

REGIONAL TECHNICAL WORKSHOP
«*MANAGEMENT PLAN PEER REVIEW*»
Rabat, Morocco, 20-22 June 2005
FINAL REPORT



1 **Introduction**

1.1 **Opening**

Youssef Slaoui, MedWetCoast (MWC) Morocco project manager, opened the seminar on behalf of the Moroccan Ministry of Territory Planning, of Water and of the Environment (MATEE) by welcoming the participants to Rabat. He presented the arrangements and logistics for the seminar and invited the participants to introduce themselves.

Besides the technical representatives of the MedWetCoast national components, the meeting is also attended by a number of experts from other projects and countries (Cape Verde GEF protected area project, Socotra Conservation project, RSCN Jordan, IUCN Wescana, Moroccan GEF Transhumance project), thereby allowing for various experiences and lessons from other countries and other projects to be presented and shared (see List of Participants in [annex 1](#)).

The agenda is attached in [annex 2](#).

1.2 **Objectives of the workshop**

Sylvie Goyet, MedWetCoast Regional Coordinator, presented a brief outline of the MedWetCoast project. She then recalled the purpose of the Management Plan Peer Review exercise (MPPR) in the context of the MedWetCoast project, i.e. the exercise is part of the '**knowledge management**' component of the MedWetCoast process and will complement the final evaluation due to be undertaken in 2006. The MPPR exercise aims at:

- a) documenting the process that has been followed and engaged in the MWC countries in the preparation, drafting and follow up of the site management plans (MP) and; at the same time,
- b) consolidating lessons learned and critical examples on that subject. The final report will constitute one contribution to the 'lessons learned' outcome of the MedWetCoast project;
- c) providing suggestions and recommendations for developing and/or finalizing the management plans for those few MWC sites that have not had a final and approved document yet and for informing the review process in the other cases; and
- d) informing the future preparation or updating of management plan guidelines. As such, the report of the activity will be widely distributed (IUCN, Ramsar, WWF, etc).

She also pointed out that this workshop is a technical one, gathering management plan practitioners and MWC experts that have been directly involved in the preparation of the MWC site management plans. She also welcomed the participation of other projects and protected area specialists.

She explained that the workshop specifically aims at:

- a) presenting the management planning process that has been undertaken in the respective sites and countries;
- b) reviewing, discussing and commenting on the initial findings of the review team and on key issues relevant to the process;
- c) exchanging experience, best practice and lessons across the MWC network and with outside partners, thereby contributing to 'closing the circle'.

1.3 **Developing Management Plans: what the guidelines say!**

Tarek Abulhawa, **IUCN Jordan/WESCANA**, introduced himself and the work of IUCN and experts that have been working for decades on Protected Area (PA) management. He cautioned that the guidelines are here to set the framework for the PA programme and are not meant to be prescriptive. He presented a definition of a protected area. He also pointed out that the definition itself implies that a protected area does not need to be centrally managed by authorities. Increasingly, the IUCN is trying to encourage community-based and even private management of protected areas. He informed that the percentage of protected areas coverage in the world is growing (more than 3% today) but that a latest World Bank study analyzed that **only 1% of the PAs are effectively managed**. For the marine ecosystem, less than 1% is managed under a Marine Protected Area designation.

He presented the IUCN PA categories, pointing out that 2 new categories have been introduced. The IUCN category system can help all of the countries speak the same language in terms of status and terminology.

He then referred to the series of guidelines produced by IUCN about management planning. He stressed that the development of a management plan has to be **part of a process**, looking into the future and providing a **mechanism for thinking and solving the problems** as well as promoting discussion. The plan also has to set some standards as to what is acceptable and what is not acceptable, in the concept of '**Acceptable Change**'. It has to be holistic and integrated, promoting benefits beyond boundaries.

He stressed the benefits of management planning as:

- improved **management** of the protected areas;
- improved **use of financial and staff resources**;
- increased **accountability**; and
- improved **communication** – the management plan is a very effective communication tool.

He reminded that " *management plans are essential if protected areas are to be effectively conserved and the stakeholders are to become genuine partners*" (line which is stated at the back of the IUCN PA guidelines)

IUCN has identified a number of requirements for successful plan preparation and he invited the participants to refer to the guidelines. He particularly emphasized the need to **increase capacity of the staff** as well as the sense of **ownership** that must be imparted to the local stakeholders. He cautioned that a MP should not have everything. He related the context within which the plan must operate, one of regional integration, allowing for linkages to the national systems and plans, and referring to a clear framework of approved policies.

"a MP must have precision with flexibility, be comprehensive yet with simplicity, include specific management orientations yet allow for ease of understanding by the public. It is an information document and must clearly identify the objectives, the actions and the strategies to implement the vision on the site".

He emphasized the need to identify resources for the process and beyond. But also, he highlighted that one ought not to wait until the plan is developed to identify who will implement it; this must be considered and reviewed early on in the process.

He presented the 13 planning steps of IUCN and the suggested IUCN format for the content of the draft plan. He highlighted that the guidelines are not here to limit you in any way, but recommended creativity and initiatives, cautioning that the plan should not be viewed as a final document; it is all about adjusting.

The Thirteen Planning Steps

1. Pre-planning – decision to prepare a Management Plan, appointment of planning team, scoping of the task, defining the process to be used
2. Data gathering – issues identification, consultation
3. Evaluation of data and resource information
4. Identification of constraints, opportunities and threats
5. Developing management vision and objectives - LACn
6. Developing options for achieving vision and objectives, including zoning
7. Preparation of a draft Management Plan
8. Public consultation on the draft Management Plan
9. Assessment of submissions, revision of draft Management Plan, production of final plan
10. Approval or endorsement of Management Plan
11. Implementation
12. Monitoring and evaluation
13. Decision to review and update Management Plan; accountability considerations

In terms of implementation, he pointed out that there are different approaches to moving to practical actions and these are either integrated in the plan or annexed to it in the form of annual plans for instance. Implementation approaches can be strategized in three ways:

- 1) **by zones**, i.e. different strategies for different zones;
- 2) **by objectives**, i.e. a set of actions for each objective;
- 3) **by projects**, i.e. a prioritized series of projects

He pointed to the need for appropriate monitoring and presented various techniques and tools for doing so.

He concluded by presenting the structure and mission of IUCN, in particular through the newly regional office set up in Amman (in 1994) and suggested that the participants look at the IUCN web site and refer to the guidelines for further background information.

He concluded by distributing copies of a CD-Rom containing IUCN guidelines for PA management and documentation pertaining to IUCN.

His presentation is attached as annex 3 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

Comments and discussion

Sami Ben Haj, MPPR consultant, asked about the effectiveness of the **participatory approach in the development of the MP**, querying whether, at times, it would not bring about a more difficult and complex process, in particular when the sites are located in very urbanized areas. He asked whether, sometimes, it would not be more interesting to have a more directive approach. It was responded that the MP tool can actually be conducive to facilitating adherence of the population and stakeholders to the management actions, if a participatory approach is undertaken. Fostering a sense of ownership requires a lot of effort but is also a warrant of sustainability. If insufficient effort is deployed, the local population may not be fully supportive and involved. As such, trying to bypass or quickly go through the process, could be detrimental. Though T. Abulhawa agreed that the process has indeed to be tailored to the site and the context, he promoted 'never too much and never too little' effort for involving the population.

Marc Lutz, conservation expert from the Station Biologique de la Tour du Valat, France, referring to the MWC experience, suggested that the **timeframe for developing MPs is often too short** and that **funding agencies**, in many cases, underestimate the time needed for the process. A clear message should be addressed to them to that effect.

G rard Collin, MPPR consultant, provided a complement of information, noting that there is now an IUCN office in Malaga for the Mediterranean, working on the basis of a vision for the region, one of networking and linking beyond the boundaries of countries and themes and adopt a more regional approach.

Responding to a question by Maher Mahjoub, Chef du Service des Sites et du Patrimoine Naturel de la Direction G n rale de l'Environnement et de la Qualit  de la Vie (DGEQV) of the Minist re de l'Environnement et du developement Durable of Tunisia, the presenter explained that IUCN not only works on the production of guidelines, but also intervenes to strengthen policy and governance. IUCN helps facilitate the dialogue among stakeholders, and, working with partners, assist in terms of technical and resource mobilization.

2 Session I: Site Management Planning process

2.1 Report by the MedWetCoast national experts

2.1.1 Albania

Taolant Bino, MP Coordinator for Vjose-Narta Landscape Protected Area (PA) and professor at the faculty of Natural Sciences (Tirana University, Albania), presented "the management planning process in the Vjose-Narta" site. He initially informed of the main habitats that can be found on the site, half of which (in ha) is constituted by wetlands habitat. He pointed to the richness in terms of flora and fauna and its values in the Albanian context. In particular, he mentioned that the site is of particular importance for wintering water birds, with a record of 80,000 birds sighted in 1997.

In the MP, a zoning was proposed with 4 different sub-zones: core areas on the coastal zone, a traditional use area (including Salinas/salt pans and agricultural land), a sustainable use area (mainly agricultural land), and a development area.

Protected areas in Albania cover some 6,5% of the Albanian territory; there are 353 protected areas in the country, including national parks and landscape protected areas. Only 6 PA have a MP (and that includes the 2 MWC sites).

He pointed out that the MP has been the product of a team that includes the ministry of environment, the project unit in Tirana and Vlora, the regional coordination unit (RCU) and international experts from Tour du Valat and also a local team led by a coordinator working with thematic experts. He reported that a **stakeholders analysis** was carried out at the start of the MP process to identify and define the stakeholders and their interests, as this was felt lacking after the diagnosis work.

The MP process was carried out over a 1-year period from December 2003 to December 2004, signature is awaited for final approval. The process included 3 phases:

- a) initial phase: analysis of the diagnosis, identification of the gaps and other studies needed, discussion of findings with local stakeholders;
- b) MP development phase: selection of local moderators and thematic experts, meetings, analysis of stakeholders groups, preparation of required studies and thematic reports (eg. study of medicinal plants, hydrology, governance, etc.) accompanied by small scale actions to demonstrate to the people that things are happening.
- c) MP final phase: meetings, implementation of small-scale actions and synthesis of final reports, presentation of draft to the stakeholders and discussions.

The MP provides a framework for ensuring the integrated management of natural resources for a 5-year period.

Difficulties and lessons learned in the process include:

- no appropriate knowledge of socio-economic issues;
- lack of cost benefit analysis supporting the conservation of the sites;
- presence of still unresolved economic conflicts in the area;
- lack of skills, knowledge, confidence and awareness;
- lack of integration among government sectoral policies;
- lack of communication between authorities and informal users;
- still inadequate management structures; and
- difficulties to elaborate accurate budget estimations.

He informed that full implementation is now starting. The institutions involved today are the MWC project and the Forestry service of Vlora; tomorrow the MOE should define the structure that will be in charge of the implementation of the plan. In terms of approach, they are now developing projects according to priorities.

He concluded by pointing out that local community involvement is quite new in Albania and that work must be continued to strengthen inter-sectoral committees and involve stakeholders.

His presentation is attached as annex 4 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

Comments and discussion

Maria Teresa Vera Cruz, Programme Manager of the UNDP-GEF Protected Areas project in Cape Verde, enquired about the economic conflicts and whether these are linked to uncertainty concerning land tenure. It was responded that the conflicts are mainly about resource uses; users have always seen each other in terms of competition.

MWC Albania further explained that they are now helping the development of management plans for other sites. Violetta Zuna, MWC Albania project manager, confirmed that the **experience of MWC is now being used for other sites**.

Afifa Sfayi, director of the Observatoire du Littoral at the Agence de Protection et d'Aménagement du Littoral (APAL) of Tunisia, referring to small concrete actions, asked which ones helped mobilize partners and how these actions have taken into account the conflicts. V. Zuna responded that the design of the actions has been done in close collaboration with the actors on the site and cited the examples of pasture land management and reforestation as practical interventions.

Abdellah El Mastour, Chef de Service de l'Aménagement des parcs et réserves naturelles du Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte contre la Désertification of Morocco, asked about the definition of the term 'management'. He suggested to differentiate between 'aménagement' and 'management', two notions that are sometimes used interchangeably but should not.

2.1.2 Egypt

Magdy Khalil, Professor of Aquatic Ecology at the Zoology Dept. of the Faculty of Science of Ain Shams University in Cairo, Egypt, first explained that most of the 24 PAs in Egypt have a MP. He further presented the MP for Burullus, as an example of the process undertaken by MWC.

He presented the 5 objectives of the plan and then the corresponding operational objectives. He also presented some of the actions that were undertaken, like public awareness activities, training for fishermen and rangers, awareness of religious leaders.

He stressed the great socio-economic importance of fishing (60,000 T/y) but with 50 % of illegal fishermen. He spelled out the main threats in Burullus: rapid increase of reed beds, bird hunting, over-fishing, inflow of drainage water. He emphasized also that even if there are no data available concerning the number of killed birds, the pressure on animals is sufficient to make them very shy: this is a question to consider if ecotourism/bird watching would be developed.

His presentation is attached as annex 5 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

Comments and discussion

M. Lutz asked about the nature of 'unsustainable hunting' at the site. It was responded that hunting is a traditional use, practiced as an alternative to fishing.

2.1.3 Lebanon

Maya Abboud, site manager of the MWC Lebanon Aammiq Wetland, started with a map of Lebanon and the system of PA, pointing out the system provides for a good representation of the various ecosystems and habitats. She explained that MPs have been prepared for 3 PAs and that MWC is working on 2 sites. At present, the 7 nature reserves constitute 6% of the territory. In addition to the nature reserves decided by law, some sites are identified through ministerial decisions and decrees. Each nature reserve receives 60 to 80,000USD per year from the Government. A framework law on environment is being developed covering both public and private lands and would include incentives for private landowners. Tyr is a nature reserve by law, while Aammiq is a private land - this is Lebanon's first initiative to work with private land.

