terms of leases (e) norms or informal agreements, conventions and historic practices which might infer management ‘rights’
 - Identify likely gaps in coverage
 - Identify the personnel or skills required to fill this coverage
 - Analyze the extent to which an adequate Plan can be drawn up based on current knowledge
 - Provide a ToR for further work to ensure coverage in comprehensive for the Plan
- 3:30 Plenary Session – Working Group Presentations
- 3:35 Summary and Discussion of Day’s Activities Mike Harding
- 4:00 **CLOSE**

Wednesday 11th August

- 9:00 Review of Day 2 Mike Harding

1.5.7 Session 7 Technical Training on Management Tools cont'd

- 9:15 Tool 3 – Strategic Plan (Operative Plan) Mike Harding
- 9:30 Questions and Discussions
Introduction to Working Group Exercise Mike Harding
- 9:45 Working Group Exercise will focus on Kaieteur National Park and Shell Beach to:
 - Assess the management needs of the sites

- Detail the participative processes require for development of the full Plan
- Develop an outline Strategic Plan for the PA
- Confirm procedures for approval and adoption
- Confirm development work required on the two Dossiers in order to inform a second phase Strategic Plan
- Outline methods of dissemination of the Plan
- Outline timescale and process for updating and amendment of the Plan

10:30 BREAK

10:45 Working Group Exercise continues

12:10 Plenary Session – Working Group Presentations

12:30 LUNCH

1.5.8 Session 8 Technical Training on Management Tools cont'd

1:15 Tool 4 – Zoning Plan Mike Harding

1:30 Questions and Discussions
Introduction to Working Group Exercises Mike Harding

1:45 Working Group Exercise will focus on Kaieteur national Park and Shell Beach:

- Consider the Strategic Plan and the objectives for the PA
- Identify the IUCN category or categories appropriate to the PA
- Where possible, map the category (ies) on a map of the PA
- Recommend a monitoring and review process for the Zoning Plan

3:30 Plenary Session – Working Group Presentations

3:35 Summary and Discussion of Day's Activities Mike Harding

4:00 CLOSE

Thursday 12th August

9:00 Review of Day 3
Outline of Day 4 Mike Harding

1.5.9 Session 9 Examining the application of the Management Planning Process

9:15 Introduction to Working Group Exercise

9:30 Working Group Exercise will focus on

- Areas where the Management Plan process worked effectively
- Areas where the process worked poorly
- Suggested improvements and amendments

10:30 BREAK

10:45 Plenary Session – Working Group Presentations

1.5.10 Session 10 Recommendations for Management Planning in Guyana

11:15 Introduction to Working Group Exercise Mike Harding

11:30 Working Group Exercise will focus on

- Recommended Process for Management Planning in Guyana
- Summary of Recommendations for the PA Lead Agency Mandates

12:15 Plenary Session – Working Group Presentations

12:35 Summary of Key Workshop Outputs Mike Harding

12:50 Closing Remarks Dr. Indarjit Ramdass

12:55 Workshop Evaluation

1:00 LUNCH

2. WORKSHOP INVITEES

No.	Name	Institution	Designation	Tel	Email
1.	Shyam Nokta	Fauna & Flora International	In-Country Officer	222 4565	shyam.nokta@fauna-flora.org
2.	Ian I. Mellville	Guyana Organisation of Indigenous Peoples	Executive Member	222 4170	
3.	Lloyd Andrews	Ministry of Amerindian Affairs	PRDO/H	223 7392	
4.	Mike Harding	Fauna & Flora International	Consultant	0044 1473 723 848	mike.harding@eco-land-people.demon.co.uk
5.	Yoletta Bynoe	Environmental Protection Agency/Fauna & Flora International	Technical Officer	222 6705	hotdimps@yahoo.com
6.	Richard Persaud	Environmental Protection Agency	Environmental Officer	222 6705	lpersaud@epagy.org
7.	Candace Phillips	Amerindian Peoples' Association	Programme Assistant	225 9128	candace_p_21@yahoo.com
8.	Raquel Thomas	Guyana Forestry Commission	Head Planning & Research	226 7272-4	head.research@forestry.gov.gy
9.	Eustace Alexander	Conservation International	Manger – Protected Areas Planning	227 8171	ealexander@conservation.org
10.	Indarjit Ramdass	Environmental Protection Agency	Director NRMD	222 5784	iramdass@epaguyana.org
11.	Donald Sinclair	Tourism Authority	Director	223 6352	dong_sinclair@hotmail.com
12.	Ramesh Lilwah	Environmental Protection Agency	Biodiversity Specialist	222 5784	rameshlilwah@yaahoo.com
13.	Jonghyon Shin	National Parks Commission	Community Development Specialist	613 8219	eos137@yahoo.com
14.	Annette Arjoon	Guyana Marine Turtle Conservation Society	Vice Chairman	225 4483	gmtcs@networksgy.com
15.	Aliesha Narain	Guyana Marine Turtle Conservation Society	Technical Director	225 4483	aliesha@networksgy.com
16.	Deolall Rooplall	Ministry of Local Government	REO	613 6276	
17.	Patrick Williams	World Wildlife Fund	Programme Officer	223 7802	pwilliams@wwf.sr
18.	Gary Clarke	World Wildlife Fund	Consultant	223 7802	gclarke@wwd.sr
19.	Melina Kalamandeen	Iwokrama	Training Coordinator	225 1504	mklamandeen@iwokrama.org
20.	David Singh	Iwokrama	Director Research & Training	225 1504	dsingh@iwokrama.org
21.	Patsy Ross	UNDP	Programme Analyst	226 4040	Patsy.ross@undp.org

3. PROCEEDINGS OF THE WORKSHOP

Day 1

NOTE: All of the presentation texts etc appear in Appendix 1 of the Report.

Session 1 Opening

Ramesh Lilwah made opening statement and welcomed participants.

Workshop Overview

Mike Harding

Gave an introduction to the workshop. Guyana is at the very early stage of Protected Area Network Development. He stated that many areas are identified and needs to be designated, also finding the money to manage them. Constructing the Management Plan and then making it work is the challenge. Developing Management Plans and how they work is the key to a successful Protected Area network. A well thought out Plan, agreed by those who live or work in or use the park, is essential.

Developing such a system is the subject of this workshop. What are some of the approaches to Management Planning? What is the new Management Plan process that has been developed specifically for South America? This methodology, which is based on the elaboration of four “tools”, will be explained in some detail.

Then we will undertake some practical exercises, which will, demonstrate the model, Plan process and get participants used to the new methodology. We will divide participants into two groups, who will use Shell Beach and Kaieteur as examples, and try to develop our own version of the four tools. The format is that the groups will work on their study site and then both groups will make presentations and a discussion will follow.

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE USE OF THE TWO STUDY AREAS IS AS EXAMPLES AND AS A TRAINING EXAMPLE. OUR RESULTS WILL IMPLY NO DECISIONS FOR THESE AREAS AND THIS WORKSHOP DOES NOT HERALD THE START OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN PROCESS FOR EITHER SITE.

Although the workshop may help shape the views and ideas of some of the participants, the real management plan process will require much more time and a very much wider stakeholder participation.

Mike identified the resources that are available to participants, such as the IUCN Handbook, FFI Management Plan Workbook written for this workshop, and the skills

and experiences of the participants. At the end there will be a workshop report, which will provide a further resource.

Dr. Ramdass

Dr. Ramdass welcomed the participants and gratefully acknowledged the contribution of DEMTOCO. The overall objective of establishing Protected Areas is to prevent damaging alterations to the environment. The aim is to protect species and ecosystems. This can be approached from nature protection and wildlife conservation viewpoint. IUCN established the international system of categorization of Pas, and he then went on to describe the categories. He wished everyone a successful workshop.

Session 2 An Overview and Rationale of Protected Area Planning

Participants introduced themselves.

Presentation 1: Aims and Methods of Management Planning – Traditional and Current Techniques.

Mike Harding

See Appendix 1 for the overheads that were used.

