Overlooking Britain's greatest biodiversity?

A WWF-UK Report

Edited by Sara Cross & Mike Pienkowski
UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum
April 1998

The Convention on Biological Diversity and the UK Overseas Territories

A report to WWF-UK by the UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum

Edited by:

Sara Cross & Mike Pienkowski

April 1998

Note added to web version February 2001

This report has been made available on the UKOTCF web-site because of continued demand for copies. Readers should note that it is already three years old and there may have been many changes in the interim. Indeed, one purpose of the report was to help set priorities for such changes. Anyone with details of changes is welcome to supply them to the editors (see Contact Us page of UKOTCF's web-site).

The Convention on Biological Diversity and the UK Overseas Territories

A report to WWF-UK by the UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum

Edited by Sara Cross & Mike Pienkowski

April 1998

INTRODUCTION

The Convention on Biological Diversity signed by the UK Government in Rio on 5 June 1992 sets out a list of actions for governments to pursue in order to conserve biological diversity and to ensure the sustainable use of those species and habitats being exploited by man. The UK Government ratified this Convention for the UK itself on 3 June 1994. A small number of Dependent Territories were included in UK's ratification at that time (BVI, Cayman Islands, Gibraltar, Jersey, St Helena and its "Dependencies" [Ascension and Tristan da Cunha group]).

Within UK itself, there has been considerable progress in using the Convention, by government, voluntary conservation bodies and many others.

A very important aspect of the Convention is that it requires parties (i.e. countries signing up) not just to conserve biodiversity in a few special places, but to incorporate conservation of biodiversity into planning for all sectors of the economy, including agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism, transport, industry etc.

The parties to the Convention meet every two years at a formal Conference, which is an opportunity for them to report on progress, and for other countries or non-governmental organisations to check on progress. The next Conference of the Parties (CoP) is in Bratislava in May 1998.

In the preparations for this CoP, WWF-UK commissioned the UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum (currently in the process of changing its name from UK Dependent Territories Conservation Forum) to review progress on the Convention in UK Overseas Territories, and to prepare a report of its findings, for use at the conference of the Parties in Bratislava in May. Interim results have been provided via WWF-UK to UK Government in the form of comments on drafts of the Government's own report to CoP. The analysis did not include the three "Crown Dependencies" of Isle of Man, Bailiwick of Jersey and Bailiwick of Guernsey, nor the Sovereign Base Areas of Cyprus.

This review is relevant to all UK Overseas Territories, regardless of whether they are included in UK's ratification of the Convention. If a Territory is not included, there may still be activities taking place which support some of the Convention's objectives. Conversely, just because a Territory is included in the UK's ratification, it does not necessarily mean that the Convention is being applied in practice. Our aim was to find out whether this is happening.

We have used several sources for this review. One approach was a questionnaire sent to colleagues in the Forum's partner organisations in the Overseas Territories (see Appendix). In some cases, OT governmental colleagues and UK government representatives contributed to the responses. Information was also included from the Forum's own records, built on continuing liaison with the OTs, regular meetings with UK Government and other sources.

During the course of the work, it became apparent that the quality of the information warranted a rather more complete analysis than had originally envisaged. The Forum therefore contributed rather more time than had been commissioned. The report is essentially a compilation and analysis of the information from, and assessments by, people working in or with these Territories, and we have not sought to impose our own views upon these.

This report is presented in several sections:

1. This Introduction

2. Acknowledgements

3. A Summary of some major features resulting from the analysis

4. A Glossary

5. The main analysis, structured by the Articles of the Convention; for each element, an overview is followed by summaries of the situation in each Territory for which we have information, with examples where appropriate. The elements are:
   - A. Introduction
   - B. Inclusion in UK's ratification of the Convention
   - C. International co-operation
   - D. National biodiversity conservation plans
   - E. Incorporation of biodiversity into cross-sectoral plans
   - F. Identification of biological diversity
   - G. Monitoring of biodiversity
   - H. Identification and monitoring of activities likely adversely to impact biodiversity
   - I. Maintaining and making available data-bases
   - J & K Protected areas and guidelines for their establishment and management
   - L. Integrated conservation inside and outside protected areas
   - M. Protection of ecosystems, natural habitats and the maintenance of viable populations
   - N. Areas adjacent to protected areas
   - O. Restoration and recovery
   - P. Regulation and control of risks to biodiversity
   - Q. Alien species
   - R. Conservation and local communities
   - S. *Ex situ* measures to support *in situ* conservation
   - T. Integration of conservation of biological resources into national decision making
   - U. Provision of economic incentives for conservation
   - V. Research and training
   - W. Public education and awareness measures
   - X. Impact assessments

   Because of the use of this structure, linked to that of the Convention itself, it is impossible to avoid a degree of repetition. Where practicable, this is reduced by some cross-referencing.

6. An Appendix showing the Questionnaire and accompanying notes

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank WWF-UK for commissioning this report, and particularly Sally Nicholson for her comments and advice. We are grateful to all those who responded to the questionnaires, those who supplied information in any other form, including the discussions of the UK Overseas Territories Forum and its Working Groups. We are particularly pleased that the wide response means that several sources of information were available for each Territory. Contributors in these various forms include the following, but we apologise to any omitted or who may have supplied their comments indirectly: Anguilla National Trust; Aquatic Environmental Consultants; Ascension Heritage Society; Prof. Tony Atkinson; Brian Baldwin; Bermuda Zoological Society; Patricia Bradley; British Microbial Biodiversity Association; BVI National Parks Trust; Dr Michael Brooke; Ann Brown; Fred Burton; Dr Rebecca Cairns-Wicks (née Rowe);National Trust for the Cayman Islands; Stuart Chapman; Ijahnya Christian; Dr John Cortes; Aragorn Dick-Read; Nick Drayton; Falklands Conservation; Sarita Francis; Friends of the Chagos; Suzannah Frith; Judith L Garland; Ethlyn Gibbs-Williams; Gibraltar Ornithological & Natural History Society; James Glass; Dr Anne Glasspool; Michael Gore; Dr Clare Hankamer; Ian Hepburn; Roger Huxley; Lianna Jarecki; H. Lavity Stoutt Community College, BVI; Ian Macdonald Smith; Mike Maunder; Dr Judy McArdell; Montserrat National Trust; Sally Nicholson; Sara Oldfield; Paul Pearce-Kelly; Association of Reef Keepers BVI; Royal Botanic Gardens Kew; RSPB; St Helena Nature Conservation Group; St Helena Government; Save Open Spaces Bermuda; Joseph Serra; Dr Phil Smith; Joseph Smith-Abbott; Jim Stevenson; John Topp; Department of Environment & Coastal Resources, Turks and Caicos Government; Turks & Caicos National Trust; Nigel Wenban-Smith; David Taylor; World Conservation Monitoring Centre; WWF-UK; officials of the Foreign & Commonwealth Office, the Department for International Development and the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions; participants in the Forum's Working Groups for Pitcairn, the South Atlantic and the Wider Caribbean.

SUMMARY OF SOME MAJOR FEATURES RESULTING FROM THE ANALYSIS

1. Four of the 13 UK Overseas Territories included in this analysis are included in UK's ratification of CBD. There is a good reason, undisputed by conservation bodies, for the exclusion of British Antarctic Territory. The UK Government indicates that a treaty obligation also prevents the inclusion of British Indian Ocean Territory. For most of the other 7 Territories, the main blockages are assessed as lack of information and of appropriate legislation.