Referring to a map, she then presented the zoning of Tyr – the tourism section, the strict conservation zone fenced off, a Palestinian refugee camp in the middle with a lot of challenges, then an agricultural land and a historical site. She pointed out that the area is an important nesting site for sea turtles.

The MP process has included:

- 1) a diagnosis (led by the Lebanon university)
- 2) a participatory approach
- 3) a review (international consultant, RCU), a peer review, and comments by partners.

She emphasized that the MP was **drafted by the site managers** themselves.

The process started in January 2003 for 2 years, **simultaneously with implementation of activities**, in order to gain the confidence of the stakeholders. The Eurosite tool kit and the MWC guidelines were considered as most suitable and appropriate.

In terms of hierarchy of objectives, she explained that the MPs lay out first a vision (the site in an ideal setting), then long term objectives, practical operational objectives taking into account the constraints and then specific projects for each of the operational objectives. To **prioritize actions**, 3 criteria were taken into account: a) conservation, b) human implications and c) available financial resources. They have used a root cause analysis approach, trying to identify how each of the root causes would affect the various issues; then, specific projects were developed to address the pressures identified on the site.

Business plans are being prepared for each of the sites together with **economic viability studies** (ecotourism, organic farming, water resources for Tyr); these 3 components will feed into the business plan and the MP will be costed.

She then gave examples of activities undertaken on the sites: peoples' involvement, user awareness, monitoring and research, social development, organic farming as alternative revenue, etc.

She pointed to the MP constraints:

- pressure on staff : the same site managers were tasked to develop MP, implement MP actions, and manage the site on a day to day basis. On the other hand, it has proved positive, for they were then fully involved throughout the whole process.
- **Site diagnosis** was not as satisfactory as expected - an **integrated ecosystem approach** was **missing**. She explained that they have received good quality feedback from individual experts but no analysis related to the integration of the issue, eg. how the nature of reed bed affects birds, etc.

She explained that the Implementation process has been quite different in the two sites:

- In *Tyr*, a Government Appointed Committee (**GAC**) is responsible for the implementation, together with a management team. Financial resources include funds from the MOE, from the municipality through economic instruments (tax on the kiosks), and from MWC.
- In *Aammiaq*, the MoE, land owners, a management team, and an NGO (involved on site for 7 years) carry out the implementation. Financial resources at this point are only through the MWC project. She explained that they have seen a drastic change in the behavior of the local communities from the start of the project. On that site, the challenge now is to set up a sustainable management structure.

In terms of lessons, she suggested:

- Lack of resources was a constraint but also led the project to partner with a lot of actors;
- The Participatory approach has proved successful;
- The new focus in PA management at the country level from strict conservation to sustainable use.

Her presentation is attached as [annex 6](#) in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

Comments and discussion

Edoardo Zandri, Chief Technical Advisor for the UNDP-GEF Protected Areas project in Cape Verde, was very interested about the issue of establishing **protected areas on private land**, questioning

what are the main advantages that landowners would be seeing for themselves in the process. It was explained that the situation is very complex and that actually, the attitude varies according to the owners, and, as such, the project is dealing with different families in different ways. The 4 groups have a different attitude but most of them are looking for incentives, i.e. large financial incentives, for example like reduced heritage transaction costs. The image factor also is very important as well as their concern to improve land productivity.

Mahmoud Chihaoui, local coordinator MWC of Agence de Protection et d'Aménagement du Littoral (APAL) of Tunisia, asked how the refugee camp was taken into consideration. H. Rteil responded that the project has worked with the relevant UN agency, doing mostly awareness raising and small activities. It is a complex issue, with implications and impacts beyond the scope of the project. Asked about the **prioritisation process** that took place to select projects for implementation, M. Abboud confirmed that the prioritization was done mainly in house for the initial activities, taking into account 3 factors: a) conservation benefits, b) alleviation of socio-economic root causes of the degradation/threat and c) availability of financial resources. For upcoming activities, these will be discussed with the local stakeholders.

Fabrice Bernard, Chargé de coopération at the Conservatoire du Littoral in France, asked how the private owners were involved in the MP process and what arbitration is being done in case a family does not agree with the MP objectives. The MWC Lebanon site manager pointed out that the private representatives of the Skaff family were very involved in the design of the project; the other 3 families were brought into it later on. In terms of dealing with both landowners and local communities, the project tried to focus on job opportunities related to the conservation of the site and ecotourism, creating a link between the users (local communities) and the owners (private family) towards a single goal of sustainable use. She explained that the visit of the Mayor of Aammîq to Tour du Valat and the Camargue in 2002 was a breakthrough. He saw some very tangible things and came back with a different perception. When the activities started to take place - local produce, ecoguide training, handicrafts, economic benefits, bed & breakfast – the community was convinced. As a result, the project has seen a drastic change of behavior of the local population towards the project and the objectives of the project.

Mohamed Houmymid, coordinator of the GEF Transhumance /CBTHA project, emphasized two interesting elements of the Lebanese approach: a) the start of concrete actions simultaneously with the MP process and b) the raising of additional funds to carry out the implementation.

Asked about the nature of the GAC, H. Rteil responded that each nature reserve that is declared by law in Lebanon must have a GAC. The representativity is also defined by law. The GAC is the responsible authority and body to manage the site, according to TORs defined by the Ministry of Environment, i.e. administration, budgeting, financing, advisory for the implementation of site actions, channeling awareness to local stakeholders and decision makers.

2.1.4 Morocco

Abdelaaziz Houssayni, director of the Direction Régionale des Eaux et Forêts de l'Oriental (DREFO), of Morocco, first explained that Morocco has 154 'Sites d'Interet Biologique et Ecologique (SIBE), out of which the oriental province has 11 which represents some 5,7% of the total surface area. He emphasized that the Moulouya is in the process of being ranked as a national park.

He presented the characteristics of the Beni Snassen site, the pressures and threats and the main issues. He laid out some of the actions that have been engaged and explained that a process is now laid out to prepare the MP. He referred to a series of consultative workshops scheduled to draw interests and needs of the stakeholders in order to come up with a 'contract' with the partners. He explained that the project is now in the phase of elaboration of the MP document, which will be presented to the partners.

Zacharie Méchali, responsable des programmes Nord et coordinateur MWC-Moulouya of Enda Maghreb in Morocco, complemented by relating the process that started in the Moulouya in April 05, and presented the methodology that was followed. He first pointed to the complexity of the site in terms of administration and institutional oversights, also referring to the various habitats and

ecosystems and also the landscape value of the site. He mentioned that the fact that there is **a solid and active civil society working in the area is a clear advantage**. He explained that the MP process is now being undertaken following a phase of **'urgent measures' that was relatively heavy** in terms of actions and investments (engineering work and infrastructure for channeling tourism flow and to control access to the site). As intermediary operator, Enda Maghreb is looking at what needs to be put in place in terms of integrated management for the SIBE.

The MP process involves:

1. training to strengthen the capacity, inform the partners on the tools and methodology, set up discussion spaces and facilities, and call for small projects to mobilize the actors;
2. addressing priority risks through the development of a **priority action plan** ('plan de gestion prioritaire') - a pilot and initial process; and
3. setting the framework for developing a full MP.

In terms of management scenario for the site, he explained that the project is now considering setting up **a foundation**, which will be tasked with the elaboration of the MP, the mobilization of funds and partners, etc. and he laid out the proposed scenario and architecture. He pointed that the **set up of an institutional management structure for the site is probably the most important challenge** for the project to date.

Their respective presentations are attached as *annex 7* and *annex 8* in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

Comments and discussion

The DREFO representative commented that the principle of action has been to involve the local communities as much as possible. It is therefore important that a focus be put on revenue generating activities, which can contribute to alleviating, voluntarily, the unsustainable exploitation of resources. Z. Mechalie confirmed that they have relied on a voluntary mobilization of stakeholders and on actions that can be of interest to the local people.

M. Lutz asked Enda Magheb how they have facilitated the process of community involvement. Zacharie confirmed that Enda has a local team on site. He explained that, at first, their actions have been about implementing 'urgent measures' already agreed upon, mainly to do with physical structures and works. It was then realized that the need for local involvement would necessitate the move of the project to Berkane and a specific office and facility was set up to facilitate discussion and exchange with local stakeholders. In addition to participatory meetings (in the framework of and building on the local consultative committee set up by the MWC project), Enda has also held individual consultative meetings with people. They also implemented a 'call for projects' through a small fund set up by the project, targeting NGOs for biodiversity actions. Finally, they have focused greatly on the socio-economic aspects, eg. integrating the fishermen into cooperatives, also creating jobs and encouraging initiatives.

S. Ben Haj asked whether one has found the trick to mobilize the local communities to get involved in conservation measures. The representative of Enda Maghreb responded that it is necessary to really take time to ensure buy-in by the locals. A. El Mastour cited the example of the work currently in progress to turn the Moulouya into a national park and explained that the Nador area has been opposed to the decree. The project is then trying to carry out awareness and communication activities in order to mobilize the local communities. But it has not been successful so far and he recalled that an effective communication effort could help in that process.

2.1.5 Palestine Authority: Wadi Gaza

T. Mustaha presented the site and its characteristics. Wadi Gaza Nature Reserve has been declared a protected area in 1999. He recalled that most of the land on the site is privately owned and there have since been conflicts with the local communities which are against the protection status.

A problem analysis was carried out through a logical framework approach. A total of 47 projects were identified in the MP exercise. The plan was prepared for a 4-year period.

Constraints during the planing process included:

- lack of upstream information,
- uncertainty and instability,
- continued Israeli closure,
- weak institutional commitment, coordination and cooperation,
- conflict of interest with the local community, and
- land ownership.

He underlined that there is still not enough coordination and cooperation among government responsible bodies. He also concurred that, with no sovereignty and stability in the area, it is very difficult to aim towards a sustainable protection of the Wadi, all the more as priorities change both at local and national levels.

The MWC project ended 3 years ago and was followed by a USAID project that focused on physical infrastructures (eg. bird watching towers). Communities reacted negatively to the work, mostly because the heavy work that was carried out did not address any of their own basic needs. He concluded by confessing that the situation of the wetlands 4 years ago was better than today. But he reminded that the project has helped build the capacity of a number of people and institutions in Palestine and that the management plan process was successful in bringing about a methodology and experience to the Palestine experts.

His presentation is attached as annex 9 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

2.1.6 Tunisia

M. Chihaoui started by referring to the PA status in Tunisia, citing the two types of PA in the country, namely a) 8 'national parks / parc nationaux' (including Zembra/Zembretta), out of which 3 + Zembra already have a MP, and b) 16 'national natural reserves / reserves nationales naturelles'. The Forestry Division of the Ministry of Agriculture and Hydraulic Resources is in charge of the management of the sites, in collaboration with other national institutions. He reminded that the selection of the MWC sites mainly stems from the fact that this geographical entity holds some 35% of the Mediterranean species; it is also an administrative unit; and lastly, the sites lie on the north-south birds migratory route.

All of the MWC sites belong to the 'public domain' ('domaine public'), i.e. even if some land areas are in the hands of private owners, they are managed by public entities. The MPs have been integrated in the national physical planning system of the country through their inclusion in the 'Schema Directeurs d'Amenagement des Zones Sensibles Littorales'.

With regards to the format of the MPs, he pointed out that MWC Tunisia has drawn from the guidelines of the RCU, international standards and practices, and also the national experience of management plans and studies. The Terms of Reference that were thus developed were used to tender the work. The process was divided into three phases:

- 1) synthesis and additional diagnosis studies + review of management scenarii ; then discussion and validation with the partners, technical meetings between the consultancy company and the project team; then participatory validation and discussion (through the local advisory committee - 'conseil consultatif de gestion locale')
- 2) development of the selected management scenario and action plan
- 3) development of tender documents for the selected actions ('cahier des charges' / 'dossier d'execution'). **Preparation of call for tender and tender documents.**

He pointed to the complexities of the Tunisia institutional system in terms of approval of the actions and practical work on the sites, citing that almost all of the works have to be tendered and that the review and selection process can be lengthy and difficult.

He reminded that MWC Tunisia has used the national diagnostic coordinator as lead consultant in the preparation of two of the MPs. He also pointed out that the international expert has been working with the team throughout, thereby ensuring continuity between the various phases of the process.

In terms of key lessons, he suggested the following:

- the MP process is enshrined in the **Tunisia national context and process**;
- the tender procedures are in line with the legislation in place, but represents a heavy process which may bring about delays in implementation;
- the selection process in the tendering may not be the most appropriate, as the cheapest offer is generally selected, no matter what the technical review recommends;
- MWC Tunisia has always worked with consultancy companies ('bureau d'études') versus individual consultants. He explained that working with a consultancy company is a guarantee of coherence and harmony and also ensures continuity of the work
- Adding a third phase to the MP process allowed to have a direct link to implementation and execution of the main actions, thus gaining time.

His presentation is attached as annex 10 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

Comments and discussion

M. T. Vera Cruz asked whether there has been an evaluation of the management plan document produced and who evaluates the work. It was responded that the work of the 'bureau d'étude' is reviewed by the local MWC team, and then it is presented to the local consultative committee.

2.2 From Management Planning to Integrated Management of Mediterranean wetlands: experience of the Tour du Valat.

M. Lutz reminded of the set up and mission of the Tour du Valat (TdV), pointing out that the Tour du Valat has the luxury of having its own estate to test and experiment various management practices. The first management plan for the estate was drafted in 1981, a first management plan then for a wetland area. He explained that the organization is now involved in the 2006-2010 plan. He remarked that, though the team had tried its best each time, the process involved mistakes; he cited as example a recommendation in the first plan to reintroduce deer – which proved irrelevant. TdV has worked for 25 years to contribute to the drafting of MPs, also feeding into the Eurosite guidelines and the MedWet methodologies, both of which have served as a basis for the drafting of the MWC guidelines. The TdV work at first was about protected areas; now he emphasized that the challenge is to move to integrated management of the area, involving all the stakeholders and reaching out beyond the physical or artificial boundaries of the site. He cautioned that everyone has a different definition of what integration is about.