The aims and methods of Management Planning seek to build on experiences to develop practical solutions to a variety of challenges faced by the stakeholders. A Management Plan must provide for stakeholders understanding of the management process and the activities that result. All resource users must be included in some way in this process.

Mike compared the traditional and the more current management planning methodologies. The European system has deep roots in the development of management systems. In Europe, authorities had strong control over the land for parks. Technical planning based on scientific information (alone) does not make good plans for large areas. These plans consider stakeholders as passive agents. They are highly deterministic.

Strategic Planning is a new approach. Local problems and issues must be considered as a first step, and then the objectives are constructed. Planning start-up should be led locally. Non-deterministic decision-making is the method chosen, recognizing that combining natural and human systems, as one must do in PA management is difficult to predict and control. Situational diagnosis, planning with scenarios and technical/political calculations are all part of the process. Strategic planning should not be top down. Overall, it provides for the management of the random, the dynamic and the unexpected. For this to work it requires discussions, cooperation, teamwork and collaboration. This approval requires the skills to mix different groups and get information out of them, often oriented to politics of the situation.

Questions and Discussion

Eustace Alexander

Looking at two types, is there a Management Plan with scientific *and* strategic components? Is strategic top down? He believes that top-down can be a good thing in some circumstances.

Ian Melville

Surprised that this ancient top-down model is still being promoted. Provided Kaieteur's boundaries being extended and communities not being involved as examples. There is a need to re-examine the Guyana situation and to reassess the situation at Kaieteur. First steps should have been taken to involve communities. Same thing happened with CI in Rupununi. It is being whispered that CI is taking people's lands, which provides a sense of negativity to the indigenous village. The people must be aware of the process and feel ownership of the project. CI is trying to overcome initial difficulties at present; also the same experience has been had at Shell Beach, but to a lesser extent. There are still many individuals who do not understand PAs. He also asked about the geography of the GSCP and its neighbours

Eustace Alexander

He clarified that it is his personal views and not CI's. Examples were given of NBAP and sites identified.

Mike Harding

Strategic Plan is a new approach. Local problems must be considered first then the objectives set. Planning start-up should be led locally. Non-deterministic governability and decision-making is being considered. Situational diagnosis, planning with scenarios and technical/political calculations are all part of the process. Strategic planning should not be top down. Overall, it provides for the management of the random and the dynamic and the unexpected. For this to work it requires discussions, cooperation, teamwork and collaboration. This approval requires the skills to mix different groups and get information out of them, possibly oriented to politics of the situation.

Patrick Williams

Bottom-up approach is a challenge. Not all stakeholders have an understanding. Those articulate persons can dominate the process of consultation. Also some level of education is needed before the project is launched.

Dr. Ramdass

There was a priority-setting workshop in 1999 to identify sites, which was done, in all ten regions. The Government has the responsibility to protect the key resources.

Mike Harding

Local stakeholders do not always have the national perspective to set national strategy. It should be the job of elected Governments to set the strategy, and then use local consultation to decide how that should be implemented in a way that meets everyone's needs.

Ian Melville

He feels that ownership is the key to the success of the area's survival.

Shyam Nokta

Stakeholder engagement is a continuous process. Information is discriminated gradually.

Eustace Alexander

Can the process work in a top-down fashion?

Ian Melville

Managing should not be top-down.

Mike Harding

Pointed out that we live in a democracy where Governments have been elected to make certain decisions. Governments are elected based on their manifestos. The process is not an end, as the electorate has the decision to vote out a party that they are not in favour of. NBAP was formulated by experts and sent to all ten regions for inputs. Some items were removed and some additions were made.

Lloyd Andrews

Consultation techniques are important. Technical persons who consult with people should know their language, which is not so simple. The beginning of the PA process aimed to strategically target stakeholders. There was poor translation/reception of information based on technical releases of information. He also asked about the legislation for Amerindian in Belize to which Ian Melville and Shyam Nokta responded.

Raquel Thomas

How material is presented is also important. Iwokrama recognized traditional knowledge and can learn from experiences of others.

Eustace Alexander

He outlined the strategy of information sharing by CI, if strategic planning should involve bottom-up. Clarified that top-down and bottom-up is really communication and information sharing and if started from top then all stakeholders must be involved in each step of the process.

***Presentation 2: The experience of the Golden Stream Corridor Project, Belize.
Shyam Nokta***

This presentation is provided in Appendix 1.

Questions and Discussion

Annette Arjoon

Who was the land bought from?

Shyam Nokta

The land was bought from private landowners.

Ian Melville

Where is the population center?

Shyam Nokta pointed out the population center on the map showing the town of Punta Gorda.

Eustace Alexander

He indicated that direct payments for conservation have been made popular more recently. Is there no legislation for GSCP?

Shyam Nokta

All PAs in Belize are governed by one piece of overarching legislation, the National Protected Areas Act. At present, this does not recognize private PAs; hence there is no legal basis for GSCP, though efforts are in train to revise the current legislation. .

Ian Melville

The archeology of Belize has attracted millions of tourist, who have an interest in ecotourism as well. When this was recognized by the landowners, they converted operations to accommodate overnight ecotourism packages. He also stated that the income from tourism is much higher than from agriculture.

Mike Harding

Is there going to be a change in legislation in Guyana to accommodate CI concession management?

Patrick Williams

There is a low economic value too much of the forest. Flooded forests and remote areas are not zoned for logging. This area had few threats, so how do you justify buying-up an area for conservation when there is little threat or no real economic potential?

Eustace Alexander

The concession area that CI purchased is a demonstration site rather than an action to save a threatened area. Logging concession purchase was not needed per se. The people are willing to pay and the laws are being revised at present.

Lloyd Andrews

Do the indigenous villages in Belize own the land?

Shyam Nokta

No legislation exists to that of granting legal lands on a communal base.

Session 3 Guyana's Experience in Protected Areas Planning and Management.

Presentation 3: Iwokrama's Approach to Protected Areas Planning and Management.

David Singh

The building of trust, institutional capacity and protected area management ability is necessary. Guyana needs to build institutional and civil society space for Protected Area Management. It is known that civil society is very weak in Guyana. Between 1996 and 2003, planning (zoning, tourism) has been in effect. Training is participatory. Not only the PA must be managed, but also the surrounding areas.

Questions and Discussion

Ian Melville

He indicated that more expansion on co-management is needed.

David Singh

There is a cyclic approach to co-management. Forcing ideas through the stakeholders should be avoided.

Ramesh Lilwah

Ramesh would say that Iwokrama has developed a co-management model that looks different in this respect from others. Iwokrama was established with big ambitions. Gather there has been a lot of success, e.g. trusts, confidence, etc. Has any attempt been made to spread this outward?

David Singh

A larger mandate has been achieved.

Ramesh Lilwah

Iwokrama is a success.

Shyam Nokta

The period in which Iwokrama chose to do its planning, made it where it is today. Iwokrama acting as a catalyst, and the sharing of responsibilities between them and the communities, proved successful. What are the terms that Iwokrama and communities would work? There is a gap between ownership and responsibility, which is now being bridged and one, which is essential for co-management and benefit sharing.

Ramesh Lilwah

To what extent are communities involved in co-management? How much management is incorporated in terms of harmonizing legislations? What about having all the Acts?

David Singh

Example of canopy walkway was given. He also stated that in the agreement, the communities have 1/3 of the share.

Ramesh Lilwah

What is Iwokrama suggesting in terms of laws, and what is being recommended?

Shyam Nokta

Noted that first of all we need to differentiate between collaborative management and co-management and there is a distinct difference. In his view it is clear that Iwokrama has collaborative management, and moving towards co-management will take time. As regards to laws, this perhaps is secondary. Most important is making it work on the ground first, the laws can follow.

Presentation 4: Managing Kaieteur National Park – Experiences and Lessons Learnt.

Shyam Nokta and Inge Nathoo

Legislation has been recognized. There are changes everyday. Government intervention is a key issue. Administration is not standing still. Some of the attributes of the protected area are dense vegetation, rare and endangered species and Kaieteur Falls itself. The increase of mining will lead to the destruction of the ecosystem. Sector interest planning (e.g. zoning for tourism) has been down for some time.