2. Some Territories have managed to secure support for conservation work using both regional contacts and the UK connection. However, an outweighing disadvantage is that the major financial contribution of the UK towards international conservation (to the Global Environment Facility [GEF], the funding mechanism of CBD) is not generally available to UKOTs. This is because UK's Overseas Territories are considered part of UK. Hence, there is an anomaly that the only areas internationally for which UK has a legal (as well as a moral) responsibility for biodiversity conservation are also the areas excluded from receiving support from UK's prime funding mechanism in this field. (CBD Article 5)

3. None of the UKOTs have a national plan for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, but several are making progress towards this objective. Those with real signs of movement in this direction include Ascension, part of Pitcairn, Montserrat (until interrupted by volcanic activity), Gibraltar, BIOT, and St Helena. There is no clear progress in the OTs in the Wider Caribbean, Tristan da Cunha, the Falkland Islands and South Georgia. There seems to be no clear relationship between inclusion in UK's ratification of CBD and the development of national biodiversity strategies. (CBD Article 6a)

4. Only for St Helena and Montserrat could we identify national plans for any aspects of the economy which appear to incorporate the conservation of biodiversity. (CBD Article 6b)

5. Only the Pitcairn Islands are considered to be adequately surveyed for biodiversity. In those Territories in which work is taking place, the initiative has generally come from NGOs, although government has contributed to some. (CBD Article 7a)

6. Most territories appear to have no biodiversity monitoring programme in place (Falklands, Pitcairn, BIOT, Montserrat, Turks & Caicos Islands, Ascension, Tristan da Cunha, BVI). Marine monitoring is carried out in a number of Territories for fish stocks and fishing activities – but not necessarily other aspects of marine biodiversity (Bermuda, Anguilla, Cayman Islands). However, only Gibraltar and St Helena indicate any monitoring of terrestrial species taking place; in the case of St Helena this is restricted to plants, and the monitoring on Gibraltar is left to the NGO, GONHS. (CBD Article 7b)

7. Official surveys of activities which actually, or may potentially, damage biodiversity are again lacking, except for the sustainability of fish stocks and, in Montserrat, solid waste disposal is monitored. This section includes examples of damage. These tend to relate to excessive construction development usually related to tourism (especially in the Caribbean), introduced species and over-fishing. (CBD Article 7c)

8. Again the responses obtained showed much room for improvement in how a Territory's monitoring data should be housed and made use of, particularly by Governments. In Gibraltar, the co-ordinating point for any form of monitoring data is the NGO, GONHS, and as the Bermuda Biodiversity survey progresses, the Bermuda Zoological Society and Bermuda Aquarium, Museum & Zoo will be responsible for maintaining these data. Information about the 1991/2 Pitcairn Survey is held at the World Conservation Monitoring Centre in the UK, and the 1996 BIOT survey information is also held in the UK, in preparation for publication by the Linnean Society and the NGO/charity Friends of the Chagos. Of concern is the fact that no such registry exists in any OT Government Department. We suggest not that the data should be held by governments rather than NGOs, but that both partners should be involved. (CBD Article 7d)

9. Most Territories have legislation in place or advanced in preparation for the establishment of protected areas. However, few (perhaps only Gibraltar) have a system of management which is viewed as largely adequate. Where some reserves are working well, an NGO (or mixed NGO/statutory body) has a lead role in reserve management in most of the Territories concerned (Gibraltar, Cayman Islands, BVI). (CBD Article 8a,b)

10. There appears to be a rather patchy implementation of steps to conserve biodiversity. Generally, this seems to work slightly better where there is a direct link between local usage and the sustainable resource, notably locally based fisheries but, even here, there are exceptions, such as Cayman Islands Government failing to regulate fisheries even when so requested by the industry. Physical planning seems generally to be failing, especially in the wider Caribbean (including Bermuda), where the pressure for tourist development seems routinely to over-ride the planning mechanisms which ought to safeguard the long-term interests of both this industry and others in protecting the environment. (CBD Article 8c)

11. The concept of protection of particular ecosystems or populations outside protected areas as well as inside (which is central to CBD and this Article) is not yet well developed, beyond legal protection for certain species in some territories. Except on Tristan da Cunha and Bermuda, any initiatives tend to be led by environmental NGOs; indeed, it forms a major part of the NGOs remits in Gibraltar (GONHS), Cayman (CINT), Ascension (consortium of NGOs, linking to Administrator and UK government). (CBD Article 8d)

12. There appear to be few safeguards that developments in areas adjacent to protected areas should be sound and sustainable, and frequent examples of where they are not. (CBD Article 8e)

13. There are a range of restoration projects in place in several Territories, most in Gibraltar and the Caribbean led by NGOs. Apart from Bermuda and some South Atlantic Territories, there appear to be relatively few projects led by local governmental bodies. There appear also to be a lack of projects in Territories without a resident population and for which UK Government is directly responsible. (CBD Article 8f)

14. Most Territories have some form of regulation in respect of importation of alien species, although the effectiveness of implementation is unclear in many. There is little information in respect of wider risks to biodiversity, including accidental introductions and natural disasters. (CBD Article 8g)

15. Whilst control measures against the importation of alien species are generally legislated, in only a few situations are measures in place to control those already present. (CBD Article 8h)

16. The extent to which local communities are empowered and assisted to conserve biodiversity, and/or to benefit from using it in a sustainable manner varies considerably between the Overseas Territories. Government involvement in this initiative is limited to one or two examples. (CBD Article 8i to m)

17. There appear to be a wide range of *ex situ* projects in several Territories. (CBD Article 9)

18. The situation in respect of the integration of conservation into national decision making is variable. Most attempts appear to be taking place in the South Atlantic Territories, and there appear to be very limited attempts in most wider Caribbean Territories. (CBD Article 10)

19. There appear to be very few economic measures being brought into practice as an incentive to conserve. The few exceptions relate to South Atlantic fisheries and to a few protected site projects run by NGOs. (CBD Article 11)

20. There is a very uneven and patchy picture as regards scientific training relevant to the Convention, and the provision of this from overseas. (CBD Article 12)

21. Considerable attempts are being made in respect of public education and awareness. These are being led by governmental agencies in some South Atlantic Territories, but are largely left to NGOs in the wider Caribbean and Gibraltar. (CBD Article 13)

22. Whilst impact assessments are generally required in theory for major developments (although, surprisingly there are exceptions to this in Bermuda), there are serious concerns about the quality and independence of assessments in at least 7 Territories. (CBD Article 14)

GLOSSARY

ANT	Anguilla National Trust
BAMZ	Bermuda Aquarium, Museum and Zoo

BBP	Bermuda Biodiversity Project
BIOT	British Indian Ocean Territory
BZS	Bermuda Zoological Society
CANARI	Caribbean Natural Areas Resources Institute
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CINT	Cayman Islands National Trust
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
DFID	Department for International Development
DOE	Department of Environment (Cayman)
ECNAMP	Eastern Caribbean Natural Area Management Program
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EU	European Union
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
FFI	Fauna and Flora International
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GONHS	Gibraltar Ornithological and Natural History Society
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
MOD	Ministry of Defence
MNT	Montserrat National Trust
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECS	Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SEDS	Sustainable Environment and Development Strategy
TCI	Turks and Caicos Islands
UKOTCF	UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature (still called World Wildlife Fund in some countries)

ANALYSIS OF THE APPLICATION OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY IN THE UK OVERSEAS TERRITORIES

A. Introduction

Although the information is derived from a variety of sources (see Introduction), in this analysis of the situation, we retain the structure of the Convention used also in the questionnaire.