There, he referred to the latest **publication of TdV/MedWetCoast on 'integrated management of wetlands'**, published in the MedWet Series of 'Wetlands Conservation'. The publication spells out key components of an integration process, raising questions and providing a framework for carrying out the process, towards conservation objectives. Finally, he recalled that the TdV experience is being applied in various settings: Slovenia, Verdier in the Camargue, etc.

His presentation is attached as annex 11 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

Comments and discussion

T. Mustaha commended the publication and questioned whether **community participation** is the only and best tool for integration. In the case of Palestine, he explained that it is most important to look at the institutional structure and ensure support from the authorities. In Wadi Gaza, he explained that the MP process has included the community from the beginning. But after finishing the preparation of the plan, he explained that the communities reacted negatively to the site. He confessed also that, sometimes, external issues (political, private investment) can interfere with the process and provoke or exacerbate the latent conflicts.

E. Zangri confirmed that there is no real approach and no solution to **community participation**. It is so specific to the context of each individual site. Funding agencies have a short time frame, whereas work with the communities requires a long span of time. There is then a **conflict in terms of timing**. Sometimes investing in community participation seems like a waste of time; but he explained that, according to his experience, in the long run, it is good investment. Without strong ownership, the implementation of the plan is a nightmare, both from a management point of view and from the point of view of financial resources.

3 Experience of management planning : contribution from partners

3.1 Other projects and experience

3.1.1 Socotra conservation and development project

Al-Eryani Abdul-Rahman Fadhl, National Program Manager for the Socotra Conservation and Development Program in Yemen, presented the exceptional setting of the Socotra islands: unique language and culture of the inhabitants, inaccessible land for a long period of time, rich biodiversity and large endemism of the level of the Galapagos islands: reptiles and invertebrates are 70% endemic, largest population of Egyptian vulture, and unique marine biodiversity. He added that the site is among the 10 most important islands in the world in terms of botanical diversity and conservation importance. The site is a MAB site and candidate for WHS. The main sources of livelihood for the local people are: livestock, date palms, medicinal plants, and fishing. The 45,000 inhabitants have had traditional ways to conserve their natural resources. And he explained that the **role of the project has been to help locals continue the protection work of the environment**.

Conservation work started in 1997 and at first, all of the some 150 tribes had to be convinced. The project was supported by a GEF and now a UNDP and Italian Aid project. After the zoning (terrestrial and marine), he explained that it took two years to get a presidential decree endorsed and a master plan drafted. He reported that the criteria used for the zoning included: level of threats and importance of the biodiversity. The plans were made in full consultation with the local stakeholders. The project had local teams in place from the island. As it was the first project there, it required some bargaining to select the team and the staff. Baseline information was gathered by collaboration with local people and experts. Also at first, the work involved working with the tribes to formalize their social structure in the form of an NGO and legalize it. The project also helped set up an ecotourism society, a women society, and now recently a heritage society.

Implementation of the MP started recently with local management teams in charge. Associations are leading the process with ministry and project support. The objective is to try and help the associations raise funds, as well as improve the resource use, enhance education, and address the basic needs of the population.

98% of the surface area of the archipelago is now protected, through terrestrial and marine plans. He mentioned that, after setting up two protected areas (Ditwah protected area and Skund protected area), there were ripple effects and other areas became interested to participate (39 PAs are proposed). In addition, to mobilize resources and raise funds for the islands, the project set up an international NGO, the **Socotra Conservation Fund** established in UK and Yemen.

He reported the challenges that the project has faced so far:

- Hard to manage community expectations;
- Tribal conflicts over control of the project;
- Financial sustainability still a priority;
- Tourism not picking up fast enough;
- Government not yet convinced that the islands should be protected.

His presentation is attached as annex 12 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

Comments and discussion

M. Chihaoui asked what justified an intervention on the islands if the communities already worked in harmony with the environment. It was responded that the area became opened in 1994, when the military left the islands and when an airport was constructed in 1998. The aim of the project is to try and pre-empt the forthcoming threats and empower the communities to be skilled in dealing with the outside world and the expected changes that will happen.

A. Sfayhi asked whether the decision to work on the island was based on a diagnosis that would have been carried out over the whole country and in this case what were the basis for selecting this site? And to what extent the approach in Socotra can be used in mainland Yemen? It was responded that, in 1996, a large conference in Yemen reviewed the issue and decided intervention on the site. It was then decided to have the zoning plan approved by the President. Bensada Abdelkader, Protected Area Management Specialist for the Socotra Conservation and Development Program in Yemen, further emphasized that the authorities are committed to the protection of the site. He cited, as example, the effort of the project / society and the response of the government to change the routing of a coastal road.

Responding to questions, A Bensada clarified that, indeed, the project document did not detail the whole process to follow, the specific implementation of the project and the analysis of the issues. The **project, upon mobilization, has worked to develop the implementation methodology**. It relies on a **network of local project officers**, thus allowing a real access to the population and the tribes. The tribes nominated a focal person, which was the link with the project; that focal person in turn was provided with some means and resources to be able to bring in his/her community into the project. With regards to conflicts, he explained that the objective was to try and expose the team to different ways of working. The objective has been to point out to them what constraints there are and giving them the means to address these.

He further added that the development of the zoning plan took about 3 years, and was completely carried out with the local population. He reminded that the objective was to develop the capacity of the population so that they were able to develop the zoning plan and able to monitor the plan themselves. As such, he said that the project team has tried to put 'itself in the feet of the local communities', thus understanding and addressing their basic needs. With enthusiasm, he pointed out that the recipe for carrying out the project was given by the local population itself: the initiatives for water, education, ecotourism, Socotra Conservation fund, etc. were born out of their suggestions and efforts.

3.1.2 Cape Verde Protected Area project

E. Zandri presented the project context, partners and components He reminded of the slogan of the Socotra Conservation Fund: 'helping nature, helping people'.

Tourism has been identified as one of the main engine for development of the country of Cape Verde. The objective of the government is to diversify the offer as well as present other products, eg. visit of national parks.

He presented a number of characteristics of the project:

- the project has chosen not to invest into any study and analysis, until there is a local team from the park in place that is able to participate in all activities from day 1. It is only so, that one can ensure that the plan developed is feasible and will be applied. He reinforced then that the project is investing good time to develop local capacities; external consultants, who may be required, would work with the team. Studies will be limited to important issues and will be driven by management considerations. He reaffirmed that the objective is to ensure that the park authority and the park team are involved in the whole process.

He pointed that the work has first involved setting up offices, procuring equipment and training core staff; they have then moved with initial steps to develop key legislation eg. for setting provisional limits of the site until these are enshrined in decrees. He remarked that the first surveys on socio-economics and biodiversity aspects will be carried out within the next 6 months. Eventually, the MP will be developed with the local community, led by the national project team;

The project set up a website and he invited the participants to refer to it: www.areasprotegidas.cv

He pointed out that the project is working to ensure participation of the greatest relevant number of stakeholders: the staff who will be charged with the plan's implementation but also future PA staff; external local people, visitors, authorities and other stakeholders;

His presentation is attached as *annex 13* in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

3.1.3 Conservation of biodiversity by transhumance on the southern slopes of the High Atlas region

M. Houmymid presented a thorough and extensive account of the project, a 7-year UNDP GEF project that started at the end of 2001. The objective of the project is the conservation of biodiversity by reviving transhumance and enhancing rural development. He described the project area, and emphasized the high endemism of the area, the biodiversity and social/cultural values of the region, the constraints and difficulties, as well as the pressures and the threats. The area covers a number of various habitats and 5 biodiversity hot spots have been identified.

He explained about the zoning plan (key sites, transhumance patterns and routes, protection habitats for otter etc). A number of priority sites have been identified; 10 of the 20 sites have been provided with a small action plan. 3 of those would benefit from a designation of natural reserve. Further, the project has developed integrated management plans for 4 of the sites, including the Mgoun.

Without awaiting the completion of the integrated plan, he mentioned that a number of priority activities have been initiated, including: micro credit (for a total of some \$200,000), health work, set up and arrangements for a revolving fund, a whole program for herders, and a mobile school in partnership with the Ministry of Education. He pointed out that the project acts as a facilitator essentially, bringing about partnerships, synergies and linkages to technical assistance, financial support or mobilization of local partners.

He suggested that elements of success for the project so far include essentially the micro projects that got off the ground, and the true involvement of a number of institutions that are real partners. He pointed also to the difficulties, including some local conflicts, and limited capacity of local NGOs

Finally, he explained that, for implementation, the project opted to prepare a number of technical feasibility notes for 10 specific actions. These would serve to gather inputs and commitments and launch the action.

The above is a summary only; his full presentation is attached as *annex 14* in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

3.1.4 RSCN Jordan: experience of management of Azraq wetlands NP

Ma'en Smadi, Reserve Manager, RSCN Jordan, explained that the first MP for the area was developed in 1980. Thereafter, a rehabilitation project was carried out in 1994-96 under GEF financing. In 1998, RSCN developed the 4th MP of the wetland and in 2004, the 5th MP of the Azraq wetland reserve. He spelled out the various objectives of the latest MPs.

He highlighted a number of weaknesses in the process, in particular the insufficient amount of resources, and the lack of adequately represented habitats in the national park.

He also proposed a number of useful lessons learned, out of which one would note:

- the change in conservation approach: in the 70s, the approach was bird oriented while in the 90s, it changed to a more integrated approach;
- the emphasis onto the local level - local policies, recruitment of local staff at 90% - and capacity building activities throughout the process;

- enlarging beyond the site: he cited the example of income generating initiatives that proved effective not only at the site level but in the adjacent areas;
- finally, he called for the need to adopt an even more integrated approach, reaching out to those sectors, administration, people and uses that are not yet addressed by the project.

His presentation is attached as annex 15 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

4 Session II: Lessons learned and key issues with the MWC Management Planning process

Gérard Collin/Sami Ben Haj, MWC MPPR consultants presented their initial impressions and suggestions from the analysis of the MWC MPs, the field visits undertaken in May 2005 to Albania, Egypt and Lebanon, and the first responses to the questionnaires that were sent to each of the MWC national components.

In addition, and complementing the analysis from the MPPR consultants, Nick Riddiford, international expert who assisted the MWC Palestine and Egypt components in carrying out the MP process, presented some of his views and comments.

Finally a small number of key issues were discussed and raised in plenary in the second part of the meeting. These include: diagnosis, root cause analysis, ecosystem integration, zoning and buffer zone, nature tourism, business/financing plan, and communication.

4.1 Presentation of initial findings of the Peer Review of MWC Management Plans, Gérard Collin

1. The **sectoral analysis of the diagnosis phase has segmented probably too much the ecological and ecosystem approach**. G. Collin remarked that the diagnosis reports that were reviewed by the consultants present a very segmented analysis, with little information on the linkages, and the inter-relations between the issues. He remarked that, of course, the system is complex and therefore needs to be fragmented in order for the experts to better understand the nature of the issues, but thereafter, there must be an effort to integrate the analysis, making the link between the reed bed, the reed cutter, the market for thatched roof, the bittern that roost in the reed bed, and the quality and quantity of the water, for example. The integrated analysis then implies that socio-economic issues are streamlined into the analysis and not as a stand alone review. Such an integrated analysis should then provide a solid basis for selecting the conservation objectives of the plan and mapping the causes of the degradation (see below).

2. The **status of protection is not often explicitly defined or clear**. For example, he cited that some sites are protected under the forestry code, but that does not necessarily mean a protection status in terms of biodiversity and overall ecosystem functioning.

3. There has been insufficient analysis of the **local knowledge ('savoir populaire')**. Exploring this avenue can help establish closer linkages with the population, eg medicinal plants, traditional strains, etc. and also balance the biological values of the site attributed by the scientific community and the social/cultural values held by the local communities. He remarked that a project would rarely have enough of that kind of analysis and he emphasized that this balance between scientific expertise and popular knowledge is a platform for ensuring integration of the protected area into the local settings.

4. The concept of **ecotourism** is not satisfactorily presented or developed in the MPs. He explained that the consultants have found reference to ecotourism in all of the MPs, but then with few details. Also, he pointed out that the consultants were surprised and sometimes disappointed to read the responses to the question 'what is ecotourism?' from the questionnaire. He proposed that ecotourism be a topic for discussion in the next day session.

5. The limits are not always clearly identified. He remarked that **identification of the limits** should most likely include an analysis of the administrative limits, of the habitats boundaries, of the physical limits that the local population sets itself and considers for their daily activities and usage (eg. pastoralism), of the ecological limits, etc. He offered that it is important to identify the most appropriate

limits and boundaries, as it is on these limits that the management will be defined, which is then up for enforcement by law. He pointed out that the review often found some 'geometrical' limits but question whether these are always coherent with the ecological limits and the cultural, social and economic limits considered by the inhabitants.

6. The **zoning** is a fundamental element of a MP and must become a reference tool in the plan. The zoning is supposed to organize, in a spatial approach, the way that activities can be organized and that uses are authorized. He remarked that the zoning in the MWC MPs is not very precise and, as such, is unlikely to be useful as a management tool. The issue would be reviewed in the next session.

7. He noted that the concept of **buffer zone** seems to be a difficult one and one that has not been taken seriously in the MWC MP process. He pointed out that the concept and definition of buffer zone is extremely important because it is where the debate conservation / development takes place and where traditional uses of the communities and/or development will likely continue to take place. In the MWC MPs, the buffer zones are not given much attention, he said; they are sometimes curiously defined and often not provided with the appropriate limits and strategies.

8. He noted that the **financing plan** in the MWC MPs is generally **just a declaration of intention**. This is insufficient if one expects the management team to follow up and carry out the implementation of the plan. He suggested that the MP needed to include a more developed financing plan, not only defining how much but also defining who can provide the financial resources (local authorities, central government, donors, park resources, economic instruments, etc.). This requires a thorough analysis and intensive consultation.