There are many challenges where management is concerned. There must be a park management plan with stakeholders' interest in mind. Around the area there are about fifty inhabitants setting up shacks to live in. although there is some sort of management at the park, it is not as clear-cut as it should be.

Questions and Discussion

Ian Melville

Before the 1970's, Kaieteur was a large mining area where persons would set up shacks. In the case of rubbish, this will be persistent because of persons coming into the area for logging purposes. Instead of staying at the guesthouse, they would build shacks and when its time to leave they will leave the shacks up. One of the reasons for not staying at the guesthouse is the cost. The inhabitants were not consulted before building of the tourist place. There is no management plan for persons living in the area. There is a lack of consultation in expanding park boundaries. He elaborated on the history of mining at Kaieteur and also the present occurrence of mining at the park. There is no mining officer at the site.

Shyam Nokta

There is a lack of funds, which is also challenging. The miners are claiming that they don't know where the park boundaries are hence physical demarcation was done. There is a need for coordination at the park, also cooperation and collaboration, which are not easy in the remote areas. Enforcement for education and awareness is necessary.

Annette Arjoon

She enquired about the number of visitors and fee income, and if this can offset management.

Shyam Nokta

Indicated that it is on average 200 persons per month but this was not sufficient to offset management costs, which are borne by the NPC from their Government subvention.

Eustace Alexander

There is an absence of a Management Plan. The data, which is being collected, should be used to assist a management plan.

Shyam Nokta

There is no strategy to facilitate the collecting of information. NPC and EPA will start discussion on this matter.

Eustace Alexander

Is the park ready for zoning? A lot of researchers that enter Guyana make an inventory at the park. This information should be collected from these various people. There should be some control over visitors for the prevention of destroying the natural habitat.

Ramesh Lilwah

Research has been suspended at Kaieteur Park, and he agrees with Eustace. There are questions that have been asked from time to time, e.g. what is Kaieteur National Park all about, what's its purpose, how's tourism in Guyana.

Inge Nathoo

The National Parks Commission reports to the Office of the President.

Shyam Nokta

A framework should be developed to see which direction Kaieteur should go in. There are gaps in the planning of activities and coordination with sector interests.

Ramesh Lilwah

The tourist operators do not spend enough time at the site.

Session 4 Protected Areas Management Tools

Presentation 5: The Four Tools of The South American Model of Management Plans.

Mike Harding

There is a range of management planning methods available to PA managers (which includes the Stakeholders). Time should be taken in choosing the right style of planning. The Four Tools method is being trailed here as the most appropriate method for South America, with its complex biological and human systems interacting. Simplifying the process would be a great advantage to the Management Plan. Identifying the lead agency is important - stakeholders must know who to go to for information and to ensure participation. A time plan is important and all involved must be updated in all stages.

Descriptive Compendium shows the general characteristics of an area (physical, biological, social, eco-political, ethnographic). He indicated that presentation of information must be suitable to all stakeholders. The best way to collect data is to identify the key features. The input of the local people and their accumulated knowledge is important.

The Compendium of laws is the second tool and was discussed. Local agreements must be written down. This is also the place to identify Amerindian rights and to agree an interpretation of them – particularly what constitutes a “traditional” right.

The Strategic Plan is the gut of the plan in the sense that this is where the issues are discussed, objectives set and actions detailed. The nine steps in drawing up a Strategic Plan were described.

The Zoning Plan was also described. This is the process whereby Park managers designate or zone the PA according to one or more of the IUCN PA categories. Each category carries an implication of objectives for that zone.

No comments or questions asked. The first day ended at this point.

Day 2

Mike Harding gave recap of Day 1.

Session 4 Protected Areas Management Tools (Con't)

Presentation 6: Who does what in Management Planning: Lead Agencies and Their Mandate. **Ramesh Lilwah**

Ramesh Lilwah gave his presentation that was to be done on Day 1.

There have been few serious attempts at developing management plans, except for Kaieteur. He outlined the country's commitment to PAs and NPAS, and then described adapting principles of 'People with Parks' and the participatory process of management planning. Guyana's sector policy also provides the guiding framework and the mandate of the EPA. The present status is that they have two legally established PAs. For the established sites, there exists a Management Plan however it's not comprehensive. All planning done by Kaieteur National Park is supported by the Ministry of Tourism and GGMC. There are also five other sites proposed and referred to Guyana's obligation under CBD. The NBAP, which was widely consulted on and agreed upon, and included PAs under the programme for in-situ conservation. He gave an overview of the administrative structure, as regards PAs in Guyana for NREAC, cabinet, sub committee, institutions such as EPA and NPC. Overviews of things at Kaieteur indicating absence of Management Plans, representation by Agencies on Board were given. The Park Administration has a work plan, but otherwise arrangements were ad hoc. Some level of interaction with communities, but more is needed

Iwokrama has its own Act and Board. Planning is underway and participatory approach has been adopted. Consultations were held and a plan was prepared and implemented.

Proposed Sites

In 1999 sites were selected. With the hope and expectation for these sites, funding by the Government is a problem. Government has been identified to lead the process on the ground, as well as to make technical input if the capacity exists. Ramesh Lilwah also gave an overview of CI's work in Kanukus. With Shell Beach, it was not extensive. GMTCS came into being at the time of priority sites being identified. Some work done, GMTCS has setbacks through funding and staff

capacity. Consultation is still a big issue. Some level of understanding at community level.

Management challenges include the loss of confidence and trust by communities over investors who have come into villages. This has led to suspicion. The need to build trust and partnerships as well as identifying a formula for benefit sharing. There is an inadequate capacity and there are many land issues, also funding. The main focus is co-management.

Co-management – Ramesh Lilwah spent several minutes looking at a definition and some of the issues related to co-management.

Questions and Discussion

Raquel Thomas

Trust was not initial at Iwokrama, took time and eventually a shared vision emerged. NRDDDB was instrumental in building partnership. Sidney's three-legged model, CEWs, committee being employed. There is a lot to learn from Iwokrama.

Ramesh Lilwah

Expressed similar thoughts and Iwokrama's experiences need to be translated. Recognized it took some time for the consultation process.

Aliasha Narain

When we talk about power sharing, has government decided on a level of sharing with regards to management?

Ramesh Lilwah

Power sharing depends on trust. No decision on post declaration. Management authority will be established for sites and it won't be top-down.

Eustace Alexander

NPC is responsible for all parks. What are NPC responsibilities and how does this relate to the other sites? What are some of the overlaps and how does this fit into GPAS?

Ramesh Lilwah

EPA has responsibility to coordinate. They have the authority to establish and only coordinate the process. NPC has the authority to manage, and is responsible for parties only. The legislation has been amended for the indigenous people.

Shyam Nokta

Gave overview/background and where we are in terms of the role of NPC and with the emergence of EPA and other organizations, and how responsibilities are shared.

Patrick Williams

There are a number of laws overlapping. There is need for review. Some organizations have regulatory and advisory roles. Emphasis is on trust. For people to develop trust need for capacity accountability, transparency between partners.

Ramesh Lilwah

Need to look at harmonization of legislation, which will be resolved to some extent by the World Bank project if it comes into being.

Ian Melville

To expand on Patrick Williams's comments, he gave Amerindian viewpoints of Iwokrama. He also made mention of his experiences with Iwokrama - initial resentment broken down because of the reaching out to communities. Up to now, there is still a sense of pride in being involved with Iwokrama. He made mention of some projects. Trust can take years to build and can be easily lost.

Lloyd Andrews

Included land rights in presentation. Some have more rights than others. Chenapau is 30 miles away; Mainstay is 3 miles away from Anna Regina. Patamona have more. A map for instance is necessary. Seem like Arawaks and Caribs don't have many rights like others. Why is it that some have more rights than others?

Ian Melville

Depends on interactions, especially with investors, gave examples of Mainstay when country rents/lease resort to the village. Community not happy with arrangement and went to renegotiate. Prefer the road, managed area. There should be some plan available as not to lose the rights of the land. The co-management plan in Bolivia has worked well and was described by Ian. There is no problem with PA overlapping the indigenous lands.