Responses to the questionnaire were obtained in respect of the following territories: Anguilla (ANG), Ascension (ASC), Bermuda (BER), British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT), British Virgin Islands (BVI), Cayman Islands (CI), Falkland Islands (FAL), Gibraltar (G), Montserrat (MON), Pitcairn Islands (PIT), St Helena (StH), Tristan da Cunha (TdC), Turks and Caicos Islands (TCI).

B. Inclusion in UK's ratification of the Convention

Four of the UK Overseas Territories (plus Jersey) are included in the UK's ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity. These are: British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Gibraltar, and St. Helena (including "Dependencies" of Ascension & Tristan da Cunha).

Those Territories not included gave a number of reasons which were perceived for this; the most frequent being:

i) a lack of information about the Convention and its relevance to the Territory (ANG, FAL, MON, TCI), coupled with

ii) inadequate legislation in place to implement the Convention (FAL, MON [although this corrected just before volcanic activity diverted attention], TCI).

iii) In the case of BIOT, UK Government's view is that extension of this Convention to BIOT would be in conflict with the 1966 Treaty with the US which reserves the whole of the Territory for defence purposes.

iv) (It would be inappropriate to include British Antarctic Territory in the ratification. To include a territory in an international convention requires the relevant government to assert sovereignty over that territory. The Antarctic Treaty has effectively put the Antarctic territorial claims of all nations into suspense. The Antarctic Treaty has strong conservation elements. For UK to attempt to include BAT in the CBD would require the re-assertion of sovereignty. This would breach the Antarctic Treaty and would be damaging to conservation.)

C. International co-operation

Article 5 of CBD strives for co-operation between states and between states and international organisations to help conserve biological diversity.

Many Territories enjoy active co-operation between themselves and others, with regard to assistance in conserving biological diversity. In part, this may be advantageous due to the UK's Territories relative isolation and small size, but it is also due to close and co-operative contacts between NGOs in the international conservation community. There are, however, problems in accessing support from international organisations and from the main UK funds for support for overseas biodiversity conservation.

For example, the Cayman Islands National Trust works co-operatively with a range of environmental organisations, and receives funding from the American Bird Conservancy and the RARE Center for Tropical Conservation in the United States, whereas its UK grant support has included projects funded by WWF-UK and the Foreign Office.

The Anguilla National Trust, established with FCO and WWF-UK funding, has ensured Anguilla's membership in the WIDECAST network which consists of 30 countries in the Wider Caribbean taking a common approach to the conservation of sea turtles; also Anguilla, Montserrat and BVI are members of the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), which requires co-operation with other member states in the management of natural resources.

There are several levels of co-operation between the two major agencies responsible for environmental management in the British Virgin Islands and regional and international agencies. The BVI National Parks Trust

has established linkages with the IUCN SSC - West Indian Iguana Specialist Group, Fauna and Flora International and the Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew in a number of species restoration and biodiversity assessment projects. The Conservation and Fisheries Department of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Labour has also established links with the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States in the implementation of training and monitoring exercises in the territory designed to protect fish reserves among others.

The Bermuda Aquarium, Museum & Zoo (BAMZ) and its support arm, the Bermuda Zoological Society (BZS) are active participants in a number of breeding and reintroduction programmes for endangered species from other UKOTs and other countries (Caribbean Flamingo, Cayman Iguana, Golden Lion Tamarins). Through the Island Resources Foundation in The US Virgin Islands, BAMZ & BZS are currently trying to promote regional co-operation and transfer of expertise. Funding to the Bermuda Biodiversity Project (BBP) has been received from both US and UK sources as well as locally. The Department of Fisheries has also established co-operative tagging programmes for pelagics.

In the case of Gibraltar, the main activity is NGO-led (by GONHS). For political reasons there are very few contacts with Spain at a Government level (although NGOs co-operate well). Those environment contacts that there are deal mainly with pollution and waste disposal; biodiversity has not yet been on any agenda. Gibraltar should otherwise present particular opportunities for co-operation because it is part of the EU.

MON: (1) TFAP appointment of a Forestry Consultant
(2) WWF-FCO-UKOTCF sponsored Biodiversity Project 1996/1997 which sought to assess the biodiversity status on Montserrat.

StH: Co-operation received in the form of:
Transfer of expertise - assistance from Edinburgh Botanic Gardens, Department for International Development through their Assistant Professional Officer scheme and development aid, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew
Funding: WWF-UK, RSPB, AUSPB (FCO)
Co-operation: UKOTCF and its South Atlantic Working Group

TdC: There are links with the Percy Fitzpatrick Institute at the University of Cape Town on conservation issues, particularly with regard to bird life. Gough Island, a World Heritage Site, is under the management of the Administrator of TdC who is advised by the Gough Island Wildlife Reserve Advisory Committee (GIWRAC). This body is multinational.

PIT: Rat eradication undertaken by a New Zealand consultancy, with funding from DFID and WWF-UK.

TCI: Support from DFID, FCO, UKOTCF, WWF and others for certain projects. Successful support from some Caribbean/American NGOs (e.g. RARE), but unsuccessful involvement of others (TNC).

The Forum has restructured its own successful model of Working Groups to a regional grouping, providing groups for the Wider Caribbean, the South Atlantic, Pitcairn and BIOT, with a European group under consideration. As local NGOs gain strength, this approach is proving helpful, in assisting Associate Members to exchange relevant experience, in helping represent their views in UK, and generally in coordinating support where they require it.

In June 1997, the Forum drew to the attention of the UK Secretary of State for International Development a crack into which biodiversity conservation in these Territories is in danger of falling. The major financial contribution of the UK to international conservation is to the Global Environment Facility (GEF). However, because UK's Overseas Territories are considered part of UK, they are not generally eligible for GEF funding. Hence, there is an anomaly that the only areas internationally for which UK has a legal (as well as a moral) responsibility for biodiversity conservation are also the areas excluded from receiving support from UK's prime funding mechanism in this field. It is true that smaller funds are available in the Darwin Initiative (although this had rarely funded work in UKOTs), in the FCO Assistant Under Secretary Project Budgets, and through grants as well as manpower and expertise brought together by the Forum's NGO members and network. The Forum and its member organisations would welcome exploration of some funding provision from the Department's Global Environmental Assistance budget line to provide the missing mechanism to help deliver UK's commitment to biodiversity conservation in the UKOTs. The Forum has also drawn the attention of the World Bank to this anomaly.

D. National biodiversity conservation plans

Article 6 of the Convention outlines the need to construct national plans. **Paragraph 6a** is a key part of the Convention in that it states that national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity shall be developed. This may be achieved by adapting existing strategies, plans or programmes to meet the measures set out in the Convention.

None of the UKOTs have a national plan for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, but several are making progress towards this objective. Those with real signs of movement in this direction include Ascension, part of Pitcairn, Montserrat (until interrupted by volcanic activity), Gibraltar, BIOT, and St Helena. There is no clear progress in the OTs in the Wider Caribbean, Tristan da Cunha, the Falkland Islands and South Georgia. There seems to be no clear relationship between inclusion in UK's ratification of CBD and the development of national biodiversity strategies.