9. All of the MWC MPs provide a list of **priority projects** or activities. The consultants questioned what criteria were used to prioritize projects. He pointed out that the conservation priorities have to be adjusted with the political context, also taking into consideration the interests of the local population (that are not necessarily consistent with the technical priorities defined by the experts).

10. Finally, he remarked that, in all countries visited, the consultants have seen or heard about other MPs being developed, building on the MWC experience. He cautioned that the capacity of the countries is still limited in that area and more effort should be deployed to increase training and build up a larger core group of competent resource persons in the countries, lest the work would fall in the hands of a very small group of experts.

He continued by referring to some initial responses that have been received on the questionnaires (80% of responses so far).

- **Landscape:** the landscape that is described in the MWC MP is generally presented as romantic sceneries. He pointed out that landscapes have to be considered from a technical point of view: understanding the dynamics, the inter-relationships, etc. and also appreciating that the landscape has a value for the local population and the visitors alike.
- **Research:** he remarked that mechanisms must be developed to select the research topics. He cautioned that the sites should not become the favorite spots for academic studies but the site management team should influence and guide the topics for research work.
- A majority of the MWC sites give priority to sustainable development, sometimes already in the prime objective of the MP. He reminded that the MP is being prepared for a Protected Area, and, as such, it would seem that the **priority objective of the MP must normally be one of conservation**. He cautioned of the implications of introducing sustainable development as a priority objective of the MP; these implications have to be analyzed.
- From «experiencing wildlife» to «a tool for a sustainable development», there is not really any satisfying definition for **ecotourism**. A necessary clarification is needed.
- **Popular knowledge** is quite important but not well recorded in the MP. This body of popular knowledge must be considered as a key entry point to encourage local participation and for ecotourism

- He remarked that a **law on Nature protection** is a necessary complement to a law on Protected Area, since 'nature' is not only found in protected areas.
- He pointed to a troubling 50 % of the answers recognizing that **economic interest** would be the main reason for commitment from local partners. This is a concern, as MWC is not a development project.
- The proposed implementation (most often along priority actions) spelled out in the MP may be realistic in **stable conditions**. What about when the conditions change (in terms of land tenure, in terms of law and legal status, in terms of priorities, in terms of financial resources, etc.)? He pointed out that care must be taken, for stable conditions often do not prevail and he encouraged a more **adaptive approach** to the management of the protected areas.

His presentation is attached as annex 16 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

4.2 Complementing the analysis from G. Collin, **Nick Riddiford, international expert** who assisted the **MWC Palestine and Egypt** components in **carrying out the MP process**, presented some of his views and comments.

1) With regards to the **diagnosis**, he remarked that the subject has **mainly be terrestrial**; there were no TORs for fish, aquatic invertebrates, or plankton, though it was found that, for example in Burrullus, there was a fantastic plankton population baseline already existed which could be used to track changes over time.

There, he also added that the timescale was not always appropriate ; eg. bird surveys were done outside of the key breeding and migratory seasons, this largely due to late decision making or funding approval.

The consolidated diagnosis reports are a compilation with repetitions and copy & paste **rather than a synthesis**. He recognized that it is difficult to bring together the different thematic diagnoses. Also the section with conclusions and recommendations is a mixture of descriptive statements versus true conclusions and recommendations and one observes still a lot of discussion going on in the conclusions and recommendations.

Root causes analysis is a weakness in the reports.

2) With regards to the **MP format**, he pointed that there were some early difficulties in accepting and applying the Eurosite MP tool kit, which was recommended for compatibility across the project. He pointed to a lot of **repetition** in the MPs.

Also, although he noted that the logframe had been quite well applied, there is a lot of **confusion over the objectives**, with a huge list of 'ideal objectives'.

In the MP operational section, he noticed **difficulties in prioritizing**, challenge in **linking the actual projects proposed to the objectives** and to the budget, and a tendency to overlook practical needs.

3) With regards to zoning and buffer zone, he noted that the MPs may have diverted from the analysis of the diagnosis and of the root causes and come up with zoning proposals that may be disconnected from the reality on the grounds that the ideal was not possible (because of a range of local constraints).

4) For **ecotourism**, he emphasized that there is a huge potential in the Egypt sites, in particular with reference to bird watching. But the constraints in terms of access and facility must be addressed first.

His presentation is attached as annex 17 in the CD-Rom of the workshop.

4.3 Plenary discussion of key issues of the MWC MP process, with inputs from outside partners

The agenda suggested that a number of key issues be discussed at the meeting, with an introduction from the MPPR consultants. The following issues were on the table :

1. Feeding of the **diagnosis** phase into the preparation of the management plans.
2. **Root Cause analysis**: addressing the causes of the degradation and identifying the impacts of the degradation (environmental, social, economic).
3. **MP team** tasked with the preparation
4. **Ecosystem integration** ('looking beyond the fence') in particular with the marine sector and with the watershed basin
5. Assessing the **value** of the site, both direct values (eg., biodiversity: threatened species where and how?) and indirect values (eg. medicinal plants, tourism, but also cultural value, etc.) and determining clearly the conservation objective of the management plan
6. **Prioritization of the actions** recommended + definition of alternative options and strategies ; definition of 'acceptable limits'
7. **Integration with the appropriate sectoral and physical planning** of the area and with the local/national institutional context.
8. **Zoning and Buffer zone**
9. **Business plan or financing plan** to support the implementation of the management plan
10. Analysis and definition of the **site boundaries**
11. **Nature / Tourism** , sustainable tourism , ecotourism : interests and problems
12. **Monitoring**: how to monitor progress in the implementation of the plan but also results and impacts of the implementation? (i.e. involves identification of baseline, and of indicators)
13. **Communication**: explaining the management plan process and products
14. Effectiveness of the **protection status**
15. **Implementation**: constraints, difficulties, successes to date. And what provisions have been made in the plan to ensure its implementation (institutional arrangements, participatory process, etc.). Who will be responsible for the implementation of the management plan?
16. **Conservation and development**

With time constraints and considering that some of the above issues were raised in the course of the presentations, the following issues were selected and eventually discussed:

1. Feeding of the **diagnosis** phase into the preparation of the management plans
2. **Root Cause analysis**: addressing the causes of the degradation and identifying the impacts of the degradation (environmental, social, economic).
3. **Ecosystem integration**: 'looking beyond the fence' in particular towards the marine ecosystem and also turning to the watershed basin
4. Assessing the **value** of the site, both direct values (eg., biodiversity: threatened species where and how?) and indirect values (eg. medicinal plants, tourism, but also cultural value, etc.) and determining clearly the **conservation objective** of the management plan
5. **Zoning and Buffer zone**
6. **Nature-tourism**, sustainable tourism, **ecotourism** : interests and problems
7. **Business plan or financing plan** to support the implementation of the management plan (including tools such as economic instruments, central government budget, etc.).
8. **Communication**: explaining the management plan process and products

This section of the report relates the discussions and the points raised; it does not attempt to draw conclusions or recommendations for each of the issues; nor does it try to consolidate or synthesize the viewpoints. This will be the subject of the report, since the regional workshop and the discussions are but one component of the Management Plan Peer Review exercise.

4.3.1 Feeding the diagnosis phase into the preparation of the management plans

S. Ben Haj referred to the guidelines, reminding that the MWC diagnosis component was divided into two parts: a) baseline or 'etat des lieux' (biological, cultural and social inventories), and b) a second

phase which consisted in an analysis of the values of the sites and a definition of the challenges, constraints and difficulties. From this analysis, the first management actions were identified and then the process of preparation of the MP was initiated.

The Diagnosis defined the activities and the threats upon the site. It has generally been conducted in a similar way in each country, i.e. through the recruitment of individual consultants specialized in one scientific or technical area. In addition, in all of the MWC countries, an international consultant or advisor assisted in the coordination and implementation of this phase. S. Ben Haj asked whether the methodology and approach that were followed proved effective? Whether there were any gaps in the guidelines and in the TORs? whether the resources that were allocated to this exercise were sufficient?

Referring to his personal assessment, S. Ben Haj explained that, at the level of the diagnosis, he felt that the socio-economic studies were not appropriate and not operational for the development of the MP. He pointed out that the socio-economic analysis remained a very macro analysis with little site approach and little behavioral approach. He regretted that there was little analysis on the linkages between man and nature, and on detailing the vision of the population for the site. Moving directly from there to the participatory approach of the MP is then very difficult. He emphasized that it is critical to understand what local people think of the site they live in.

M. Chihaoui further pointed out that the challenge in this phase has been to **keep the scientists under guidance**. He added that they had a tendency to move on with a scientific approach, i.e. one that requires trying to have a full picture of the situation before making any analysis, and as such undertook complete and comprehensive inventories of things.

E. Zandri proposed that the challenge is to find the balance between carrying out complete baseline studies versus focusing on the main biodiversity challenges without putting too much time and effort into a comprehensive diagnosis. On the other hand and referring to the experience in Cape Verde, he pointed out that there the Park Administration is really driving the diagnosis process and setting the limits. And the studies are then not only scientific studies but also an opportunity to involve local staff, have them learn about their job, their site, the communities, etc. E. Zandri also emphasized that it is very important to have local moderators and facilitators. Investing in and training people from the park staff is a good investment. One gets a better understanding of what the communities really have in mind, plus they are likely to trust a local facilitator more.

A. Khattabi remarked that, from a scientific point of view, the diagnosis studies in Morocco were well done. What has been missing is the consolidation of knowledge between the biophysical studies and the socioeconomic study to come up with an integrated and ecosystemic approach for the areas under study. As a result, at the end of the diagnosis phase, one still does not know what is most important from a conservation point of view and what is the main disfunctioning of the ecosystems.

F. Bernard reminded of the initial objectives of the diagnosis, i.e. one to quickly appraise the biological values of the site so that the project could move on with the MP and the actions on the ground. He suggested that:

1. It is useful to have a zero baseline;
2. One would need to teach the scientists to not be scientist and not draw lists and lists. It has no interest from a conservation point of view, he added;
3. Training is required to teach scientists to listen to other scientists, listen to the local population, listen to the TORs and listen to the team in charge;
4. Training is required to teach scientists to be able to assess the values; and,
5. Management teams should get down to doing things, and should stop studying; there will surely be lots of mistakes but, if followed and monitored, one would learn.

M. Houmymid underlined again the **need to take local knowledge on board in the diagnosis**. He explained that, in the Transhumance project, they paid due attention to this body of knowledge, pointing out that it is often eroded and must be revived. Local knowledge he added must be integrated with the scientific analysis.

E. Zandri proceeded further with the issue of **involving local people** and the extent to which it is possible and realistic. The big challenge, he noted, is to find ways to channel tangible benefits to the local population.

4.3.2 *Root Cause analysis: addressing the causes of the degradation and identifying the impacts of the degradation (environmental, social, economic).*

S. Ben Haj introduced that, within the framework of the MWC management planning process, the analysis, that was carried out following the site inventories, consisted in carrying out a listing of the main problems and summary explanations of these problems. The analyses of the root causes and the logical framework approach are suitable instruments for the development of the management plan, but they were not adopted in the MWC management planning process. As a consequence, the clarity of the analysis was reduced considerably and the choice a site strategy sometimes was difficult to appreciate. He further explained that these simple instruments are used to present, in a logical way, the root causes, the operational objectives, the actions, the activities, the indicators, and the corresponding budgets, all deriving from the identified problems. When developed further, the exercise can lead to a prioritization of these same problems, causes, objectives and actions while bringing up, for example, common causes to several problems or selecting common objectives that address several of the problems. Not using this instrument in the crucial analytical phase has been a major problem in the development of the management plans.

S. Goyet pointed to the need to develop a root cause analysis, upon identification of the key issues on the site. The root cause analysis, done in a participatory way, can help **ascertain and focus the priority actions onto the most appropriate pressures and threats, mobilize** all stakeholders to agree on the causes of the degradation, and **communicate**, inside and outside, on the objectives of the management actions: why the team is doing these particular actions? The analysis should also help **identify the impacts**, thereby better justifying the measures taken, eg. if the degradation of water quality of a particular river has quantified health impacts, then surely, the need to intervene to reduce pesticides coming from the fields nearby will be better understood.

M. Houmymid added that it is important to discuss the causes and have these socially accepted by the communities before moving on with implementation.

N. Riddiford cautioned that, in the case of MWC, it has been difficult to quantify some of these issues, whether causes or impacts, for there was no baseline. He reiterated that it is then important to have **local people participate** in this exercise to bring out the **local values** of things. T. Abul Hawa agreed that one ought to use better the knowledge of the communities. A **participatory exercise** at this stage is quite crucial, rather than being too idealistic.

E. Zandri confirmed that a baseline at the start of the project is quite important, but that the process should be **scaled down and rationalized**. External advice can help identify a few studies that need to be done; the baseline structure must remain limited in scope, for there are limitations in financial and human resources. In addition, he pointed out that one ought to put in place a **methodology that can be repeated in 5 years and by the local stakeholders**. This must be considered very early on in the process.

H. Rteil confirmed that it was important to carry out a diagnosis in Lebanon, for it was the first time that a baseline was carried out on the site. From the biological analysis, the MWC team was able to develop the challenges. She explained that they used a participatory approach to develop a list of the problems of the site. This initial table of problems, impacts, causes and potential mitigation measures eventually then turned into the operational objectives of the MP.

G. Collin confirmed that the RCA has indeed generally been done in the MWC sites. The **problem is one of scale: in time and in space**. He emphasized that the critical challenge is **to question behaviors**, eg. why do they hunt? Is it traditional or cultural? is it for food complement or a response to the tourists' demand? These reasons are often difficult to analyze and appreciate. He presented the case of the Cevennes National Park in France, pointing out that there has always been conflicts between the park management and local hunters, and this, he explained, because the Park had first

not devoted the appropriate resources to really enter in contact with the local communities and understanding what motivates this or that behavior.