Raquel Thomas

Need to be careful of terms used, e.g. CI "taking over". This can make things difficult for CI. Perhaps need to use a different term. Enquired who is chair of cabinet sub-committee.

Ramesh Lilwah

He responded to Raquel Thomas's statement. CI, EPA and GMTCS cannot take away lands. Interested groups have concessions and should be aimed and discussed.

Mike Harding

It seems usual that lead Agencies are NGOs. What role do you see for EPA?

Ramesh Lilwah

EPA is a lead for Roraima and Orinduik.

Ian Melville

Asked for a copy of the presentation.

Session 5 Technical Training on Management Tools.

Presentation 7: Tool 1 – Descriptive Compendium (Technical Dossier)

Mike Harding

In this brief recap and over-view, Mike outlined some of the roles of Lead Agencies which is the steer for the Management Planning process. He gave outlined of working group sessions. He also made mention that the human side is often more critical than the biological side when managing a complex protected area with a range of stakeholders. The most modern way is the strategic method. All stakeholders must be involved in the process.

The following work groups were identified:

Mike Harding introduced the working group exercises at the end of which presentations were made by Richard Persaud on behalf of the Kaieteur Group, and Aliesha Narain on behalf of the Shell Beach Group. These are outlined below:

KAIETEUR NATIONAL PARK	SHELL BEACH
Lloyd Andrews	Annette Arjoon
Raquel Thomas	Aliesha Narain
Richard Persaud	Yoletta Bynoe
Eustace Alexander	Candace Phillips
Gary Clarke	Mike Harding
Pasty Ross	Ramesh Lilwah
Shyam Nokta	Melina Kalamandeen
Jonghyon Shin	Deolall Rooplall
Ian Melville	

Questions	Kaieteur National Park	Shell Beach
1. What are the key features of the PA?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Endangered species – Cock of the Rock ▪ Endemic species – golden frogs, cultural/spiritual ▪ Significant Cultural Value ▪ Resident Communities – Chenapau, Menzies ▪ Economic – mining, tourism ▪ Aesthetics – falls, river, gorge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nesting grounds for four species of marine turtles ▪ Largely intact mangrove forest ▪ Wilderness area ▪ Cultural ▪ Rich biodiversity ▪ Gallery and swamp forest ▪ Priority ransom site identification ▪ Complete sequences of intact (coastal ecosystem/beach movement.) ▪ Feeding ground for migratory birds ▪ Archaeological features

<p>2. What do we know about them?</p>	<p>Existing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Map of the area ▪ Some information on Fauna and Flora ▪ Geological Assessment ▪ RAP – Social Survey <p>Need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detailed resource map ▪ Biodiversity assessment ▪ Social Assessment – resource use 	<p>Existing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Four decades of research information ▪ Smithsonian survey ▪ Basic GIS data ▪ Site analysis/local knowledge ▪ Studies on buds/herps/fish ▪ Bird data, wetland ecozone ▪ Basic GIS/local knowledge ▪ Preliminary data/sightings ▪ Site analysis
<p>3. What are the key issues in the PA?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Funding ▪ Safeguarding/Protection of Area ▪ Absence of Management Plan ▪ Illegal Mining – Brazilians ▪ Poor Institutional Capacity ▪ Tourism Impact ▪ Stakeholder Relations ▪ Park Extension ▪ Coordination of planning (sector interest) RDC, Tourism – operators, GGMC ▪ Health – malaria and typhoid ▪ Inaccessibility and high transportation cost - possibility of road to Chenapau ▪ Security – hideout for criminals 	<p>Features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communities resource use map ▪ Detailed biological research: Migratory/resident/mangrove ecosystem functions and succession patterns/mammals/fishes ▪ Coastal geomorphology and beach dynamics ▪ Document local knowledge, history and language ▪ Accumulative impacts from mining ▪ Impacts and extent of forest fires ▪ Determination of boundary <p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land issues ▪ Funding ▪ Poorly coordinated sea turtle conservation efforts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - slaughter - incidental mortality - education enforcement ▪ Forest fires – man made and natural ▪ Sea level rises ▪ Promotion of ownership/stewardship of natural resources ▪ Poor communication infrastructure impending conservation effort ▪ Security issues ▪ Social – health/poor human conditions/lack of employment opportunities/access to fresh drinking water ▪ Poorly managed wildlife

		<p>trade and illegal wildlife trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trust ▪ Livelihood issues
4. What is already known?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land issues being addressed by GoG on a regional basis through the Ministry of Amerindian Affairs. ▪ Reports from various sources on increase in sea turtle meat sale. ▪ 1998 El Nino fires. ▪ Preliminary predictions gathered through CPACC project. ▪ Some level of unsustainable harvesting of resources (timber) ▪ First hand knowledge – communication ▪ Security – first hand ▪ Social – inadequate medical and education facilities. ▪ Lack of data.
5. What resources do we have available?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local knowledge, scientific knowledge ▪ Interested parties – researchers, operators ▪ Management structure – NPC (2 rangers, radio, accommodation, trails, infrastructure (air strip) ▪ Park visitation fees – park management ▪ “Kaieteur” - marketable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On ground <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - seven wardens - three CEW's ▪ One beach administrative center – FFI ▪ Close collaboration with region administration ▪ Two boats and engines ▪ Research by volunteers ▪ Biodiversity assessment – FFI ▪ Technical capacity
6. Can we prioritize information gathering?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Biodiversity assessment ▪ Baseline data on geology ▪ Social, cultural, anthropological (historical) ▪ Community resource use ▪ Plans for areas adjacent to KNP ▪ Carrying capacity study ▪ Sources of financing 	
7. Is there sufficient information to being the planning process?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possible species management plan (turtles) ▪ More detailed data collection needed.

Discussion on Session 5 Exercise

Following the Kaieteur Group presentation, the following discussion ensued:

Racquel Thomas

Added that additional features include ecosystem types, aesthetics, cultural values, economic aspects and the Kaieteur Falls itself.

Ramesh Lilwah

Indicated that the Kaieteur Falls should be included as a main feature. He also questioned why illegal mining was a key feature.

Mike Harding

Pointed out that the consideration of 'feature' was mainly to look at attributes of the park, whereas mining is perhaps an issue.

Aliasha Narain

Enquired whether all threats have been identified, in particular as it relates to tourism activities and made reference to the Tourism Threat Approach which could be used in identifying these.

Richard Persaud

Responded studies to be done would be able to assess how the integrity of the Park would be affected.

Mike Harding

Noted that it seems there was much emphasis on the institutional management issues rather than threats.

Shyam Nokta

Clarified that both have been outlined and that there is much integration between the two since one has given rise to the other.

Ramesh Lilwah

How illegal mining is a key feature? Why had the Falls itself is left out?

Raquel Thomas

She included the Fall under aesthetics and rivers.

Richard Persaud

This is a key feature because it is something that is currently happening in the area.

Ramesh Lilwah

Disagrees, the fall should be a key feature.

Aliesha Narain

Have you identified all your threats? It is important to find out how your threats affect the features.

Richard Persaud

Stated that there is insufficient information, however biodiversity studies will help.

Shyam Nokta

The importance of safeguarding the features and identifying threats is emphasized. However we highlighted some of the threats, but focused more on Management Planning. He also mentioned that Kaieteur National Park is already established whereas Shell Beach is not.

Aliesha Narain made presentation on behalf of the Shell Beach Group.

Richard Persaud

What about resources?

Shyam Nokta

There should be a management plan for the geographical space. Something needs to happen before a Management Plan can be put in place.

Session 6: The Compendium Of Laws

Presentation 8: Tool 2 – Compendium of Laws, Norms and Agreements.

Mike Harding

Mike Harding recapped on this Tool and provided more detail on how compilation should proceed.

He introduced the working group sessions and presentations were done by Shyam Nokta on behalf of the Kaieteur Group, and Candace Phillips on behalf of the Shell Beach Group.