Examples of those well under way include Ascension, where RSPB are working with the Administrator on a management plan, to be in final draft by April 1998.

The Henderson Management Plan (PIT) was drafted in 1992 as a result of the 1991/2 expedition. If it is ratified, it will represent something close to a national biodiversity plan.

Montserrat was beginning to work towards an integrated plan for the island, and developed a National Forestry Action Plan in1994, but continuing work had to be abandoned when volcanic activity brought normal operations to a standstill. Now, a plan for the development of the north is being put together.

In Gibraltar, the Gibraltar Ornithological and Natural History Society (GONHS) has been asked by Government to draft the section on "The National Environment" in the Government's proposed Environmental Strategy. Also, GONHS has representation in the Development & Planning Commission and in this way tries to ensure that biodiversity conservation is taken into account. Biodiversity Convention considerations will be integrated into the strategy.

In BIOT, the BIOT Commissioner recently (7th October 1997) announced that his Administration will take an approach with respect to the Biodiversity Treaty, similar to that adopted in relation to the World Heritage Convention, i.e. although treaty commitments are considered to prevent inclusion in UK's ratification, UK will treat BIOT as if it were included, subject to defence requirements of UK and USA.

The Strategic Review, the key policy and development plan for St Helena incorporates the environment but does not integrate the environment and biodiversity conservation with the economic and social development of the island. The recently formed advisory committee on the environment will be responsible for the production of a National Sustainable Development Strategy by 2001.

At the other end of the scale, Anguilla has a series of background reports upon which to base a future biodiversity plan, but little governmental action is taking place in support of this yet. A mechanism is now being developed, viz the Environmental Advisory Committee, which the OECS recommends be upgraded to a more autonomous Council for Sustainable Development.

Similarly, despite numerous biological studies carried out in the Cayman Islands (where the CBD has been ratified), there is no such plan, in the face of spiralling development on the islands. There is a land use zoning plan, called a "development plan", which is not integrated with other plans, and which pays little regard to biodiversity conservation.

Another Territory now facing rapid development is the Turks & Caicos Islands, which have a system of protected areas set aside on paper, without an integrated land use and development plan, or progress towards one to safeguard the national biodiversity in practice. This means that even protected areas are at risk, and there is a current major threat to the Ramsar site on North, Middle and East Caicos.

There is no plan in BVI. However, in 1986 the then Eastern Caribbean Natural Area Management Programme (ECNAMP), now Caribbean Natural Area Resources Institute (CANARI), conducted an assessment of areas deemed for protection and vestment into the National Parks Trust. This study was conducted in conjunction with the Town and Country Planning Office of the Chief Minister's Office and the Conservation and Fisheries

Department. The document *A Parks and Protected Areas System Plan for the British Virgin Islands* is the guiding document concerning the advocacy and selection of areas to be protected in the BVI.

The Falkland Islands Government is concentrating on the enactment of new nature conservation legislation enacted first, before considering biodiversity planning, but time may be limited for this as extensive oil exploration activities are beginning to take place.

Even the Territory with the most sophisticated infrastructure and the densest human population, Bermuda, does not have a national plan which integrates biodiversity conservation. The Bermuda Biodiversity Project, run by BZS was launched with the intent of collecting and disseminating biodiversity data for use by local resource managers and planners, but again this has some time to be completed, whilst development continues apace.

E. Incorporation of biodiversity into cross-sectoral plans

Paragraph 6b of CBD says that plans for the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use must be integrated into other cross-sectoral plans.

Do any of the national plans for other sectors of the economy (for example, tourism, agriculture, or industrial development plans) in the Territories take into account the conservation of biodiversity? Only for St Helena and Montserrat could we identify national plans for any aspects of the economy which appear to incorporate the conservation of biodiversity.

G: Not formally, although GONHS liaise closely with the authorities to ensure that impact on the natural environment is kept in mind.

CI: Not to any significant extent, although there are general references to the environment in the tourism development plan. Tourism and economic planning is currently founded on principles of exponential growth.

ANG: see Section D above.

TCI: Only indirectly and for one of the protected areas - Management Plans for the Princess Alexander National Parks.
A currently proposed major development demonstrates the lack of this approach in TCI. A proposed new cruise liner port for several liners would totally destroy the existing natural habitat of one of the larger uninhabited islands, East Caicos, and impact the Ramsar site. Fishery interests are concerned about the major impact of sedimentation, turbidity and disturbance on the fish stocks whose spawning grounds are nearby. There are similar concerns of the effects on the almost pristine coral systems, which are the basis of the eco-tourist industry. The development could involve the presence on the island, at any one time, of a number of cruise passengers equal to the total present population of TCI. A proposal to assist the local community on the neighbouring island (many of whom do not want their lives disrupted by the proposed development) to develop eco-tourism and protect the Ramsar site was unsuccessful in securing funding from UK Government's Darwin Initiative.

BVI: The National Integrated Development Plan of the British Virgin Islands is currently in finalisation. This project has incorporated a multisectoral view of development in the Territory with the environment being a major section of the study. This project has been conducted in collaboration between the Government of the British Virgin Islands and the UNDP. However, current practice fails to integrate biodiversity conservation into planning in many cases. Sewage pollution of BVI waters is becoming a matter of major concern, and one that threatens the major economic activities of diving, yachting and other tourism. However, plans for inappropriate tourist developments which would add to the problem are still being promoted. One of these includes a holiday development and golf-course at Beef Island; this would impact one of the few major remaining areas of mangrove in BVI. Mangrove swamps play a vital environmental service in helping to lock up excessive nutrients. The golf-course would require fertilisers, run-off of which would exacerbate pollution problems.

FAL: There is a great awareness of, and pride in, Falklands wildlife, but this is not really translated into plans. Oil developments do have environmental restrictions.

MON Yes - Tourism and agriculture plans. Tourism - mainly for marine environment and for nature trails.

StH: Yes - Tourism - Recent consultancy to develop heritage and nature-based tourism.
Industrial development - Requirement of all development projects for an environmental impact assessment
Agriculture - Integrated Pest Management Project.

TdC: Yes - the people of Tristan are aware of their unique position and take conservation and environmental factors into consideration. With regard to tourism they see the potential for eco-tourism and the link between its economic benefits and conservation of species. A number of local ordinances are in force to protect the environment.

BER: Bermuda has planning legislation that supposedly goes some way toward protecting biodiversity, but it is poorly enforced and there are several flagrant examples of its abuse (see H below). The planning legislation encompasses/assigns zonings (e.g. "commercial"/"tourism"/"open space"/"woodland reserve") but these are often ignored, overturned by ministerial decisions and periodically even officially changed. There are examples where, in fact, tourism has been used as justification for unsuitable development which would lead to erosion of biodiversity.

BIOT: Not really applicable because of the defence requirement and the absence of local population. However there is a steadily growing body of local legislation to increase protection for BIOT natural environment

F. Identification of biological diversity

Article 7 of CBD contains instructions for the elements of a national framework to identify and conserve biological diversity. **Paragraph 7a** requires identification of components of biological diversity which are important for its conservation and sustainable use.

Only the Pitcairn Islands are considered to be adequately surveyed for biodiversity (The Sir Peter Scott Memorial Expedition in 1991/2). In those Territories in which work is taking place, the initiative has generally come from NGOs, although government has contributed to some.