E. Zandri recalled the example of the Socotra project. For 2 years, the project went into a phase of **training some of the local resource users who gradually became park staff**. Then the project brought international partners to work with the team. It **made the analysis of root causes much easier**. The team working on this consisted of 45 people, bringing then a wealth of inside understanding of what is happening and why. It also helped in the community participation component.

A. Khattabi confirmed that the RCA is normally something that would be done immediately after the diagnosis as part of the synthesis work. He pointed out that what has been done in MWC Lebanon for analyzing the RC is interesting and that MWC Morocco is starting to reflect on this.

E. Mahe stated that the root causes are well known. One must not spend too much time repeating the process. The root causes are known all over the world, and there is no need to do more analysis of them.

M. L. de Carvalho pointed out though that it is important to identify the problems at the site. It is on the basis of the RCA analysis and the impacts on the population and on the ecosystem, that one can develop the management actions. He added that one would also need to **know the motivation of the users and their limits**. He cited the example of hunting of sea turtle in Cape Verde. The Ministry has tried to develop actions addressing the why of the hunting, which has to do with food complement, in order to specifically design actions towards food increase.

H. Rteil asked **how far one should go, if the sources of the pressures are to be found outside** of the site. G. Collin cautioned that the work should not involve questioning too largely the whole world. He cited the example of allowing grazing in the Cevennes national park in France where this activity is fundamental for maintaining the landscape as such. The competition with the low prices of the sheep meat imported from New Zealand pushed the local breeders to abandon their activities. The Cevennes national park has set up with them a meat label allowing their product to be recognized and permitting, consequently, the landscape to be maintained. In Albania, T. Bino explained that they have done a thorough RCA analysis, with a table spelling out the main impacts and causes. He explained that the team then decided that some of the issues could indeed not be tackled by the project, but at least the project team was aware of all of the sources of pressures and threats.

S. Ben Haj referred to the Burullus site where the causes of the degradation of the environment stemmed mainly from poverty and urbanization problems. There indeed, there must be certain limits of what the project can and can not do. Burullus appears as the typical case where conservation projects cannot or should not be implemented as a stand alone, since the environmental problems identified and their major causes are so intimately inter-twinned with those more important development-related issues and the physical planning of the territory, thereby making it difficult to achieve any durable success for the project. He suggested that such a conservation project must be included as a sub-component of a larger integrated management project, which would first take into account the socio-economic challenges (primarily fight against poverty) as well as other quite as important components such as sanitation or physical planning of the area. He remarked that it would indeed be pretentious and futile to claim that the MWC project can take into account and solve the whole of the problems of Burullus.

M. Dakki explained that there must be a distinction between the identification of the impacts and the causal chain analysis. The causal chain analysis must be as complete as possible as it leads to the selection of solutions. He pointed out that there are many different types of solutions for the same problem. At the time of implementation, a practical solution can be the most appropriate, on the understanding of course that the practical solution can evolve.

H. Rteil also stated that it is important to know all of the causes. She cited an example in Tyr where the farmers were abstracting water from the surface waters. Analyzing in depth the water issue, the causes of pressures, etc. with hydro experts, it was found indeed that it would be better to abstract surface waters than ground waters. Had the team not gone through this analysis of the causes of the degradation, a different advice would have been given to the farmers. She also explained that, for the site of Aammiq, they are aware that, at this point, a number of pressure sources are outside of the

control of the team. However she explained that the team keeps the issues on the radar screen for when there would be opportunities to address these with outside partners in the future.

M. L. de Carvalho explained that his ministry recommends a revision of the plan every 6 years. The RCA will then be revised accordingly. In order to integrate the plan fully with the other sectoral ministries and plans, he also recommended that strategic impact assessments be conducted at the policy level.

4.3.3 Ecosystem integration: 'looking beyond the fence' in particular towards the marine ecosystem and also turning to the watershed basin + the issue of physical 'limits'

G. Collin introduced the subject, querying why some integration of ecosystems did take place or did not. For example, he explained that the consultants were surprised not to have much information on the marine ecosystem, the marine problems and issues in relation to the site, noting that the fishermen communities targeting the wetlands and those targeting the seas could have a lot in common. Also, when looking at the zoning plans, he continued, the maps are not so precise and the question is then one of the boundaries of the site. Quoting from the MWC MPs, he asked about the standard 1,5 nautical miles sea limits, asking if this is based on ecological limits or on administrative regulations? From the terrestrial side, the same applies with regards to the water catchment. One must question what is happening upstream? It is often not very clear in the MP how these issues are taken on board and he pointed out that it is often not addressed because considered outside of the site boundaries. He pointed to the difficulty to have a holistic approach to the ecosystems. Finally, he noted that the question of the relations in- between the sites, i.e. through corridors, is not addressed.

N. Riddiford also pointed out that the sand bars, in particular, raise a number of critical questions: currents, coastline changes, etc..

M. Chihaoui reminded that the RCU and the funding agencies GEF and FFEM requested the team at the beginning of the project 'not to put a foot in the sea'. The MWC national teams mainly respected that instruction.

E. Zandri confirmed that an **ecosystem approach** is the way forward. Understanding the ecological links between the various habitats and ecosystems has to be the long-term objective, even if realistically it can not necessarily been done at first. He complemented that, in the case of Socotra, trying to set **a straight line around the site is not feasible**. It is not acceptable to draw a line separating tribes and resources. The boundaries have to be a function of the traditional uses.

F. Bernard suggested that a balance must be found, between working inside the sites and addressing the surrounding issues that affect the site. It is then a question of priorities, which must be spelled out in the MP. He insisted on the need for **adaptability and flexibility**.

M. Dakki recalled that the problem relates to the root cause analysis: how to address a problem that stems from outside. **If the management addresses only the inside of the sites, then it will be difficult to have any result**. The management institution overseeing the site must be allowed to work outside of the park, within certain frameworks and contexts.

E. Mahe, referring to the concept of integration and limits, recalled that the working principle must be one of **territoriality rather than protected area**. On a given zone, a vision is developed. Thanks to the SIBE, the whole region is then organized and the SIBEs are then used as a tool for the physical planning of the territory. He explained that, in Morocco, the first protected area sites to be integrated in the SDAR (Schema d'Aménagement Regional) were the MWC sites.

M. Mahjoub reminded that, before, experts were talking of protected areas as discrete areas that were degraded and were to be protected. Things are now more flexible and opened up. With regards to zoning, it is a protection by objectives. The management team should not remain within the protected area limits, but must go beyond the limits. He referred to the **UNESCO zoning system, i.e. central zone, buffer zone, transition zone or development zone**. If the development zone does not have a status of protection, he questioned how one would be able to regulate the pressures there. He pointed

out that in Spain for example, this development zone has a status of natural reserve with more flexibility in terms of do and don't.

G. Collin pointed out that the definition of the physical planning of an area is also a political one and that must be taken into consideration. Further he cited the example of the Cevennes NP, where it took 15 years to do an ecosystem integrated approach. He noted that it requires a particular maturity, in terms of the team, the scientists involved, etc. Finally, he explained that, in France, a protected area is associated to a definition of zones. Inside the park, the different zones are under the management of the park authority; the periphery /buffer zone was in the hands of an inter-communal committee. In the Cevennes NP, the team has finally obtained that the central and the buffer zone are managed by the park authority. He pointed out that it took 30 years to do that.

4.3.4 Assessing the values of the site, both direct values (eg. biodiversity: threatened species where and how?) and indirect values (eg. medicinal plants, tourism, but also cultural value, etc.) and determining clearly the conservation objective of the management plan

G. Collin suggested that the MP often refers to 'absolute values' eg. threatened species as per IUCN list. He asked how one explains the globally threatened concept to local inhabitants and visitors. The work on identification of the values must be accompanied by some communication activities with the people. He further explained that the local population also grants values to the surroundings and to nature. He continued by suggesting that patrimonial values that are held by local population are very important. He cautioned that if these local values are not sufficiently taken on board, the project team might have some surprise thereafter. Finally, he suggested that it would be useful to regionally exchange information on the 'values of the sites', thereby determining, for example, how this particular species or habitats is threatened at the level of the MWC network and drawing recommendations that may apply to the whole region. This, he remarked, was surprisingly not done by the project.

A. Bensada referred to the need to find a balance between scientific and locally-held values but also ways of getting support for these values. In Socotra, he remarked that sea turtles are important for the people, for food but also cultural values. He explained that the project tried to link the turtles to the opening up of opportunities for tourists visiting the sites to view the turtles. That was not successful for there was an insufficient stream of tourists at the moment. He explained that, as a next step, the project considered strict enforcement. That too did not prove very successful. Recently though, the project has commenced a community-based turtle monitoring programme. He noted that this may prove to be a positive incentive for changing behavior.

E. Mahe cautioned that patrimonial values must be in line with reality. For the population, the patrimonial value is neither the turtle, neither the plant, but the washing machine. Working in protected areas in the south of the Mediterranean, he explained that one has to realize that the patrimonial values are different for the local population or the northern scientists. Finally he suggested that it is up to the governments to enforce the directives.

E. Zandri agreed that they indeed live in a world of mercantilism and that experts indeed have to talk the same language as the local population. Conservation experts have to sell what they are doing as something financially valuable that has a value. For this, he pointed out, there is a need to support the conservation argument with economic considerations. He reminded that, in Socotra, people did not realize at first that they had so rare species, now though they are proud of it and feeling proud about something is very important as well.

M. Abboud continued by explaining that Tyr nature reserve was set up to keep the beach as a public beach. The management team then had to find a way to sell the idea of protecting turtles. Going through the kids, the MWC team was able to change their attitude. The team sold the idea "you can help us if we help you". She gave the example of asking the kids what they like to do in the summer: swimming but in the summer there are a lot of jelly fish, but then the turtles eat the jelly fish. Then the kids were brought in to protect the turtles. She also cited the examples of the kiosks owners who were told how the turtles would not come if there is too much noise or too much light at night. ... and if the turtles do not come, then the jelly fish would come and the tourists would go away!. Today the kiosks

owners have been turned into partners in the conservation of the site and in the monitoring of sea turtles.

M. Dakki argued that one could always convince the local population. Some words though like 'protected' or 'conservation' must be banned. One must sell the idea of values of the site in a different way: convincing the local population of the merit of the sustainable resource use alternative that is proposed to them. He pointed out that a most difficult undertaking is to convince local authorities. Also a most serious constraints are the big investors and developers.

4.3.5 Zoning and Buffer zone

G. Collin presented the example of the biosphere reserve of the 'Cevennes national park in France' to introduce the zoning process. The limits of the Cevennes national park have been defined, in 1970, on the basis of a compromise between ecological parameters, administrative boundaries and local and the desires of the population. That first zoning was not ideal but was well fitted with the conflicting situation of these times. The nomination of the park as a Biosphere Reserve in 1985 has given opportunity to establish a new zoning respecting ecological limits. These "new" limits are said to be the "work space" of the Cevennes NP and BR: it means that the previous limits are still valid by law but the team now has a legitimate "right" to work in coherence with the logic of the functioning of the ecosystems. This has been quite easily accepted by the local population, because it has not been decided by law and also because of 15 years of field discussions with people. He also pointed out that the buffer zone is normally the zone where the balance between conservation and development is taking place. Buffer zones are usually subjected to a different regulatory framework. He then referred to the definition of UNESCO of central zone, transition zone and buffer zone. He reminded that the buffer zone is not a no man's land, but a zone of progression in the degree of protection..

A. Khattabi asked whether there should be any minimum surface areas for buffer zone? G. Collin explained that the IUCN guidelines define minimum surface areas for some key types of ecosystem, also taking account of the local communities traditional usage. For example, zoning will have to consider the range of surface area used by Bedouins for grazing. He confirmed that the zoning has to be in line with what there is to manage, what is logical and coherent. He also mentioned that, sometimes one has to abandon the concept of 'strictly protected reserve', because it is not compatible with the species or social requirements there. It is a matter of local context.

M. L. de Carvalho explained that, in Cape Verde, zoning is being applied as a function of the carrying capacity, and other criteria.

E. Mahe referred to the Cevennes NP and the biosphere reserves, pointing out that these schemes are possibly valid in African countries but do not apply to the Mediterranean context, where the natural environment in a strict sense of the term does not exist any more and in which spaces under protection have been modified by human activities for a long time. He further suggested that talking about central zone and transition zones does not apply in this region. He explained that, in Morocco, zoning is only about defining certain habitats on which conservation is applied, and there is no point in going further. Trying to think of transition zone and buffer zone is not appropriate in this Mediterranean context. He proposed that, in Cape Verde, the situation is probably different because there is no human activity inside the park and that it is an African model. He concluded by asking what zoning system can really be applied in the Mediterranean region.

H. Rteil responded that, in Tyr Coast nature reserve, the zones have been defined and established by law in 1998, according to usage and land uses then prevailing. She explained that the project is now trying to develop a buffer zone to the conservation zone and reducing the tourism activity in the buffer zone and suggested that the zoning concept, as a tool, has helped much in reaching conservation objectives.

T. Abul Hawa also provided some concrete examples. When the protected area of Dahna (210 sq kms) in Socotra islands were put to zoning, a buffer zone could not be established, but, through MOUs with production factories, agricultural agencies, etc., the project was able to influence the legislative and planning context and therefore the land use planning of the area. He also explained that, at times, there was a need to define zones inside zones, eg. defining zones of activities inside a conservation

zone. Of course, the concepts of the biosphere reserve could not be applied fully as per the definition; they were adjusted to the local context. In Socotra, there is no real core zone, since all of the zones have traditional usages; but the area still qualified for the UNESCO biosphere nomination, with a number of core zones, a transition zone and buffer zones.