Questions	Kaieteur National Park	Shell Beach
1. Collate all known (a) International Laws and Conventions which are relevant (b) PA Laws (c) Other national laws which are relevant (d) Agreements and terms of leases (e) Norms or	Existing Laws, International Conventions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CBD, framework for Conservation in Guyana ▪ World Heritage Convention ▪ Ramsar Convention ▪ CITES ▪ Cartagena Convention ▪ Kyoto Protocol National Legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ KNP Act 	International Laws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CBD ▪ Ramsar ▪ CITES ▪ Cartagena Convention ▪ MARPOL (Marine) ▪ Kyoto Protocol ▪ World Heritage Convention ▪ Plan and Biosphere National Laws <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EPA Act ▪ Fisheries Act ▪ Forestry Act

<p>informal agreements, conventions and historic practices which might infer management "right"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Parks Commission Act ▪ EP Act – regulations: species protection ▪ Amerindian Act ▪ Wild Bird Protection Act ▪ Fisheries Act ▪ Forestry Act ▪ Mining Act <p>Agreement and Terms of Lease</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MoU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NPC & UN - WWF & GoG - CI and GoG ▪ Inter Agency (a) cooperation and collaboration (b) procedures for operation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operational guidelines <p>Norms and Informal Agreements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indigenous rights over area ▪ Access through KNP for locals and other stakeholders ▪ Access to Kaieteur falls as tourist site ▪ Access as a Guyanese, right to access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amerindian Act ▪ National Parks Act ▪ State Land Act ▪ Sea Defence Act ▪ Maritime Boundary ▪ Criminal Law ▪ Public Health Ord. ▪ Water Act ▪ Wild Birds Act <p>Agreements/Leases/Concessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land Leases ▪ Exploratory ▪ Extractive Lease <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - mining/forestry - Fisheries/Wildlife ▪ MoUs GMTCS – EPA and FFI ▪ Grant Agreement – GMTCS – WWF <p>Informal and Historic Practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traditional
<p>2. Identify likely gaps in coverage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regulations need to be developed for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - tourists and tour operators - facilities and accommodations (ecology) - protection of sites in park - fines and fees - powers and authority of wardens ▪ Laws and regulations governing activities outside of park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ramsor not signed ▪ Specific sea turtle legislation ▪ TED – use/enforcement ▪ Indigenous Charts ▪ Strengthening of laws that govern protected areas ▪ Lack of clarity/definitions ▪ Weak enforcement/admin ▪ Lack of resources
<p>3. Identify the personnel or skills required to fill this coverage</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current revision of Amerindian Act ▪ World Bank/GEF Project to look at institutional/legislative reform ▪ Process to develop with stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - understanding of need (regs) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advise from persons with requisite protected area and management legal skills ▪ Institutional strengthening

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - agreement on roles and responsibilities ▪ Legal experts to put into 'legal language' – revised act ▪ IPR and benefit sharing ▪ Iwokrama Act could be used as 'frame' for revision to Kaieteur and experience/lessons 	
4. Analyze the extent to which an adequate Plan can be drawn up based on current knowledge		Shell Beach Management (based on existing laws) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possible to do. ▪ Conservation contracts with communities/land covenants ▪ Strengthening of international sea turtle conventions
5. Provide outline structure of the final compendium, inserting key information where already known	No time	No time

Mike Harding indicated that although understanding and compiling the Compendium may not be a subject of interest to many people, and that many people do not have the specialist skills to interpret the laws, the working group exercises demonstrated very clearly the very great range of laws and agreements that affected Protected Areas and their management.

Consequently, the Protected Area manager must have a good understanding of these laws etc in order to effectively manage the PA. They may need specialist advice to assist with interpretation. The importance of the Compendium is that it draws together all of this information in one document that is accessible to all.

He also noted that a great deal of work needed to be done on the rights and practices of Indigenous groups and how this would affect management of the PA, and vice versa.

Discussion on Session 6 exercise

There were no questions following the Kaieteur Group presentation, however the following discussion ensued after the Shell Beach Group presentation:

Aliesha Narain

At what phase of the process do you compile a legal compendium.

Mike Harding

This is something that should be done at the beginning (it could be done currently for these two PAs) to get an understanding of what laws exist and apply, and who is responsible for enforcing them.

Aliasha Narain

At what stage is the legislation established for management

Shyam Nokta

Indicated that it is a two-step process, the first being to legislate the aim/purpose of the area, its boundaries and management authority, citing the examples of Kaieteur National Park and Iwokrama. The other details of management, as it related to guidance, empowerment, fees and fines, are added at a later stage through regulations and there is good reason for that, mainly to allow for an understanding and for systems to develop which can then work. The example of the enforcement powers of the Iwokrama rangers which have only been recently conferred, after 8 years since the areas are legally established.

Mike Harding

There should be a firm grip on the laws and their understanding. Legal advice should be sought, and implementation should be strengthened. Gaps in coverage may need to be filled by new laws.

Annette Arjoon

Acts should be simplified in this document.

Mike Harding

The Compendium should be a simple, general document and a balance should be struck between over-simplifying the laws (and therefore losing meaning and important detail) and providing too much and being too technical (whereby people wont read it or cant understand it).

Day 3

Session 7 – Technical Training on Management Tools – Strategic Plan

Presentation 9: Tool 3 – Strategic Plan (Operative Plan)

Mike Harding gave an overview of Days 1 and 2 and indicated that there will be some slight changes to the working group sessions based on the previous day's activities. The main session would be broken down into a series of sub-sessions, with report backs at the end of each.

He then introduced the working group session. Because compiling a Strategic Plan was a lengthy and complex process, it would only be possible in these workshops to

look at the most critical sections. During development of a “real” process, whole sequences of workshops may need to be run for each of the nine steps identified in compiling a management plan. Consequently, our workshop can only be considered an introduction to the process.

It was emphasized that the exercises that follow, and the conclusions or suggestions made, in no way indicate that any decisions have been made or any active management planning for either of the Protected Areas have taken place. This is simply a training exercise.

1. Setting Objectives

This is a key Step in developing the Plan and should take account of the reason for designation of the PA and the special features that have been identified.

Each group was asked to develop *five* objectives for their study area. Although in any plans, more objectives may be identified, for the purpose of this exercise, the five most important should be developed.

Richard Persaud and Yoletta Bynoe delivered the presentations for the Kaieteur and Shell Beach Groups respectively.

Questions	Kaieteur National Park	Shell Beach
1. Objectives	<p>Laws of Guyana CH 20:20 KNP protected because of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scenery ▪ Flora and Fauna <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rare and endangered species and ecosystems <p>New KNP Act</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognition and respect of indigenous rights to KNP. ▪ Plan, implement and manage sustainable livelihood opportunities for the benefit of stakeholders. ▪ To make Kaieteur available to the world as a place of significant natural beauty and of spiritual value. ▪ To promote scientific research and education at KNP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protect the nesting marine turtle population. ▪ Maintain the integration of the entire mangrove resources. ▪ Maintain the full range of cultural features such as archaeological site, language. ▪ Maintain the integrity of the full range of habitat, maintain the rich biodiversity. ▪ Promote opportunities that may enhance well being of local people through the wise management of the natural resources of PA.

Discussion

Following the Shell Beach Presentation, there was discussion as it relates to the first objective on sea turtle conservation and the fifth objective on 'well being of local people.' Following the discussions these objectives were re-worded.

Shyam Nokta elaborated on Richard's presentation indicating that the group approached the issue from the objective of initially establishing the Park, as well as how the objectives had evolved over the years to present.

Ramesh Lilwah made the point about global significance and importance of the area which was supported by *Shyam Nokta* and *Eustace Alexander*.

Shyam Nokta pointed to the significance of Kaieteur Falls internationally while *Eustace Alexander* referred to the important repository of fresh water the Guiana Shield plays, as much as 10% of global fresh water. Some participants questioned whether this broader environmental and climatological aspect was a worthy objective.