Although the GONHS has surveyed much of Gibraltar's wildlife and is continuing to do so, lack of funds (and several unsuccessful Darwin Initiative bids) for the charity mean that the urgent need for surveys of invertebrates and lower plants is as yet unrealised.

Similarly, information about St Helena's invertebrates is in need of updating and expansion, as does marine survey work. St. Helena's lower plants require comprehensive surveying.

TdC: There is a need for more scientific research on the Tristan islands to identify species.

The Montserrat Biodiversity Survey was begun with the intention of completing a comprehensive survey of the island's key biodiversity, but FCO funding was halted in 1997, in response to the volcanic activity. Consequently, with an incomplete knowledge of the island's biota, it will be impossible to quantify the effects of the volcano on Montserrat's biodiversity, or to know whether pockets of endemic species are distributed in relatively safe areas.

The biodiversity of neither the Turks & Caicos Islands, nor the Falkland Islands has been adequately surveyed, nor has either Territory conducted a survey into how biodiversity could be used and promoted in a sustainable way.

In Bermuda, the Bermuda Biodiversity Project, has initiated a comprehensive survey of the island's biota. In addition, the Bermuda Zoological Society has been encouraging local marine and dive operators to develop ecotourism through a series of lectures.

CI: A biodiversity study started in 1998, with FCO funding.

The British Indian Ocean Territory's most recent scientific expedition in 1996 surveyed selected groups of species, adding to information known from the 1970s but there are still gaps in knowledge remaining.

G. Monitoring of biodiversity

Paragraph 7b. These components must then be monitored through sampling and other techniques.

Is there a monitoring programme for biological diversity and its sustainable use?

Most territories appear to have no monitoring programme in place (Falklands, Pitcairn, BIOT, Montserrat, TCI, Asc, TdC, BVI). Marine monitoring is carried out in a number of Territories for fish stocks and fishing activities – but not necessarily other aspects of marine biodiversity (Bermuda, Anguilla, Cayman Islands). However, only Gibraltar and St Helena indicate any monitoring of terrestrial species taking place; in the case of St Helena this is restricted to plants, and the monitoring on Gibraltar is left to the GONHS.

The long term cost effectiveness of monitoring of reef deterioration from recreational diver impacts by the Department of the Environment in Cayman is questionable, as the department's recommendations for sustainability are not being accepted at a political level. There is some limited monitoring of endemic and vulnerable birds in the Cayman Islands, carried out and funded by NGOs.

BVI: No, despite the concerns about sewage pollution noted at Section E, and the consequent concerns about the carrying capacity for tourists.

TCI: No

FAL: No

MON: The development of plans had to be abandoned in 1997 due to ongoing volcanic activity; some emergency monitoring of endemic species is being attempted.

StH: Monitoring programme for plant species only at present. Marine monitoring planned over next 18 months for sustainable use.

ASC: Seabirds are monitored. RSPB recently reviewed the whole monitoring process. Turtles are not fully monitored, neither are lobsters, etc. i.e. only birds are adequately monitored.

TdC: Only partially. There are regular counts of certain sea birds and seals.

BER: Monitoring programmes are being developed through the BBP for biological diversity. Additionally, the Dept. of Fisheries has been monitoring biodiversity and sustainable use of local fisheries.

BIOT: No, other than periodic scientific expeditions, the most recent in 1996

In Gibraltar, the results of GONHS's survey revealed that another area where there is a long way to go / much room for improvement is in the development of biodiversity monitoring.

ANG: Not an integrated one. Monitoring of Fisheries and Marine Resources e.g. is part of the work of that Department. There is currently an OECS project on the Management of Coastal Resources. This was the focus of a one-day national consultation scheduled for 14th January 1998. ANT monitoring of biodiversity would be linked to specific projects.

PIT: No

H. Identification and monitoring of activities likely adversely to impact biodiversity

Paragraph 7c. Processes and categories of activities which have, or are likely to have, a significant adverse impact on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity should be identified. The effects of these factors should be monitored.

Has there been an official survey of activities which actually, or may potentially damage each Territory's biodiversity, and are these activities being monitored?

Official surveys of activities which actually or may potentially damage biodiversity are again lacking, except for the sustainability of fish stocks, and in Montserrat solid waste disposal is monitored.

G: No. Again, except in GONHS's day-to-day monitoring of activity. In Gibraltar it is difficult to carry out damaging actions without this NGO noticing.

CI: Partial: Department of the Environment is monitoring reef deterioration from recreational diver impacts, but recommendations for sustainability have not been accepted at political level.

ANG: Limited. The Department of Physical Planning monitors the setback of developments from the coast to minimise hurricane damage; this should also be beneficial for biodiversity consevation. One relevant proposal from the office of Parliamentary Secretary (Environment) is that a national forum be collaboratively organised by the Department of Physical Planning, the Anguilla Tourist Board, and The Anguilla National Trust, to explore Anguilla's potential for "nature tourism" if not "eco-tourism".

TCI: No

FAL: Fisheries are very carefully monitored, but for fish stocks, not overall diversity.

MON: Yes - Solid waste disposal.
- Use of small sized fish nets.

BVI: No.

ASC: The Administrator and the Users Group are well aware of the situation but potentially damaging operations will be covered in the management plan.

TdC: no

StH: Official marine resources consultancy identifying needs and priorities with relation to protecting marine resources. Marine and coastal resources DFID APO currently on island for about 18 months to tackle this issue.

BER: The Department of Fisheries has officially monitored fishing activities and continues to do so. Terrestrially, there are isolated cases of monitoring of specific sites/activities (e.g. Tynes Bay incinerator) but no funds are allocated for general surveys as it is not a government priority. BAMZ/BZS have been encouraging local marine and dive operators to develop ecotourism through an annual series of lectures.

PIT: No official survey - No routine monitoring

BIOT: The 1996 survey was an important aim of the BIOT Administration. The issue of ongoing monitoring is now being addressed .

EXAMPLES OF ACTIVITIES WHICH THREATEN BIODIVERSITY IN SOME TERRITORIES

Although few official surveys or monitoring programmes are taking place of actual or potential threats to biodiversity, our respondents demonstrated an awareness of an extensive catalogue of activities currently damaging biodiversity or threatening to do so. Of most dramatic concern, because of the speed with which it is destroying ecosystems, is the over-development of tourism and related construction work, especially in Caribbean Territories. This threatens not only to destroy the natural resource but also the basis of its own industry, as has been well demonstrated elsewhere.

In the Cayman Islands, large scale destruction of mangroves for tourism related real estate and to house a rapidly increasing human population is disrupting coastal processes and biodiversity; in addition, dredging of marl (used in local construction) from marine habitats is destroying marine life directly and by sediment pollution. Inland marl excavation is destroying wetlands. Dry forests, high in biodiversity are being destroyed at an accelerating rate for real estate speculation and construction. On Cayman Brac, road construction, to stimulate

real-estate development is being carried out by the local government in the island's primary dry forests. Reef biodiversity is being reduced by recreational diver damage and unsustainable harvest of Conch, Nassau Grouper and other marine species.

The story is similar in Anguilla, where again, the process of development for tourism is overriding concern for safeguarding biodiversity. Here, housing and economic development is resulting in loss of habitat for iguanas and snakes; the proposed development of Prickly Pear East offshore cay is posing a threat to sea turtles and birds; the proposed satellite launching from Sombrero could effect endemic lizard species and seabirds; and the location currently being proposed for a new airport is on a conservation area, identified in the island's Draft Land Use Plan of 1996. More traditional activities also take their toll: long-line fishing poses a continual threat to protected sea turtles, and the practice of cutting trees to make charcoal still continues.