E. Zandri complemented that the structure of the zoning system can also be strongly influenced by the financing that is available. He added that zoning can also be an opportunity to focus on certain priority areas. It can be most effective to concentrate efforts where one can have an impact; and then, with further resources and funds, extending to the other zones. He also reminded that the Cape Verde setting is very similar to the Mediterranean context, with sites heavily populated. And he confirmed that the zoning is not easy in such a context and that the task of designing a proper zoning system in Cape Verde will not be easy.

A. El Mastour reminded that, in Morocco, the zoning is usually regulated by law and has a lot to do with land tenure. He mentioned the difficulties to establish the limits of a PA even for political reasons: a great Biosphere Reserve project is foreseen in the cedar forest of 'Moyen Atlas' but the two concerned governorates would prefer to set up two PAs, one for each governorate ! The importance of a zoning with defined objectives could be of high importance when facing great tourist development projects (Morocco is exactly facing that issue at the moment). But he also pointed out that the local context and the parameters can change overtime, therefore the zoning system should evolve.

M. Mahjoub reminded that the zoning approach gives an opportunity to better understand the site and is a tool for implementation. He explained that, in Tunisia, they try to apply the concept in relation to the local context: a central zone where protection is maximum, and then buffer zones where activities are tolerated. The zones are organized as per the objectives of conservation.

T. Mustaha also reminded that zoning is an important tool for management and for communication with the communities. He remarked though that, when the site is very small (e.g. Wadi Gaza), the zoning can be difficult. It is then a challenge to differentiate between different zones and he asked for suggestions in that regard.

M. Chihaoui, referring to the Tunisia case, questioned what legal status the different zones would have and whether the zoning plan can then be enforced legally over and above any other legislative text.

G. Collin summarized the debate by referring to the difficulties involved with the zoning exercise but also the usefulness of the tool both for management purposes and for communication. He recalled some of the specific issues that were raised: can the zoning plan have a legal value that can prevail over other legislative documents and then be enforced? How to do with a small size PA? How to take into consideration the various biological, cultural, and socio-economic values in the zoning plan, together with the institutional and administrative context? How to have a zoning approach evolve with time and changes?

4.3.6 Nature / Tourism, sustainable tourism, ecotourism : interests and problems

As an introduction, S. Ben Haj confirmed that all of the MWC MPs do make reference to the immediate development of ecotourism activities on site, often considered as an ideal solution, but that the MPs give little details on how these activities will be implemented, what constraints prevail, what opportunities must be harnessed, etc.

M. Abboud agreed that ecotourism is probably not the ideal solution to solve all of the problems on site and that the issue must be carefully reviewed. She explained that, in Lebanon, the project team first looked at what kind of tourists are coming to the country. Taking that the bulk comes from Arab states, they studied the opportunity of including a short excursion of 'nature tourism' in packaged tours. At the same time, they are working to **enhance the availability of services** to the visitors (Bed&Breakfast, guides, etc.), involving the local communities. For each of the sites, the project team has carried out a **feasibility analysis and market study**, examining what activities can best be implemented. The objective is to have an 'ecotourism package' for each of the site. She offered to share the results when available.

Responding to a question on the definition of ecotourism, G. Collin referred to the UNEP definition of ecotourism. N. Riddiford further quoted the 2002 Montreal ecotourism conference and confirmed that there are a great number of different documents proposing a definition of ecotourism but that, generally, it relies on three key pillars: a balance between social, economic and environmental care.

<p>'Ecotourism is a responsible travel to natural areas that conserves the environment and sustains the well-being of local people' <i>The (International) Ecotourism Society in 1990 (in WWF International Guidelines for community-based ecotourism development, July 2001) endorsed by UNEP and WTO in 2002</i></p>
<p>General characteristics of ecotourism, as identified by UNEP and the World Tourism Organization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • involving appreciation not only of nature, but also of indigenous cultures prevailing in natural areas, as part of the visitor experience; • containing education and interpretation as part of the tourist offer; • generally, but not exclusively, organized for small groups by small, specialized and locally owned businesses (while recognizing that foreign operators also market and operate ecotourism); • minimizing negative impacts on the natural and socio-cultural environment; • supporting the protection of natural areas by generating economic benefits for the managers of natural areas; • providing alternative income and employment for local communities; and • increasing local and visitor awareness of conservation. <p><i>(in WWF International Guidelines for community-based ecotourism development, July 2001)</i></p>
<p>Ecotourism is travel to fragile, pristine and usually protected areas that strives to be low impact and (usually) small scale. It helps educate the traveler; provides funds for conservation; directly benefits the economic development and political empowerment of local communities; and fosters respect for different cultures and for human rights. <i>Martha Honey (1999) in TNC Ecotourism Development – A Manual for Conservation Planners and Managers Volume 1: An Introduction to Ecotourism Planning (2005)</i></p>
<p>Ecotourism is Environmentally responsible travel and visitation to natural areas, in order to enjoy and appreciate nature (and any accompanying cultural features, both past and present) that promote conservation, have a low visitor impact and provide for beneficially active socio-economic involvement of local peoples. <i>Definition adopted in 1996 by the World Conservation Union (IUCN) in TNC Ecotourism Development – A Manual for Conservation Planners and Managers Volume 1: An Introduction to Ecotourism Planning (2005)</i></p>

M. Smadi presented the RSCN experience. In Azrak National Park, Jordan, income generation from **ecotourism has become a conservation tool for the reserve**. The ecotourism revenues allowed to break even with the tourism costs and park management from 2000 onward. Local capacity inside and outside the reserve has also been developed. And this income generation has become the only income generating activity for the people in this area. He also gave the example of a facility formerly used by a copper mine company and that was turned it into a museum and an interpretative center.

E. Mahe reminded that the debate of ecotourism started from a concept of **solidarity**. Today, the concept involves a lot of various components, which is not a problem. The objective of a MP must not primarily be to set up 'physical structures for tourism' but the challenge is first to get a **local charter** agreed by all partners with a clear vision and operational objectives for tourism development and responding to the principle of solidarity.

E. Zandri pointed to the Jordan example and reminded that when it was started 10 years ago, no-one then envisioned that it would be so successful. He added that the concept indeed must ensure that the local communities do share the benefits. He continued by presenting what is being done in Socotra. Local communities have been trained to set up and provide services; today 70% of the visitors coming to the island are managed by the locals. The main effort has been to help locals position themselves to grasp the benefits of the activity. The creation of an **ecotourism association** is important. It has to be business oriented, transfer has to be done gradually between the conservation program and the society. He concluded by stating that investment in infrastructure can be limited; but investment in capacity has to be more important.

A. Khattabi reminded that ecotourism is a revenue-generating activity and a business. There is then often a risk that the activity is wholly taken over by the business and investment sector. The initiative, he said, must be integrated within a physical planning strategy for the area and a national ecotourism

strategy. He mentioned the role local NGOs should play in order to control and frame the ecotourism activity inside its normal and tolerated limits and cited the example of the association whose creation was initiated during the MWC diagnosis to promote responsible tourism in Cap des Trois Fouches, Morocco, and recently received a GEF Small Grants for ecotourism activity.

M. Houmymid confirmed that ecotourism could be one component of rural development in Morocco.

H. Rteil mentioned that they are trying to have the local communities retain the sense and the concept of ecotourism. She also asked about the carrying capacity of the sites? In terms of local society and environment.

A. Sfayhi reminded that, in most of the Mediterranean countries, tourism is in the hands of a powerful industry and, at the government level, a powerful ministry. She pointed out that it is difficult to develop ecotourism activities without involving them. But then, any ecotourism activity must be developed on ecological criteria and not be only a commercial venture. She said that there is a risk that the site managers are completely sidelined from the development of this activity.

H. Belhaj pointed out that the person that has to be considered is the 'tourist' in the first place. Surely, one must consider the products on offer and the interest of the communities ... but also the **demand and the 'tourist' himself**. She reminded that the visitor could also be an asset and not necessarily a client that will degrade the site. There are good examples of involvement of visitors in social and environmental actions on the site and it was recalled that **visitors also want to see a clean environment and happy local people**.

4.3.7 Business / financing plan to support the implementation of the management plan

G. Collin presented the subject and particularly highlighted a small number of issues: a) the need to spell out in greater details in the MP the cost of planned actions and the possible origin of the financing and b) the question of what external financing can be accepted: all? only 'green' money? No funding from extracting companies?

T. Abul Hawa explained that, in Jordan, protected areas cover 20% of their operational costs but that some nature reserves cover more than that. He pointed to the advantage of having an NGO run the management of a protected area, as it can open other doors in terms of financing. He also mentioned that trust funds have proved quite effective in Jordan and the country now has good experience with such a tool. Finally he remarked that small actions could be more difficult to finance than big ones.

M. Khalil explained that Egyptian protected areas have a mix of financing from visitors' fees, external donor funds to central government allocations.

E. Mahe reminded of the example of The World Bank, which provides support to environmental projects on one hand, and yet subsidizes huge development programmes that destroy the environment on the other. He pointed out that the community of experts ought to put pressure on the funding agencies, calling them to compensate the environmental wrong doings of the development programmes, that they support.

G. Collin admitted that the financing issue is one of paradox: funding agencies are not always coherent in their approach, governments require protected areas to raise the share of self financing yet do not provide for the regulatory mechanisms to do so, etc.

4.3.8 Communication: explaining the management plan process and products

S. Ben Haj highlighted that patrimonial management of protected areas implies many exchanges between the core team in charge of the project and a very significant number of partners. Many actions and activities necessitate communication: lobbying, activities of the local committees, meetings of negotiation with the actors and the local populations, activities related to awareness, forums, workshops, seminars, etc. Conservation experts use a particular language with a very complex terminology that could not be easily understood by their interlocutors. He further suggested

that what experts consider as arguments could actually lead to their being cast away and isolated, since few of the local stakeholders, political leaders or community representatives understand this particular language. Also, communication materials that are not conceived by communication professionals may also be less attractive and missing the targets and objectives that they were designed to address. Ultimately, he said, most conservation projects are not equipped with up-to-date communication tools. This major weakness has a high cost on nature conservation. He asked whether we should stay in an archaic communication system and take care of ecological issues exclusively between experts of this field?... Or whether nature conservation projects should be supported by adequate and professional communication strategies, which would bring about higher impacts in terms of target audiences and awareness raised. He also questioned whether key project officers should not receive particular training in communication? He said that, in his opinion, it could reduce the conflicts and the usual misunderstandings, which can quickly bring a project to failure.

Experts may have no or little experience in communication, at times then bringing about very detrimental reactions from the communities to the management actions that are being implemented. It was reminded that a) the MP has to be explained to stakeholders and b) the MP is also a communication tool.

A. Khattabi pointed out that the mere introduction of a large project in an area may bring about a negative perception from the communities and authorities, mainly if the expectations generated by the projects, either consciously or by lack of transparency or exact information, are not fulfilled. The need to explain and communicate is then essential, at all levels and particularly to the main stakeholders.

H. Belhaj pointed out that communicators like to talk of **targets or audiences** (she remarked that she prefers the use of the more positive terminology of 'audience'). She explained that the objective is to try and bring about 'a change of behavior'. She referred to the latin origin of the word 'communication' that points to two meaning: '**sharing**' and '**manipulating**'. As such, she pointed out that there is both a rational aspect but also an emotional component of 'communication'. What is important is **to support the technical message with an emotional message**, i.e. the translation effort. She reminded that we have audiences, that may know nothing about the project, and the **objective is to get these audiences to change their attitudes**. She then explained that the **first task is to understand what the people think and why they do this particular action. The behavior would change when the emotional change take place**. She referred to the posters that have been prepared for the Moulouya site. She explained that it is the message on the poster that carries the emotion.

M. Chihaoui echoed what all participants clearly felt in that it is refreshing to hear such a discourse. Referring back to the MP, he asked whether the objective is to communicate in order to inform the local inhabitants of its content or to manipulate and convince them, since one has to confess that the MP takes little of the interests of the local communities into consideration. He also explained that the MP is a technical document and enquired as to how the plan should be translated into user-friendly terms. He remarked that it is difficult to explain to the local people what the management team is doing.

Y. Slaoui explained that the MWC Morocco project has tried to do communication work for years, thinking that preparing a booklet and a poster would be sufficient. He confessed that it took the team a long time to realize that **communicating is a job in itself**. He then encouraged the national MWC teams to bring in professional communicators, in particular noting that reaching out to inhabitants, governors, or tourists does require professional attention.

M. Teresa Vera Cruz agreed that communicating is a job in itself. In Cape Verde, she explained that they have nice management plans that have been prepared at a high cost but practically nobody knows about the plans, even people inside the Ministry do not know of the plans.

E. Zandri reaffirmed that it is important to talk with the heart to have people listen. It is important to **equip the project team with EPA and education professionals**, especially for reaching out to the local communities. Referring to the question from Tunisia, he feels that the key is really to have someone in the protected area that talks the local language and that the community recognizes as one of its kind. To liaise with the local communities, the Socotra conservation project set up a large network of **extension officers**. They would go to the villages and talk to the people from local people

to local people. The project then developed a series of supporting documents and materials to enable them to carry out the message. He also suggested that communication has to be 2 ways. Someone has to be on the spot all the time and has to be seen as the focal person to whom the community can channel ideas, complaints and suggestions, and simply can talk to.

Finally, the meeting reminded that kids are the best communicators ... along with women!

5 Session III : From Management Plan to implementation

S. Goyet introduced the discussion and pointed out that the more the MP would have anticipated on the implementation, the easier it will be to carry it out. That means that institutional arrangements, financial plans, organizational issues, monitoring systems have to be considered as early as possible in the MP process. Implementation does not start when the MP is approved, but much before. In the MWC project, the 'urgent measures' were designed to already initiate the process of implementation and, besides attending to priority conservation actions, entrust local partners with a responsibility to contribute to the protection of the site. She suggested that if the MP results from a true participatory approach and the objectives (e.g. restoration of habitat x) have been agreed by all stakeholders, then there is a greater likelihood that the local partners will have a higher degree of ownership for the plan and will contribute much to its implementation (through leadership, in-kind support, etc.).