Mike Harding suggested this was a classic example of a high-value "ecosystem service", i.e. a function that the ecosystem provides with very broad benefits to society – water conservation, flood control, climate control etc – and internationally is a well recognized and valued function of PAs. Ultimately, it is up to the Protected Area and the stakeholders to decide whether it wanted to include this as an objective.

Ramesh Lilwah

For the objection of protection, should it have a global value?

Mike Harding

Yes, usually linked to international organizations and the criteria/priorities they set.

Ramesh Lilwah

Eco-system service is the main objective of protection.

Eustace Alexander

It may be right, Guyana shield (10% of global water), discharges through Kaieteur which is the largest water source. It's a down stream effect is critical and contributes to the hydrological cycle.

2. Stakeholders Analysis

Mike Harding provided an introduction to this exercise. The Stakeholders Analysis, one of the nine Steps in compiling the Strategic Plan, is a classic planning tool which:

- Identifies the stakeholders (“actors” or “players”), which are relevant to the PA.
- Identifies how they affect the protected area – negative and positive impacts. Column 2 in the tables below.
- How the PA affects the stakeholders – is it their main source of livelihood, or their homes, or source or recreation, important to their spiritual or cultural well-being etc. Column 3 in the tables below.
- Methods of communication – what is the most appropriate way of communicating with each Stakeholder group? This is important to know for a PA manager.

In this way a Stakeholder Analysis characterizes the human and social interactions that take place in the PA and analyze the relationships between people and the PA. The groups were asked to undertake a simple Analysis using a matrix to summaries their findings.

Then they were asked to construct a diagram with the PA in the centre of the space. Each Stakeholder group is then placed on the diagram, positioned relative to the strength of the relationship between the group and the PA (the stronger the relationship, the nearer the symbol is placed to the centre). The size of the symbol indicates the importance of the stakeholder group in the management of the park. This then presents a simple, graphical summary of the stakeholder relationships.

Annette Arjoon presented on behalf of the Shell Beach Group while *Aliesha Narain* described the Diagram with *Ramesh Lilwah* presenting on behalf of the Kaieteur Group and *Richard Persaud* describing the Diagram.

The following tables summarize their results. The diagrams cannot practically be incorporated into this report.

KAIETEUR NATIONAL PARK					
GROUP	AFFECT PA		PA EFFECT		COMMUNICATION
	+	-	+	-	
Local					
▪ NPC	✓		✓		Radio/Mails/DC
▪ Menzies		✓		✓	Radio/Mail/DC
▪ Ind. Commission	✓		✓		Radio/Mails/Group C
▪ Tour Operators	✓	✓	✓		Tel. Meetings, Corresp
▪ Visitors	✓	✓	✓		Public Notices, Corresp, DC
▪ Researchers	✓		✓		Tel, DC, Email, Corresp.
▪ RDC	✓		✓		Tel, DC, Corresp, Radio
▪ Touchan’s Council	✓		✓		Corresp, DC, Radio
National					
▪ Researchers	✓		✓		Tel, DC, Corresp
▪ Amerindian NGO’s	✓	✓	✓		Tel, DC, Corresp
▪ Government Sector Agencies (EPA)	✓	✓	✓	✓	Tel, Meetins, DC, Corresp
▪ Airlines Operators	✓		✓		Tel, DC, Corresp
▪ NGO’s/CBO’s					Tel, Radio, Corresp, DC

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ UG/MOE ▪ Tourists 	✓	✓	✓	✓	Tel, DC, Corresp Email, Tel, DC
International	✓	✓	✓	✓	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Researchers ▪ Tourists ▪ Donors (FFI, WWF, UNDP, KFW, CI, Iwokrama) ▪ Research Institutions (National Geographic, Photo Natura) 	✓	✓	✓	✓	Tel, Email, Corresp, DC Tel, Email, Corresp, DC Tel, Email, Corresp, DC Tel, Email, Corresp, DC

SHELL BEACH			
GROUP	AFFECT PA	PA EFFECT	COMMUNICATION
Local <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Almond/Gwenu within ▪ Waramuni etc. ▪ Morowhana Fishermen ▪ Fishermen ▪ Wildlife Trappers ▪ Turtle Users ▪ Loggers ▪ Amcar ▪ Miners ▪ GMTCS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Habitat conversion ▪ Sustainable? Use impact negatively sea turtle ▪ Probably unsustainable fishing activities. ▪ Probably unsustainable practice. ▪ Unsustainable practice. ▪ Unsustainable practice. ▪ Unsustainable practice. (detrimental to health) ▪ Facilitate conservation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete dip – fishing, farming. Partial - other gold mining, etc. ▪ Complete dependence for livelihood. ▪ Seasonal dependence. ▪ Seasonal dependence. ▪ Partial dependence. ▪ None present. Partial culture. ▪ Employment. (+) 	For Local <p>On site meetings, interpersonal and continuous with adequate notification and time spent on ground.</p>
National <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Region Administration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ EPA ▪ GFC ▪ MoDD ▪ GMMC ▪ NPAC ▪ Indigenous NGO's ▪ UG 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilitate conservation. (+) ▪ Regulate activity & evaluate canal. ▪ Facilitate indigenous rights. ▪ Provide information. (+) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Capacity building. (+) ▪ Extra work load (-) ▪ Devolution in authority (+) ▪ Process (+) (-) ▪ Demarcation (-) ▪ Indigenous expert advise. ▪ Capacity building. 	
International <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FFI ▪ WWF ▪ World Bank ▪ UNDP ▪ USAID ▪ CRI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilitate sea turtle 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ External Universities ▪ Widecast ▪ MTCC (Barbados) 	<p>conservation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mainly through funding. ▪ Regional (C'bean) facilitator. 		
--	--	--	--

Discussion

Following the Shell Beach Group presentation, a discussion ensued as described below.

David Singh

Pointed out that the issue of reduction in authority depends on how you look at it and it can be seen in a positive light – as a type of devolution.

Ramesh Lilwah

Agreed, and pointed out that no authority of a regulatory body will be reduced, rather there will be empowerment at the local level.

Following the Kaieteur Group presentation, a discussion ensued as described below:

David Singh

In light of Menzies Landing being there for decades, would it be wiser for them to have a positive influence on the Park?

Richard Persaud

Indicated that the Menzies Landing residents can provide goods and services as well as maintain the integrity of the area by helping in monitoring.

Ramesh Lilwah

Pointed out that it is important to understand that the principal activity of Menzies residents is mining and that the settlement is an illegal one.

Shyam Nokta

Outlined briefly the efforts of the last Kaieteur Board to embrace Menzies landing which had resulted in a good working relationship and that many of the residents were moving away from mining and wanted to be involved and benefit from opportunities the Park would offer, though this needs clear policy guidance to facilitate organizing the settlement and integrating them into planning and management. This policy guidance has not been forthcoming.

3. Problem/Opportunity Analysis

Mike introduced the next critical step, which was analyzing the problems that the PA faced and identifying the opportunities, which may be used to enhance the PA or the well-being of the stakeholders.

This provides a framework for the future management of the PA and helps to focus attention on the main issues (problems) and helps to capitalize on opportunities. In this way it will make the Strategic Plan efficient, addressing the most important areas of activity.

Problems should be framed with reference to the PAs Objectives. If the so-called problem does not detrimentally impact on one of the Objectives, is it truly a problem? Often Park managers become diverted by addressing issues which they find disturbing or are high profile within the PA but actually don't affect the Parks objectives. This is wasteful of resources and can engender unnecessary conflict (for instance if the Pak tries to stop a Stakeholder group undertaking an activity which is not actually damaging).

In the exercise, participants were asked:

- Firstly, to identify individual problems.
- Then, the stakeholders that were involved in these problems (either as possible causes or possible cures) should be identified.
- Then, the problems should be grouped together to develop the main, or “Macro-Problems”
- If time allowed, links between macro-problems should be identified – so for instance is poverty within the communities causing over-exploitation of the wildlife resources through hunting?

In that way a “problem tree” of issues, their causes and their linkages to each other could be built up. This provides a simple and yet powerful tool for understanding the problems which a protected area might face.