Another Caribbean Territory rapidly opening up to commercial tourism is the Turks and Caicos Islands. Here, threats to the islands biodiversity include large-scale marina developments, marine pollution from boats, unsustainable harvesting methods in fishing, the practice of sand mining for construction, charcoal burning etc. A proposed new cruise liner port for several liners would totally destroy the existing habitat of one of the larger uninhabited islands, East Caicos and impact the Ramsar site. Fishery interests are concerned about the major impact of sedimentation, turbidity and disturbance on the fish stocks whose spawning grounds are nearby. There are similar concerns of the effects on the almost pristine coral systems, which are the basis of the eco-tourist industry. The development could involve the presence on the island, at any one time, of a number of cruise passengers equal to the total present population of TCI. A proposal to assist the local community on the neighbouring island (many of whom do not want their lives disrupted by the proposed development) to develop eco-tourism and protect the Ramsar site did not secure funding from UK Government's Darwin Initiative. In another part of TCI, despite Ambergris Cay being found to house one of the largest populations of TCI's endemic rock iguana, in the 1996 survey, a residential development complex has been approved – an encroachment which will undoubtedly affect the iguana population adversely.

In the British Virgin Islands, cultural practices such as the uncontrolled movement of livestock and introduction of exotic flora are cited as being a direct threat to the islands biodiversity.

Bermuda has the most developed infrastructure of the Wider Caribbean Overseas Territories, but there are still continuing pressures to develop what is left of its natural habitats. Land development continues apace, and of particular concern at this current point in time is the proposed hotel and golf course development at Ship's Hill, a habitat containing endemic plants, and extensive underground caves, which have been found to house over 50 species of rare endemic crustaceans and other invertebrates; and a proposed Equestrian Centre, threatening three acres of very important secondary growth native and endemic plant species. Also of great concern in Bermuda, with a high human population density, is waste and sewage disposal. Between 5 - 10 million gallons of sewage per day are currently being pumped just a mile offshore. Other threats to the island's remaining biodiversity are fishing activities (including inshore lobster pot fishing) and the introduction of biological control agents. Some Bermudans report a refusal by Government adequately to address and fund conservation efforts.

Human activities threatening the biodiversity of Montserrat are the careless disposal of solid & liquid waste (sometimes toxic) into streams, ponds, and the sea, as well as the removal of forests for development and agriculture.

In Gibraltar, the threat of urbanisation is always present, although much decreased of late. Rather than human activity, it is natural processes (vegetation succession) and natural processes acting on previous human activity (the spread of exotic plants) which threaten biodiversity and which need tackling. Again GONHS could tackle this problem, with funding, and is taking limited action already - as far as funds allow.

With regard to the more isolated South Atlantic Territories, there are concerns regarding both the Falkland Islands and St. Helena with regard to fishing activities; with investigations into the potential for over-fishing of inshore waters now underway in St. Helena. The Falkland Islands draw attention to the need for more research into the effects of fisheries on seabird diets, and the impacts of long-lining. In St Helena, motorcross on "crown wastes" is potentially damaging to wirebirds as well as impacting on the terrain and plant life. In the Falklands, farming practices can have detrimental effects on biodiversity, such as the continued shooting of Johnny Rooks and the introduction of new grass species. On Ascension, the biggest threats to biodiversity are feral cats, which have devastated the seabird populations, invasive plants and rats. In the case of Tristan da Cunha, the situation requires striking a balance between the needs of a remote people and their natural environment. Sheep grazing on the main island of Tristan may threaten some biodiversity but the islanders do limit the numbers of

grazing animals. If funds were available it would be useful to conduct research to assess the balance between the cash benefits of, for example, eco-tourism, against the cost of imported meat and wool. However, wool remains a vital ingredient in a traditional island craft which itself is an attraction to tourists.

Even more isolated from tourism and development threats are the Pitcairn Islands. However, a serious threat to biodiversity is the encroachment of introduced plants (especially *Syzygimm jambos*) into the native vegetation of Pitcairn Island.

In the British Indian Ocean Territory, illegal fishing and the concentration of yacht anchorage in one vulnerable site is a cause for concern.

I. Maintaining and making available data-bases

Paragraph 7d. Data derived from monitoring should be maintained and organised.

Are biodiversity monitoring data routinely maintained and organised by a central registry, in a form suitable for others to use?

Again the responses obtained showed much room for improvement in how a Territory's monitoring data should be housed and made use of, particularly by Governments. In Gibraltar, the co-ordinating point for any form of monitoring data is the NGO, GONHS, and as the Bermuda Biodiversity survey progresses, the Bermuda Zoological Society and Bermuda Aquarium, Museum & Zoo will be responsible for maintaining this data. Information about the 1991/2 Pitcairn Survey is held at the World Conservation Monitoring Centre in the UK, and the 1996 BIOT survey information is also held in the UK, by the NGO/charity Friends of the Chagos. Of concern is the fact that no such registry exists in any OT Government Department. We do not suggest that the data should be held by governments rather than NGOs, but that both partners should be involved.

G: GONHS data are provided on request. GONHS wants to be able to offer facilities at Bruce's Farm Conservation Centre and will shortly have computer facilities there. However GONHS do require financial assistance in order to computerise all present (and future) data.

CI: Not yet. Hopefully the WWF/FCO/UKOTCF biodiversity project 1998 will move matters closer.

ANG: No

TCI: No

FAL: No

MON: No

StH: No

TdC: No

BER: This will be accomplished through the BBP. BAMZ/BZS are responsible for this

PIT: Yes - maintained by WCMC and suitable for use by others.

BVI: No

BIOT: No

ASC: No, although RSPB covers birds

J & K. Protected areas and guidelines for their establishment and management

Article 8. This is a key Article in relation to conservation practice and is fundamental to the work of the statutory conservation agencies.

Paragraph 8a states that a system of protected areas should be established where special measures are taken to conserve biodiversity. **Paragraph 8b** indicates that guidelines for the selection, establishment and management of these sites should be developed.

Does each Territory have a system of protected areas, and are special measures taken to conserve biodiversity in these?

Most Territories have legislation in place or advanced in preparation for the establishment of protected areas. However, few (perhaps only Gibraltar) have a system of management which is viewed as largely adequate. Where some reserves are working well, an NGO (or mixed NGO/statutory body) has a lead role in reserve management in most of the Territories concerned (G, CI, BVI)

Two major reserves exist in Gibraltar, the Upper Rock Nature Reserve and the Gibraltar Marine Reserve. The latter covers all territorial waters (not recognised by Spain - which causes problems of fishing by Spanish fishing boats). Enforcement is not perfect, but not as yet a cause for serious concern, (except in respect of pollution – see Section N below). The NGO, GONHS provides the criteria for the selection, establishment and protection of protected reserve areas in the Territory, for consideration by Government. There is a contract to monitor activity in the Marine Reserve given to The Helping Hand, a sister charitable trust to GONHS, and GONHS controls aspects of the Upper Rock reserve through its other charitable trust, The Gibraltar Trust for Natural History. However, both NGOs are seriously under-funded. There are terrestrial areas outside the Upper Rock that need to be declared protected areas.