Referring to the IUCN guidelines and presentation, she suggested that there are different approaches to implementation: on the basis of the zoning plan, on the basis of thematic strategies (e.g. environmental education, as in the case of the Sidi Boughaba site, that the meeting visited the previous day) or on the basis of prioritised projects. She recalled that, in any case, it is critical to be able to monitor the effects of the actions undertaken, comparing with a baseline, in order then to adjust the management strategy to reach optimum conservation impacts.

She added that institutional arrangements for managing a site could be very diverse. Speakers at the meeting have referred to an NGO or an association, a mixed committee, a government specialised agency for protected areas, a Government Appointed Committee (in the case of Lebanon). Someone, she argued, has to be in charge and accountable, then also sharing the responsibility for implementation of specific actions with local partners.

G. Collin reminded that, in terms of management of sites, there is really no school to bring up protected area managers but for on-the-job training. He complemented that the MWC project has started to build up such a team of qualified and dedicated site managers and suggested that the host governments would need to ensure 'reproduction' and strengthening of the team. A. Khattabi further informed that the National School of Forest Engineers (Ecole Nationale Forestiere d'Ingenieur) is about to set up a specialization field (Master level degree) on management of protected areas. .

M. Mahjoub emphasized that the MPs in Tunisia are ready to be implemented but that they have noone to do it. He asked whether there is any recipe or framework of sound practice for implementation: it is best to solicit experts that have been involved in the MP and locate them on site for site management? Or should the project team be called upon to lead the implementation? Or if it better should be an NGO, what competences should it have?

E. Zandri pointed out that these questions should be addressed at the start of the preparation of the MP. He emphasized that one always has to keep in mind the implementation phase and that one should not think of actions and priorities unless one keeps in mind who will do it. This thinking has to come at the beginning of the MP process. Who will be using this plan should be the first question that the drafting team asks itself. All of the phases that have been mentioned earlier – institutional arrangement, financing plan, operational plan, monitoring, etc - should be part of the plan.

In Tunisia, M. Chihaoui confirmed that the project team has moved to implementation of the actions, putting in place partnerships with various institutions for specific interventions, e.g. if this is a forestry intervention, then the project partners with the forestry department. He clarified that the project team is currently in charge of leading the implementation but fully rooted within APAL (Agence pour la Protection et l'Aménagement du Littoral) that is currently in charge of the management of the sites.

The structure that is progressively being set up for local management of the sites will be instituted within the structure of APAL.

M. El Mastour agreed that it is very important to define the institutional and organizational structure for managing the protected area. He cautioned though that the MP would need to be integrated within the national and sectoral plans.

M. Khalil explained that, in Egypt, identifying who will undertake the implementation of the MP should not necessarily take place before the plan is approved. Some of the MP projects are very big and only the Government can be in charge of these. E. Zandri clarified that even if it is not possible to identify clearly who will do what, it is important to identify who will take the process forward, who will have the responsibility to identify resources, and develop the partnerships. G. Collin complemented by suggesting that there must be an entity that ensures the coherence in the implementation of the MP.

T. Abul Hawa clarified that, in the prioritization process, the overriding principle should not only be conservation. He gave an example where the project banned all pastoralist activities and the communities then rejected the project altogether. Also he suggested that, even if there is not much money, it is important to maintain a presence on site, showing that you are here with the people. Small grants can then help get things done on the ground.

M. Teresa Vera Cruz informed that, in Cape Verde, a law specifies that there will be an autonomous body in charge of implementation of the MPs. As such, the project team is putting all efforts to put in place the site group who will participate in the development of the MP and then ensuring that it is equipped to become the lead implementing agent.

On the other hand, H. Rteil informed that the GAC in Lebanon (Government Appointed Committee) can subcontract an NGO to implement the MP, but the overall responsibility remains with the GAC. In one of the countries' nature reserve, the Chouf, it is indeed an NGO that has been subcontracted by the GAC to take charge of the management of the reserve.

6 Session IV: Preparing the next management plans

G. Collin presented that soon will come a time when the next MP will have to be prepared for all of the MWC MP. Most of the MPs provide for an implementation of 5 years. That means that a few years before completion, work has to start towards the evaluation of the first plan and drafting of the second. The second plan requires a **re-analysis** of things, considering what has been done and implemented, assessing what to do with the actions that have not been carried out, analyzing the changes in the context and in the situation of the local communities, studying the monitoring results to appraise whether the actions that have been carried out have generated the desired conservation impacts, etc. All of this has to be taken into account to prepare the next plan.

He further explained that, in the Cevennes, for the first MP, they 'did the best they could'. For the second one, they merely used a lot of copy & paste, for there was no time for a proper evaluation and they started the process ... almost at the end of the first MP implementation. Indeed, he cautioned that a 5-year plan really becomes a 3-year plan, since it takes time to mobilize the people and the implementation team. He recommended that **starting 2 years before the end of the MP** is about right.

A. Bensaada explained that a first MP can be prepared without too much data and information but then focusing on the priority conservation and local mobilization actions. Baseline information and data, that will then be collected, can feed further into adjusting the management actions and into the development of the next MP.

M. Houmymid confirmed that the MP **process is iterative and continuous, as the information becomes available**. In the transhumance project, the team has started defining conservation zones, and then they conducted a series of targeted studies to collect information.

7 Conclusions of the seminar and closing

S. Goyet concluded by pointing out that the technical workshop is part of a larger MPPR initiative, itself part of the 'knowledge management' component of the project. She reminded that it should serve to inform the process of finalizing the MWC site MPs, and also updating and revising the MWC MP mid-way and adjusting the implementation actions. Finally, it is hoped that the inputs can inform the preparation of guidelines and case studies.

The MPPR consultants will prepare a regional report (scheduled for completion by October 2005) that will draw from the discussions at the workshop, as well as from the management plan reports themselves, from the responses to the questionnaires and from observations of the field visits.

She and Y. Slaoui, host of the meeting, thanked all participants for their contribution, extending particular appreciation to the participation of non-MWC and external visitors: Cape Verde GEF Protected Area project, Yemen Socotra Conservation programme, Jordan RSCN, IUCN WESCANA and Morocco Transhumance project. Their fresh outlook and sharing of experience has been extremely beneficial. Y. Slaoui invited all of the participants to keep in touch to exchange further technical information and experience. On that note, he closed the meeting.

Material available:

- Accompanying CD-Rom containing IUCN guidelines for PA management - distributed by IUCN WESCANA at the meeting)
- Accompanying CD-Rom containing a number of reference documents for PA management (WWF, TNC, Europe Commission, IUCN, etc.) and all of the presentations made at the meeting (MWC national components, invited projects) – initially distributed at the end of the meeting and finalized thereafter with this report.

Annex 1: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MWC NATIONAL TEAMS	
Country	Name of participant and contacts
Albania	<p>Ms. Violeta Zuna MedWetCoast Project coordinator Rr. Pjeter Bogdani, P.39/1, Ap.3/3, Tirana, Albania Tel.: +355 4 257627 Fax: +355 4 257627 violetazuna@albmail.com</p> <p>Mr. Eno Dodbiba MedWetCoast Project, expert Rr. Pjeter Bogdani, P.39/1, Ap.3/3, Tirana, Albania Tel.: +355 4 257627; mobile. 00 355 682055669 Fax: +355 4 257627 enod@albmail.com</p> <p>Mr. Taulant Bino MP Coordinator for Vjose-Narta Landscape Protected Area Faculty of Natural Sciences (Tirana University) Museum of Natural Sciences, Rr. e Kavajes 134, Tirana, Albania Tel. 00 355 69 22 97 125 Fax. 00 355 42 29028 taobino@icc-al.org</p>
Egypt	<p>Mr. Magdy Khalil Prof. Aquatic Ecology Zoology Dept., Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University Cairo, Egypt. Tel. 202-4185436 Fax. 202-4146591 Email mtkhalil52@hotmail.com</p>
Lebanon	<p>Ms. Maya Abboud Site Manager- Aammq Wetland MedWetCoast Project- Lebanon Ministry of Environment, P.O. Box 11-2727 Beirut Tel: 00961 1 976 555 ext 445 Fax: 00 961 1 976 530 m.abboud@moe.gov.lb www.moe.gov.lb</p> <p>Ms. Hiba Rteil Site Manager- Tyre Coast Nature Reserve MedWetCoast Project- Lebanon Ministry of Environment, P.O. Box 11-2727 Beirut Tel: 00961 1 976 555 ext 445 Fax: 00 961 1 976 530 h.rteil@moe.gov.lb www.moe.gov.lb</p>
Morocco	<p>Mr. Youssef Slaoui Gestionnaire du projet MWC Maroc, Rabat 212-37 77 61 57/37 77 61 58 medwetcoast@menara.ma</p> <p>Ms. Sana Jemily Assistante du chef de projet, MWC Maroc 212-37 77 61 57/37 77 61 58 sanamwc@menara.ma</p> <p>Ms. Houda Belhaj MWC Consultante en communication 212-37 68 14 32/37 68 13 32 houdabel@menara.ma</p> <p>Mr. Abdelaaziz Houssayni Directeur régional des Eaux et Forêts de l'Oriental Direction Régionale des Eaux et Forêts de l'Oriental (DREFO), Oujda 212- 61 35 59 77 dref2001@hotmail.com</p> <p>Mr. Lahcen Amaoun Chet de Service à la DREFO, Oujda 212-63 75 82 74 lahcenamoun@caramail.com</p> <p>Mr. Zacharie Méchali Responsable des programmes Nord et coordinateur MWC-Moulouya, Enda Maghreb 212-39 88 32 15 / 71 19 68 17 zacharie.mechali@enda.org.ma</p>

Palestine Authority	<p>Mr. Tayseer Mustaha Head of policies and planning department Environment Quality Authority, Palestine Authority 970 - 82 84 71 98 / 970- 82 82 20 00 mushtaha_t@yahoo.com</p>	
Tunisia	<p>Mr. Mahmoud Chihaoui Coordinateur Local MWC Agence de Protection et d'Aménagement du Littoral (APAL), Tel.: +216 1 840 177 Fax: +216 71 847 122 m.chihaoui@apal.nat.tn / mahmoud_c@yahoo.fr</p> <p>Ms. Afifa Sfayhi Directrice, Observatoire du Littoral Agence de Protection et d'Aménagement du Littoral (APAL) Le Belvédère, 2, rue Mohamed Rachid Ridha 1002 Tunis Phone: +216 71 843 01 77 Fax : +216 71 84 86 60 a.sfayhi@apal.net.tn</p>	<p>Mr. Maher Mahjoub Chef du Service des Sites et du Patrimoine Naturel Direction Générale de l'Environnement et de la Qualité de la Vie (DGEQV)/ Ministère de l'Environnement et du developpement Durable, Tunis, Tel + 216 71 704 000 Fax. + 216 71 704 340 Maher24705@yahoo.fr</p>
<u>MWC RCU / FACILITATORS</u>		
<p>Ms. Sylvie Goyet Regional Coordinator, MWC-RCU Station Biologique la Tour du Valat, le Sambuc, 13200 Arles – France Phone : +33 4 90 97 29 78 Fax : +33 4 90 97 20 19 Email : sgoyet@medwetcoast.com / sgoyet@aol.com</p>		
<p>Mr. Gerard Collin Consultant MWC Man Plan Peer Review Agde Marine 1 C28, 1 place Agde Marine, 34300 Cap d'Agde, France E-mail : ge.collin@wanadoo.fr</p>		<p>Mr. Sami Ben Haj Consultant MWC Man Plan Peer Review 1, rue d'Istamboul - 7000 Bizerte – Tunisie Tél/fax : (216) 72 43 59 28 Mobile : (216) 22 88 90 20 email : samibenhaj@yahoo.com</p>
<u>MWC INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANTS / RESOURCE PERSONS FOR THE MANAGEMENT PLANNING PROCESS</u>		
<p>Mr. Nicholas (Nick) Riddiford The Albufera International Biodiversity Group (TAIB) PN S'Albufera, Llista de Correus E-07458, Ca'n Picafort, Mallorca, Balearic Islands Tel. +34 971 89 22 50 Fax. +34 971 89 21 58 taib@mallorcaweb.net www.fsd.nl/TAIB/mainalbu.html</p>		<p>Mr. Eric Mahé Independent consultant Tél. (00 33) 4 99 62 03 96 Tél. (00 33) 4 99 62 03 96 erikmahe@hotmail.com</p>
<p>Mr. Marc Lutz Station Biologique de la Tour du Valat Chef de projet Conservation / Gestion integree Le Sambuc, 13200 Arles, France Tel. +00 33 04 90 97 20 13 Fax. +00 33 04 90 97 20 19 Lutz@tourduvalat.org</p>		

INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS / PARTNERS**GEF Protected Areas Project Cape Verde**

UNDP GEF Projecto Areas Protegidas, Ministerio do Ambiente Agricultura e Pesca, Direcção Geral Ambiente
CP 115, Praia, Cabo Verde
www.areasprotegidas.cv

Mr. Edoardo Zandri

Conselheiro Tecnico Principal - GEF-UNDP Protected Areas project
edoardo.zandri@undp.org
phone(+238) 2618072
mobile (+238) 9930991

Mr. Manuel Leao DE CARVALHO

Programme Director - GEF-UNDP Protected Areas project
rnapdga@cvtelecom.cv
phone(+238) 2611654
fax: (+238) 2616970

Ms. Maria Teresa Vera Cruz

Programme Manager - GEF-UNDP Protected Areas project
biodiv@cvtelecom.cv
phone(+238) 2618072

Mr. Mohamed Houmymid**Coordonnateur du projet Transhumance /CBTHA**

Tel. 044 88 75 00
Fax. 044 88 75 04
bio @ menara.ma
Website <http://www.transhumancemaroc.com>