If time allowed, the groups were asked to undertake the same exercise for *opportunities*.

David Singh made the presentation on problems on behalf of the Kaieteur Group with Eustace Alexander outlining the opportunities. For the Shell Beach Group, Deolall Rooplall presented. In the following table, macro problems are in *italics*.

KAIETEUR NATIONAL PARK	
<i>Problems</i>	<i>Opportunities</i>
<p><i>Poor land use planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unregulated use of adjacent areas. ▪ Uncoordinated land use <p><i>Poor Policy Management Planning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No Board. ▪ No strategy by KNP. ▪ Limited information on historical values (cultural, social, another logical, archeological, bio-physical) available. ▪ Limited infrastructure – no health facility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access to local human resources. ▪ Funding. ▪ International recognition (for government of Guyana) ▪ Enhancing livelihood of Indigenous. ▪ Research ▪ Government meeting obligations. ▪ World Heritage Site. ▪ Conservation. ▪ Capacity building. ▪ Increase in income from Tourism.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Malaria. ▪ Limited instrumental capacity. ▪ No policy on research. KNP closed for research. ▪ Potential for conflict between protection and sustainable use. ▪ No management plan. ▪ Uncoordinated planning. ▪ No monitoring. <p><i>Low levels of security</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Crime – hideout for criminals. ▪ Security. <p><i>Low Stakeholders Participation and empowerment (ownership by communities)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insufficient involvement of local communities. ▪ Poor communication between Georgetown and communities. ▪ Unresolved land rights issue. ▪ Menzies landing relationship of KNP not defined. <p><i>Significant threats to integrity of Park</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unmanaged water disposal. ▪ Mining in concession. ▪ Water pollution. ▪ Miners passing through. <p><i>Remoteness</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High cost of travel. ▪ Limited access. ▪ Poor communication (facilities and channels) <p><i>Lack of Funds</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insufficient funding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase infrastructure. ▪ Creation of Guyana Corridors.
--	---

SHELL BEACH	
Problems	Opportunities
<p><i>Lack of Empowerment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Poor ownership of resources. ▪ Lack of resources. ▪ Lack of education and awareness. ▪ Lack of responsibility. <p><i>Poor Economic Potential</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Low incomes. ▪ Inadequate health and education facilities. ▪ Low education and health values. ▪ Limited employment opportunities. ▪ Inadequate skills. 	

<p><i>Unacceptable Sea Turtle Mortality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Killing for local and community use. ▪ Poaching of eggs for local and community use. ▪ Setting of nets in nesting areas. ▪ Non-TED compliance. ▪ Drowning seines, hooks and lines. <p><i>Loss of Cultural Values</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Undocumented local knowledge. ▪ Loss of language. ▪ Change in regulatory loss practices. ▪ Changes to traditional customs. 	
--	--

Following *Eustace Alexander's* presentation, *Ramesh Lilwah* added that under *International Recognition* in the table, it would allow the opportunity for Guyana to meet it's obligations under the Convention of Biodiversity and this will in turn bring recognition to the PA.

At the end of the Shell Beach Group presentation *Racquel Thomas* enquired about the loss of indigenous religion and Annette indicated that there are many religious organizations from the coastland which are now present in the communities and have converted the locals from their original religions.

Day 4

Introduction

Mark Harding reviewed briefly the previous day's activities. He outlined changes to the programme for this last day. The session on Park Zoning would be compressed since there had been an entire workshop on Zoning. However, for the benefit of those who had not attended this workshop, we would undertake a zoning exercise on Kaieteur. Shell Beach had been specifically addressed in the previous workshop. Then there would be a brief review of the Management Plan process, including a discussion regarding whether or not the new format should be adopted for Guyana, and finally a round up of the workshop and close.

Session 7: Continuation of The Strategic Plan...

4. The Programme of Actions

Mike Harding described how in this critical step of the Strategic Plan, the activities which would neutralize the problems and take advantage of the opportunities would be identified.

- The method would be as follows:
- For each of the problems identified, a single action should be taken which aims to address the problem.

- For each action, the stakeholders who would be engaged in the action would be identified.
- When all the actions are identified, similar actions should be grouped together in Programmes (or Themes).
- If time allows the same process should be undertaken for *opportunities*.

It was emphasized that in a full management process, this is a large piece of work, whereby many more than one action might be described for each problem. However, with the time available, the above exercise illustrates the thought processes needed to go through.

Results of the working groups were summarized in the following tables.

KAIETEUR NATIONAL PARK		
Problem	Action/Output	Stakeholders
Unregulated use of adjacent areas	A land use planning process for Region 8 leading to a Plan being prepared.	L & S Commission to lead other stakeholders integrally involved.
Uncoordinated land use		
Absence of Board	Reappoint Board – O. P.	GoG – o. P. NPC/others to lobby.
Limited Information	Collate information; baseline studies.	NPC, UG, EPA & others.
Weak Institutional Capacity	More funding needed/funding strategy.	NPC, GoG/Donors & others.
Limited Infrastructure	More funding needed/funding strategy.	NPC, GoG/Donors & others.
No Management Plan	Start a Management Planning Process.	NPC, EPA, Board & others.
Uncoordinated Planning	Reappoint Board & start a Management Planning Process.	GoG, NPC, EPA, Board & others.
No Monitoring/Enforcement	Start Management Planning Process.	NPC, GoG/Donors & others.
No Marketing Strategy	Develop marketing strategy – Plans.	NPC, GTA & others.
Potential conflict between Conservation and sustainable use	Clear policy guidance on Kaieteur National Park.	GoG, NPC & others to lobby.
No clear Research Policy on Kaieteur	Policy to open Kaieteur to research. Develop research strategy.	GoG, EPA. NPC, EPA, UG & others.
Health Issues	Health Facility & Personnel. Education & Awareness.	NPC & Ministry of Health/RDC & others.
Insufficient involvement of local communities	Develop a strategy with local communities for their involvement and participation.	GoG (NPC, EPA, MoAA & others).
Poor communication between management & communities		

Unresolved Land Rights	Develop good working relations with communities. Play a facility role.	NPC, Board & others. NPC, Board & others. Including Touchau Council & Community Organizations.
Land and Water Pollution	Education and Awareness, Monitoring, Enforcement.	NPC, EPA, GGMC, RDC & others.
Haven for criminals Criminal activities/security	Security facility and presence in park.	GPF, NPC.
High Cost of Travel	Work with airlines to develop schedules. Offer overnight accommodations.	NPC & GTA/THAG, PAOA NPC, GTA
Limited Access	Improve existing trails/over land routes.	NPC.
Poor Communication	Radio set at Park and Georgetown.	NPC – GoG & Donors.
Funding	Develop strategic and operational plans – Funding Strategy.	NPC & KNP Board. Donors

Questions and Discussion

Ramesh Lilwah

There is a policy on research. EPA has a policy on research in the country. UNDP supported research priority identification which needs to be strengthened.

Annette Arjoon

A system must be put in place for research. Like Shell Beach, Kaieteur should collect information and identify research priorities.

Melina Kalamandeen presented on behalf on Shell Beach Group.

SHELL BEACH		
Problems	Action/Output	Stakeholders
Sea Turtle Mortality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collaborative effort with Ministry of Fisheries & Coast Guard. ▪ Enforcing no netting zones. ▪ Secondary camp – additional wardens. ▪ Awareness before season starts. ▪ Sourcing of resource to manage park. 	Fishermen, National Agencies Local Communities Donors Ministry of FCL Indigenous NOG's
Poor Economic Potential	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build capacity to undertake and manage small enterprises. ▪ Business development unit 	Local communities, Donors Private Sector General Public RDC Ministry of Education & Amerindian

Lack of Empowerment	in Region 1. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Promote Shell Beach as brand on large scale. ▪ Focus on developing existing resources. 	Affairs Indigenous NGO's Local Communities CDC Private Sector Public Ministry of Amerindian Affairs Government Agencies Indigenous NGO's
Loss of Cultural Values.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Awareness of local communities of their influence on the resources (people who's one problem becomes a solution). ▪ Awareness of value of resources and market potential. ▪ Strengthen local governance structure. ▪ Involvement of local communities. ▪ Setting up cultural institutions. ▪ Strong awareness drive. ▪ Promotion of cultural activities. ▪ Documentations of local knowledge. 	Indigenous NGO's Ministry of Amerindian Affairs Amerindian Res. Unit Ministry of Culture & Education Local communities Researchers

After consideration of the Actions, the Shell Beach Group coded each action with a symbol which assigned each action to one of the following Programmes:

- Biodiversity Conservation.
- Public Awareness and Education
- Community Programme (which included economic development).
- Small Grants Programme
- PA administration, funding and management.