The Cayman Islands have had a system of Marine Parks since 1987. Marine Parks guidelines and management are constantly evolving under the responsibility of the Department of Environment. The National Trust began to establish, through acquisition, both terrestrial and wetland National Trust Nature Reserves in 1998. To date the National Trust owns 1619 acres (about 650 hectares) of protected land, although much more land is needed to be incorporated into these, to safeguard adequate habitat for species protection. National Trust Nature Reserves criteria were established and are reviewed by the Trust's Environmental Advisory Committee. The total protected area of the Cayman Islands is 3591 acres (about 1450 hectares).

In Anguilla there is a system of marine parks and measures for protecting coral reefs. As yet, no such system exists for terrestrial areas. The Anguilla National Trust perceives protected areas as devices for biodiversity conservation and has a policy to involve stakeholders in management plans. The identification of resources within protected areas is part of stakeholder analysis which informs management plans. This is the approach being taken with the development of Big Spring Park. Consideration is currently being given to determine how Big Spring (Taino ceremonial site) and The Fountain Cavern will be developed and managed. The rare (in Anguilla) greenness and diversity of the Katouche Valley and the Brimigen area are the criteria being used to advocate for their selection but the issue of private land ownership requires sensitivity. There is also the need to demonstrate how protected areas can be economically viable for owners.

TCI: Activities in all protected areas are governed by the National Parks Regulations (1992). No development can take place without the written approval of the Director. However, most protected areas lack management plans, thereby weakening their protection. Some, including the internationally important wetland (North, Middle and East Caicos) listed under the Ramsar Convention, are threatened with serious damage. Although Regulations are adopted, enforcement is lacking. Problems arise through inadequate zoning restrictions – for example, houses are built right up to the water's edge around Chalk Sound in Providenciales. This protected area is being contaminated by domestic effluents.

The British Virgin Islands have a well-established programme of marine resource conservation through the establishment of moorings throughout the territory. This programme reduces coral reef deterioration and destruction by boat anchors by providing moorings at dive sites in the BVI. Fees are charged to boaters and dive operators for the use of the moorings, providing a revenue base for the sustainability of the programme. On the terrestrial elements of the National Parks Trust system, however, there are several measures that must be legislated in order to maximise conservation efforts within protected areas. For instance, some areas are freely roamed by livestock and also may be impacted by the uncontrolled effect of invasive species. There are no legal mechanisms for the control of movement or introduction of species in the territory.

National Parks Legislation was passed in Montserrat in 1995 to establish protected areas and to develop measures for conserving biodiversity. The Biodiversity survey which commenced in 1995 would have provided substantial information to assist with this development. There are some guidelines which were used to establish protected areas. These were developed as part of ongoing attempts of Montserrat National Trust and Government of Montserrat to meet Ramsar specifications and any other conventions.

The Falkland Islands do not have a system in place as yet, but this subject area is included in new conservation legislation due to be enacted in 1998. Guidelines for establishment and protection of areas will be included in this legislation.

St Helena has established protected areas for biodiversity, but there are no formal guidelines for the selection, establishment and protection of these areas in place.

Ascension has local legislation aimed at protecting birds, volcanic features and heritage. Recently, two small areas have been set aside as nature reserves (one, Mars Bay reserve, provides a habitat for endemic brine shrimps). There are no guidelines in place as yet, but the Administrator is open to suggestions: the new management plan provides an opportunity to give guidance.

Forty percent of Tristan da Cunha is officially classed as a nature reserve with strict enforcement of conservation measures within this area. There are no guidelines for the establishment, or selection of protected areas, but in practice, much of Tristan is subject to very limited human interference due to topography and climate.

Bermuda's protected areas include Coral Reef preserves (the whole Bermuda Platform is in effect a coral preserve as harvesting of coral is illegal), fish spawning grounds and nature reserves with controlled activities. However, there are concerns that enforcement within these areas is very weak. The survey respondents were not aware of any formal guidelines being in place for Bermuda's protected areas. Many marine species are protected based on research conducted over the years.

PIT: Henderson Island World Heritage Site - Management Plan awaits ratification.
No guidelines

A system of protected areas is currently being introduced for BIOT. Also, work is in hand to produce guidelines.

L. Integrated conservation inside and outside protected areas

Paragraph 8c. Biological resources important for the conservation of biological diversity should be managed whether within or outside protected areas.

What steps have been taken (e.g. in physical planning procedures or land use policies) to conserve biodiversity throughout the Territory, and are there examples of these working or not working in practice?

There appears to be a rather patchy implementation of steps to conserve biodiversity. Generally, this seems to work slightly better where there is a direct link between local usage and the sustainable resource, notably locally based fisheries but, even here, there are exceptions, such as Cayman Islands Government failing to regulate fisheries even when so requested by the industry. Physical planning seems generally to be failing, especially in the wider Caribbean (including Bermuda), where the pressure for tourist development seems routinely to over-ride the planning mechanisms which ought to safeguard the long-term interests of both this industry and others in protecting the environment.

G: Action is totally NGO led. This is fine and probably the best way to do this, but public funding is required

CI: "Storm Belt" mangrove fringes were "protected" in Land Use Plans 1997 - present, but in practice developers have been allowed to destroy these in many instances. A requirement for planning permission to clear forest is widely ignored.

ANG: The Draft National Land Use Plan of 1996 proposes:
- Mangrove replanting and designation for conservation as critical marine life/wildlife habitats. ANT to develop a proposal for assessing and re-establishing mangroves.

- Dog Island to be designated as a bird sanctuary - collection of eggs to be prohibited.
- Beaches of Scrub and Dog Islands to be kept free of built development - important turtle nesting sites.

TCI in theory provides for the following:

(1) Establishment of a Protected Areas System.
(2) Establishment of Development Guidelines (Planning) – (There is doubt that these hold in practice.)
(3) Institution of Environmental Impact Assessment for all large-scale developments.
(4) Formation of the National Trust of The Turks & Caicos Islands
(5) Approval in principle of Coastal Resource Management Project

However, it is not clear that all of these work in practice, and there are major indications that 1, 2, 3 & 5 do not provide for effective conservation. For example, a proposed new cruise liner port for several liners would totally destroy the existing habitat of one of the larger uninhabited is lands, East Caicos and impact the Ramsar site. Fishery interests are concerned about the major impact of sedimentation, turbidity and disturbance on the fish stocks whose spawning grounds are nearby. There are similar concerns of the effects on the almost pristine coral systems, which are the basis of the eco-tourist industry. The development could involve the presence on the island, at any one time, a number of cruise passengers equal to the total present population TCI. A proposal to assist the local community on the neighbouring island (many of whom do not want their lives disrupted by the proposed development) to develop eco-tourism and protect the Ramsar site did not secure funding from UK Government's Darwin Initiative.

BVI: The Town and Country Planning Office informs different agencies as to potential development projects which may impact National Parks or Protected Areas in the territory. This allows environmental agencies to comment on plans which may impact protected areas. Also, as a stakeholder in the original process of the determination of national parks and protected areas in the territory, they actively engage in planning for biodiversity conservation. The Land Development Control Authority is the main agency responsible for approving all development projects in the territory. Major development plans that adversely impact biodiversity may be vetted by environmental agencies. However, this does not appear to work consistently. Sewage pollution of BVI waters is becoming a matter of major concern, and one that threatens the major economic activities of diving, yachting and other tourism. However, plans for inappropriate tourist developments which would add to the problem are still being promoted. One of these includes a holiday development and golf-course at Beef Island. This would impact one of the few major remaining areas of mangrove in BVI. Mangrove swamps play a vital environmental service in helping to lock up excessive nutrients. The golf-course would require fertilisers, run-off of which would exacerbate pollution problems.