Mr. Tarek Abul Hawa**PA Program Officer, IUCN – Wescana RO**

Abdel Karim Khalil Street # 6 Shmaisani,
P.O. Box 942230, Amman 11194, Jordan
Tel: +962 6 568 03 44 ext. 105 Mobile: +962 77 77 20 964
Fax: +962 6 568 03 55
Tarek.abulhawa@iucn.org
www.iucn.org/places/wcana

Mr. Ma'en Smadi

Reserve Manager

RSCN Jordan

962-65 33 79 31
reserves@rscn.org.jo

Mr. Fabrice Bernard

Chargé de coopération

Conservatoire du Littoral, Aix en Provence, France

Phone : +33 4 42 91 64 10
Fax : +33 4 42 91 64 11
7.1.1.1.2 f.bernard@conservatoire-du-littoral.fr
<http://www.conservatoire-du-littoral.fr/>

Socotra Conservation and Development Program,

UNDP Sanaa, SharaAl Siteen , BOX 551, Sanaa- Yemen
www.socotraisland.org

Mr. Al-Eryani Abdul-Rahman Fadhl

National Program Manager

Terl. 00 967 01 425310- 00 967 73804222
Fax. 00 967 01 425309
aferyani@socotraisland.org

Mr. Bensada Abdelkader

Protected Area Management Specialist

Tel. 00 967 01 425310- 00 967 5 660130-435
Fax. 00 967 01 425309
kaderbensada@socotraisland.org

ADDITIONAL EXPERTS / RESOURCE PERSONS FROM MOROCCO**Mr. Mohamed Dakki**

Professeur

Institut Scientifique à Rabat et GREPOM

212-37 77 45 49/61 39 12 81

dakki@israbat.ac.ma

Mr. Abdellatif Khattabi

Professeur consultant socio-économique MWC

Ecole Nationale Forestière des Ingénieurs

212-61 21 08 54/37 86 11 49

a_khattabi@email.com

Mr. Youssef Faqih

Chargé de mission

Enda Maghreb

212-56 23 03 44/56 23 03 47

youssef.faqihi@enda.org

Mr. El hassane Doumi

Administrateur

Direction de la Coopération au MATEE

212-66 14 24 38

elh_doumi@yahoo.fr

Mr. Jawad Mouabid

Administrateur

Direction de l'Aménagement du Territoire

Mr. Mounir Hakou

Administrateur

Direction de l'Aménagement du Territoire

212-63 85 35 50

mounhak@yahoo.fr

Mr. Hafid Chihab Administrateur à la Direction de la Réglementation et du Contrôle, MATEE	Mr. Fouad Zyadi Chef de la Division du Contrôle MATEE 212-37 77 26 44/37 68 25 73 fouadzyadi@yahoo.fr
Mr. Mohamed El Khalloufi Assistant au coordinateur local de MWC DREFO 212-61 10 05 18 medkhaloufi@caramail.com	Mr. Abderrahime Boutaleb Chef de Service de gestion et programmation DREFO 212-61 65 82 47 aboutaleb59@yahoo.fr
Mr. Abdellah El Mastour Chef de Service de l'Aménagement des parcs et réserves naturelles Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte contre la Désertification 212-62 03 89 34/37 67 27 70 elmastourabdellah@yahoo.fr	

Annex 2: AGENDA**Monday 20 June**

- 9.00 – 9:30 **Opening of the seminar and welcoming. Seminar arrangements and logistics** and introduction of the participants
Youssef Slaoui, MWC Morocco project manager
- 9.30 – 9.45 **Introduction: purpose of the Management Plan Peer Review in the context of the MedWetCoast project**
Sylvie Goyet, MedWetCoast Regional Coordinator
- 9.45 – 10.15 **Developing Management Plans: what the guidelines say!**
Tarek Abulhawa, IUCN Jordan/WESCANIA
- 10.15 – 10.45 **Session I: Site Management Planning process**
- a) Report by the **MedWetCoast** national experts: **Albania, Egypt, Lebanon, Morocco, Palestine Authority, Tunisia** : 10-minute presentation by the respective national expert on the basis of the format suggested (see attached annex 1) + 5-minute Questions & Answers.
- 10.45 – 11.00 Coffee break
- 11.00 – 12.45 a) continued
- b) From Management Planning to **Integrated Management of Mediterranean wetlands**: experience of the Tour du Valat (15-minute + 5-minute Q&A).
Marc Lutz, Station Biologique de la Tour du Valat
- [c] **Site management planning process in third countries and experience of other projects** will be presented throughout session II (10-minute + 5-minute Q&A)
- Socotra Protected Area, Yemen;
 - Cape Verde Protected area project;
 - RSCN experience;
 - Transhumance project experience]
- [d] video: **experience of the Cevennes national park** (22 minutes) – French and English version. The video will be shown in Day II or III].
- 12.45-14.00 Lunch
- 14.00-17.30 **Session II: Lessons learned and key issues with the MWC Management Planning process**
- 14:00 – 14:45 **Initial feedback from Man Plan Peer Review mission and discussion**
Gerard Collin/Sami Ben Haj, MWC Man Plan Peer Review consultant
- 14:45 – 17:30 **Review and discussion of the key issues**
- For each of the tentative issues listed below, there will be:**
- Introduction and positioning of the issue (MPPR consultants) – 5 min
 - Case study from MWC national setting, when available and appropriate (5 min)
 - Discussion, comments, suggestions, information (20 min)

- As appropriate, useful and available, contribution from other invited partners and experts, relating their experience on that subject and possibly suggest alternative scenarios and methods

Presentation of the planning processes in other countries and experiences of other projects will be inserted in Session II at the appropriate time.

Preparation process

1. Feeding of the **diagnosis** phase into the preparation of the management plans.
2. **Root Cause analysis**: addressing the causes of the degradation and identifying the impacts of the degradation (environmental, social, economic). Sources of the pressures upon the protected areas can be found outside of the site
3. **MP team** tasked with the preparation + time line + work programme

Principles of the Man Plan

4. Ecosystem integration ('looking beyond the fence') in particular with the marine sector and with the watershed basin
5. Assessing the value of the site, both direct values (eg., biodiversity: threatened species where and how?) and indirect values (eg. medicinal plants, tourism, but also cultural value, etc.) and determining clearly the conservation objective of the management plan
6. Prioritisation of the actions recommended + definition of alternative options and strategies ; definition of 'acceptable limits'
7. Integration with the appropriate sectoral and physical planning of the area and with the local/national institutional context.

Elements / contents of the Plans

8. Zoning and Buffer zone
9. Business plan or financing plan to support the implementation of the management plan (including tools such as economic instruments, central government budget, etc.)
10. Analysis and definition of the site boundaries
11. Nature / Tourism , sustainable tourism , ecotourism : interests and problems
12. Monitoring: how to monitor progress in the implementation of the plan but also results and impacts of the implementation ? (i.e. involves identification of baseline, and of indicators)
13. Communication: explaining the management plan process and products

Outcome

14. Effectiveness of the protection status
15. Implementation: constraints, difficulties, successes to date. And what provisions have been made in the plan to ensure its implementation (institutional arrangements, participatory process, etc.). Who will be responsible for the implementation of the management plan?
16. Conservation and development

16.00-16.15 Coffee break

16.15 – 17.30 **Session II continued**

Tuesday 21 June

9.00 – 10.45 **Session II (continued): Lessons learned and key issues with the MWC Management Planning component**

10.45-11.00 **Coffee break**

11.00 – 13.00 **Session II continued**

13:00 – 14:30 Lunch

14:30 – 17:30 **Field Trip to Sidi Boughaba**, a wetland and Ramsar site some 20 km from Rabat. It is a small site, managed by an NGO and equipped with an environmental education center and facility for visitors.

Réserve de Sidi Bou Ghaba

D'une superficie de 650 ha, la réserve de Sidi Bou Ghaba, classé site Ramsar en 1980, est situé sur les territoires de la commune rurale de Sidi Taïbi et la commune urbaine de Mehdia (cercle de Kénitra banlieue, Province de Kénitra). Elle est située sur la rive gauche de l'embouchure de l'oued Sebou, à 13 km au sud de la ville de Kénitra, chef-lieu de la région Gharb-Cherarda-Beni Hssein, et à 35 km au nord de Rabat. Le site est composé de : forêt : 540 ha ; lac : 110 ha ; routes et sentiers : 7 ha.

La réserve porte le nom du Marabout de Sidi Bou Ghaba, guerrier célèbre, situé à la limite sud de la réserve. Ce marabout est visité quotidiennement par des fidèles qui organisent chaque année, en été, après une bonne récolte, une grande fête (Mousseem) qui dure une semaine.

Au Nord, se trouve la Kasbah de Mehdia, forteresse construite 5 siècles avant JC. Classée comme monument historique, mais qui est à l'état d'abandon.

Les activités humaines dans le bassin versant se limitent à la circulation de visiteurs dans le cadre de programmes d'éducation environnementale et d'enseignement du fait de sa richesse biologique et de la proximité de la capitale. Toutefois, la crête du côté ouest (mer) a subi récemment une légère extension de l'habitat humain depuis la ville de Mehdia.

Wednesday 22 June

9.00 – 10.45 **Session II (continued): Lessons learned and key issues with the MWC Management Planning component**

10.45 - 11.00 Coffee break

11.00 – 13.00 **Session III : From Management Plan to implementation**

Introduction (S. Goyet)

Presentation of partners' experience (TBC)

Discussion

13.00 – 14.30 Lunch

14.30 – 16.00 **Session IV: Preparing the next management plans**

Introduction (G. Collin / S. Ben Haj) and discussion

16.00 – 16.15 Coffee break

16.15 – 17.00 **Session V: Discussion/response to questions raised in presentation of day one if not addressed before, and any other questions**

(facilitated by the Man Plan Peer Review consultants)

17.00 – 17.30 **Conclusions of the seminar:**

Recapitulation of the points raised and discussed: elements to make the management plan an effective tool for managing the site

Sylvie Goyet, MedWetCoast Regional Coordinator

Closing

OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

The workshop constitutes one component of the Management Plan Peer Review exercise. The exercise aims at :

- a) documenting the process that has been followed and engaged in the MWC countries in the preparation, drafting and follow up of the site management plans and, at the same time,
- b) consolidating lessons learned and critical examples on that subject. The report will constitute one contribution to the 'lessons learning' outcome of the MedWetCoast project.
- c) providing suggestions and recommendations for developing and/or finalizing the management plans for those few MWC sites that have not had a final and approved document yet and for informing the review process in the other cases, and
- d) informing the future preparation of guidelines amendments (IUCN, Ramsar, WWF, etc). As such, the report of the activity will be widely distributed.

This workshop gathers management plan practitioners and MWC experts that have been directly involved in the preparation of the project site management plans. The workshop specifically aims at:

- a) presenting the management planning process that has been undertaken in the respective sites and countries;
- b) reviewing, discussing and commenting on initial findings of the review team and on key issues relevant to the process;
- c) exchanging experience, best practice and lessons across the MWC network and with outside partners, thereby contributing to 'closing the circle'.

Annex 1: Format of the MWC country presentations

The MWC national representatives will be making a 15-minute presentation to set the scene and present to the audience the characteristics of the management plan process that was carried out / is being carried out at the site level.

Recommended format of the presentation: 15-minute presentation + 5 minute A&Q

1. Background: site/country specificities but also in the context of your country (i.e. how many protected areas in your country? And how many equipped with a management plan? Since when? Etc.)
2. The MWC Management Plan process in your country's sites: how was it carried out? Under which modalities? Same experts as those involved in the diagnosis? How long was the process until the final plan? Was it approved and who approved it? Did you use experience from other sites? Any external assistance and/or peer review? Etc.
3. Format of the document: how were the guidelines adapted? How were priorities set and selected? Etc.
4. What lessons, if any, from the process that was undertaken in your country? What particular experience would you like to highlight? Etc.
5. Implementation (success and/or difficulties) : how is the management plan being implemented? By whom? What financial resources are available? What has been / is the feedback of the local communities? If not yet implemented, what do you foresee that the MWC project will do to ensure implementation of the Management Plan? Etc.
6. Any particular question? (these will be noted and addressed in a later session of the workshop)

Les représentants nationaux MWC sont invités à faire une présentation de 15 minutes pour cadrer le contexte de leur pays et de leurs sites MWC et présenter aux participants les éléments du processus plan de gestion qui a été engagé / qui est en train d'être engagé au niveau des sites sélectionnés.

Recommandation pour le format de la présentation : présentation de 15 minutes + 5 minutes de Questions/Réponses

1. Contexte: specificités du/des sites mais aussi contexte du pays (i.e. combine d'aires protégées dans le pays? Et combien sont munies d'un plan de gestion ? depuis quand? etc.)
2. Le processus plan de gestion MWC dans les sites de votre pays: comment a-t-il été mené? Sous quels principes et mode d'organisation? Avec les mêmes experts que ceux de la phase de diagnostic ? Sur quelle durée a été mené le processus de préparation jusqu'à la production du plan définitif? A-t-il été approuvé et par qui ? est-ce que l'expérience d'autres sites a été utilisée ? avez-vous eu recours à une assistance technique extérieure et/ou un suivi, une évaluation ?
3. Format du document: comment est-ce que les lignes directrices ont été utilisées/adaptées? Comment est-ce que les priorités ont été définies et sélectionnées ?
4. Quelles leçons, si leçon il y a, pouvez-vous présenter du processus engagé dans votre site/pays? Quelle expérience particulière souhaitez-vous souligner?
5. Mise en œuvre (succès et/ou difficultés) : comment est-ce que le plan de gestion est mis en œuvre? Par qui ? Quelles ressources financières sont disponibles? Quel a été ou bien quel est le retour/la perception des communautés locales? Si le plan n'est pas encore mis en œuvre, comment pensez-vous que la rédaction et la préparation du plan de gestion peut aider et garantir sa mise en œuvre ?
6. Quelques questions particulières à l'auditoire? (celles-ci seront notées et abordées dans une autre session de l'atelier)