Mike noted that this is a very common and very typical division of actions in Protected Areas around the world (although often a small grants programme is included within Community Programmes). It therefore reflects the natural division of functions of any well-managed protected area. This is also often how staff are structured, as each Programme requires staff with a different kind of background, qualification and set of skills.

It does not matter if actions within a particular programme are from different areas. For instance it is more sensible that public awareness actions on marine turtle conservation and, for instance, economic development, are in the same programme, because the skills and approaches required for each are the same – only the subject matter is different. Much better, then for a specialist in Public Awareness to take on all such actions than for a marine biologist to do public awareness on sea turtle conservation, because that will not be their specialism (although of course they would define the goals and information required for such an awareness programme).

Session 8: Technical Training on Management Tools – Tool 4, the Zoning Plan

Introduction

Mike explained the basic principles of zoning. The standard categories of the IUCN Zones are now internationally adopted and used for most Protected Areas.

In the previous workshop specifically on Zoning, the Shell Beach Study Area was used as an example for the exercises. The conclusion of the workshop was:

- Overall Zone – Category 6, Managed resource protected area.
- Beach Area - Category 4 – Species Management Area (in order to protect and manage the breeding habitat of the marine turtles).

In general, the previous workshop concluded that Category 6 is likely to be the predominant zone for most PAs in Guyana because it allowed sympathetic and sustainable use of the PAs resources for the benefit of local stakeholders.

Presentation: Zoning at Kaieteur National Park - Shyam Nokta

Shyam provided the delegates with some background information about Kaieteur to provide context for the discussions.

Shyam presented a PowerPoint, outlining the zoning to date for Kaieteur National Park. The PowerPoint showed several artists drawing as overlays of key development plans, and other physical and biological information as it related to the immediate surrounding of Kaieteur Falls. The PA had not yet been zoned according to the IUCN categories.

Questions and Discussion

The aim of the discussion was to try and identify which IUCN categories best suited Kaieteur. A lengthy discussion ensued and revealed that there was a number of categories and combination of the IUCN System to which Kaieteur could fit. There appeared to be no obvious category into which it fitted and reference to the original PA objectives did not help complete the categorization.

Mike Harding commented that this was one of few PAs he had come across where the process appeared to be so difficult.

Overall, it was felt that category 6, managed resource protected area could be considered the predominant category, but also category 5, protected landscape would be appropriate because the park was originally designated for landscape and recreational values.

It was generally agreed the area around the falls should probably be zoned as category 4, a Species and Habitat Management Area, in order to protect the

endemic species and the unique habitats associated with the humid conditions around the falls. These were of international importance.

Ramesh Lilwah from the EPA stated that he believed that the visitor facilities were too close to the falls and were within what should be the Category 4 area as a prime area for endemics and Falls habitat. His view was that the facilities should be set further away and out of this zone, and that the area of the Falls should be as free of human impact as possible. The level of development is still low and the area could be rehabilitated.

Mike Harding agreed and thought this a sensible suggestion. He suggested the area to the north of the river might be sufficient distance away and yet still be within reach of the Falls.

Ramesh's view would go forward to any further consideration of plans for development of the visitor facilities at Kaieteur.

Session 9: Examining The Management Plan Process

In this brief session, the appropriateness or otherwise of the new IUCN/GTZ management plan format for Guyana's Protected Areas.

Bearing in mind participants' limited experience of management planning in general and the Four Tools format specifically, there was general agreement that this was an appropriate methodology.

However, there were certain caveats:

- That whatever process is chosen, full stakeholder participation, the building of TRUST, and extensive consultation are essential and primary ingredients of any management plan.
- That in any process, full account should be taken of the experience gained in the establishment and planning of protected areas already undertaken in Guyana, most notably at Iwokrama, the Kanuku Mountains and Shell Beach.
- That we should also learn from broader national experience, with examples of the National Development Strategy and Poverty Reduction Strategy approach identified.

4. WORKSHOP SUMMARY

Mike Harding summarized some of the key points of the workshop.

Management Planning is a detailed and time-consuming process. Hence at this workshop we can only give a flavour for what is done.

We began with some presentations that outlined how plans have evolved from the early days, which was highly scientific and deterministic, and understood that there's a need for modern and flexible methodology which involved stakeholder relations.

There were some presentations on management planning in various situations in Guyana and Central America which allowed us to see how the process worked.

There are two key features of successful planning:

(1) On the longer time-scale, to undertake detailed and extensive consultations with stakeholders and to gather basic biological, human/social information and

(2) Need for large amounts of resources, both in terms of people and funds, in order to do proper co-operative planning and management that involved full stakeholder participation.

Then we undertook some exercises to demonstrate the Management Planning Process. Because this process is time consuming, we were only able to complete a short selection of the components of the full process.

First an attempt was made to pull together the basic Information (Technical) Dossier. Eventually we concluded that not enough was known about the PAs, and some delegates felt that a meaningful Management Planning process could not go ahead with current information, more so for Shell Beach than Kaieteur. Despite this however, some progress in planning was made and we may want to revisit this conclusion.

Then we looked at the Legal Dossier and concluded that although it was not everyone's cup of tea, analyzing in detail the legal framework and all the laws that affect a PA is essential for PA Management. Three key factors emerged:

- (1) The need for accurate and reliable legal advice to interpret the existing situation
- (2) The fact that full coverage in laws is mostly incomplete to assist effective PA Management
- (3) The issue of indigenous people's rights needs more definition and clarity to allow stakeholders to manage PAs effectively.

Then we commenced the Strategic Planning component. This section requires full stakeholder participation. We identified objectives for the PAs, a surprisingly difficult exercise. Then we undertook a stakeholder analysis. Understanding who the players are in the region, how the PA affects their well-being, and how they as a group impact upon the park, is an essential step in any management process.

Then we analyzed the problems and opportunities of the PAs. Problems were grouped and diagrams drawn to illustrate the links between them. For each problem/group, stakeholders were identified who can help address them. We looked at a programme of action aiming to achieve the PA objectives through addressing the problems.

The actions were then arranged into Programmes of similar, themed actions. The Shell Beach programmes are:

- Awareness & Education
- Biodiversity Conservation
- Community Programmes
- Small Grants Programme (often combined with the above).
- Management/Admin/Funding

These are usually the programmes that most PAs end up organizing their work into.

Then, through a presentation by Shyam, we undertook a zoning by IUCN Category for Kaieteur. It The PA did not fit neatly into the categories although it was generally agreed that the Falls and the habitat immediately surrounding would be best zoned as Category 4 Species/habitat Management Zone because of the endemic species and unique humid habitats found here.

Finally, delegates broadly adopted the Four Tools approach for Guyana but emphasized the need to incorporate valuable in-country experience into the process.

Overall I hope we were able to illustrate the key components of the Management Planning process, in particular the links and pathways from objectives to problems/gaps to actions and programmes. And throughout the need to take into consideration the interests of stakeholders and need to involve them throughout the process.

Participants should now have a range of resources available:

- The workshop report
- The IUCN handbook
- The Workbook that FFI has produced.

Together, these materials and your experience in the past four days should equip you to undertake planning in your areas.

Mike Harding then invited everyone to complete the workshop evaluation questionnaire.

APPENDIX 1: PRESENTATIONS

APPENDIX 2: WORKSHOP EVALUATION