FAL: This will follow from new legislation.

MON: The Physical Development Plan which was developed by the Physical Planning Unit in consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture, Trade & Environment and Montserrat National Trust takes protected areas into the overall plan. The recently developed plan for development of the North also identifies key areas and habitats.

TdC: Limitation of the number of stock animals (cattle and sheep) and a complete ban on the import of exotic flora and fauna e.g. there are no cats on Tristan.

StH: Strategic Land Use Plan - set out environmental protected areas. Majority actually protected as national forests, dedicated forests or national park. Sometimes neglected. Strategic land use plan under review.

BER: - Fisheries Regulations: - protected areas, fish pot ban, bag limits - largely effective
- Tree Protection Order - largely effective
- System of land zoning - largely effective, but there are a few notable exceptions when the zoning system has been over-ridden.

There is no strategic planning specifically for the conservation of biodiversity. There are examples of opportunities having arisen for action to have been taken towards promoting the cause, but such actions were not taken - e.g. Devonshire Marsh experienced a terrible fire last year, with much damage caused, but no reaction in terms of re-planting/restoring the area.

PIT: Fisheries Zone Ordinance provides for fisheries management and parts of the local Government regulations provide for species protection.

BIOT: not applicable in general terms because of the absence of resident population. The military operations do include plans for biodiversity conservation. The main gap is effective policing of illegal fishing from outside the country.

M. Protection of ecosystems, natural habitats and the maintenance of viable populations

Paragraph 8d requires promotion of the protection of ecosystems, natural habitats and the maintenance of viable populations.

What, if any, steps have been taken to promote the protection of particular ecosystems or populations?

The concept of protection of particular ecosystems or populations outside protected areas as well as inside (which is central to CBD and this Article) is not yet well developed, beyond legal protection for certain species in some territories. Except on Tristan da Cunha and Bermuda, any initiatives tend to be led by environmental NGOs; indeed, they form a major part of the NGOs' remits in Gibraltar (GONHS), Cayman (CINT), Ascension (consortium of NGOs, linking to Administrator and UK government).

The Cayman Islands National Trust has developed an integrated conservation programme for Grand Cayman's Blue Iguana, *Cyclura nubila lewisi*, and is involved in the population monitoring of endemic parrots *Amazonia leucocephala hesterna and Amazonia leucocephala caymanensis* . There is some support in place to aid recovery of the West Indian Whistling Duck *Dendrogigna arborea.* The Trust also has recovery programmes for selected endangered plants. Major contiguous dry forest and mangrove wetland ecosystems have been identified as a high priority areas for protection and are targeted for land acquisition by the Trust when funding allows.

The Anguilla National Trust is currently engaged in public awareness for Coastal Resources Management and facilitated Teacher Training Workshops on Conservation in the Classroom and Schoolyard Ecology in February 1998. The Trust also played a pivotal role in the election and protection of Anguilla's National Bird *Zenaida aurita* (1994) and has an adopt-a-beach programme and involvement in sand dune rehabilitation.

TCI: (1) Establishment of a Protected Areas System – but few have management plans
(2) Listing of the East, Middle, North Caicos wetlands under the Ramsar Convention – but without a plan or management, and threatened by a major development.
(3) Public Awareness Programme (TCINT/RARE) on the conservation of the endemic iguana.
There is now a need for studies of indigenous species and local habitats.

FAL: Legal protection for Cetaceans in Falkland waters; some birds legally protected.
New Legislation will be much more comprehensive, but details not yet known.
Pressure via IUCN to reduce/adapt long-line fishing on the Patagonian Shelf.

MON: Legislation and monitoring in watershed and forestry areas. Prior to recent volcanic damage: monitoring and fencing of areas in Fox's Bay Wetland Area; and public awareness on the importance of the area.

StH: Establishment of a national park and development of national park management plan.
Management of remnant populations and monitoring programme in place.

ASC: At the instigation of the UKOTCF, joint proposals between UK NGOs and the UK Government are in hand to eradicate feral cats and rats, and to control the Mesquite Thorn. Turtle beaches are protected but some problems occur on these, especially by encroachment of Mesquite.

TdC: Most species of birds are protected by local legislation. Five conservation officers (out of a population of 285 islanders) check nesting sites and other areas on a regular basis. Regular public notices are issued to remind the general public of the protection laws. The school curriculum contains a special "Tristan studies" subject emphasising conservation principles.

In Bermuda, the marine environment is well protected - the whole platform is effectively a coral preserve, while many species (turtles, mammals, several mollusc species) cannot be harvested, and there are bag limits on many species of fish. Nonsuch Island (15 acres) is an ecosystem that has been resurrected by the Chief Conservation Officer David Wingate - it is well protected and controlled. The Chief Conservation Officer has, virtually single-

handedly, promoted the conservation of the endemic Bermuda Cahow (petrel), including the provision of artificial nesting burrows; there are tree protection orders in place to protect endemics, and there are a number of designated nature reserves which offer protection to specific ecosystems/populations. Through the BBP, efforts to protect the endemic Bermuda Rock Lizard (skink) are underway. Fish pot bans were enacted due to lobbying by the "Friends of Fish" action group

PIT: Applicable international obligations are: World Heritage Convention. Ramsar, CITES, and Convention for the Protection of the Natural Resources and Environment for the South Pacific Region. Also Fisheries Zone Ordinance provides for fisheries management and parts of the local Government regulations provide for species protection.

N. Areas adjacent to protected areas

Paragraph 8e. Environmentally sound and sustainable development should be promoted in areas adjacent to protected areas.

Are there examples of good or bad practice in the areas adjacent to protected areas?

There appear to be few safeguards that developments in areas adjacent to protected areas should be sound and sustainable, and frequent examples where they are not.

Even within protected areas there is concern in Gibraltar about industrial activity, specifically air and sea pollution from refuse incinerator plants, leaks in oil supply lines to ships (private and MOD) and ships cleaning tanks just outside (and sometimes even within) territorial waters affecting marine life.

The Cayman Islands offer little planning control on development next to protected areas.

There are examples of good and bad practice in Anguilla: to be commended are projects such as the use of indigenous plants for landscaping of Big Spring park. However, there are litter problems adjacent to the site. Also, planning approval has been given for asphalt plant either in or too close to Brimigen conservation area and also for a development project too close to the site of Fountain Cavern. Consideration is also being given by the Anguillan authorities to a proposal submitted by Royal Caribbean Cruise Lines for the development of Prickly Pear Cay (East) as an "out island" for their passengers - if this goes ahead, it will result in 4,000 - 4,500 visitors weekly. The main conservation group on the island, the Anguilla National Trust supports the position that all offshore cays should be designated protected areas.

Examples of bad practice next to protected sites in the TCI include sand mining for construction, the situation of dump sites next to protected areas and boat fuelling activities, and the proposed development of a major cruise liner terminal partly in and adjacent to a Ramsar site and other protected areas.

In the case of watershed and forested areas (zoned for protection prior to the volcanic activity) in Montserrat, farming with some slash and burn techniques, and livestock grazing is/was carried out in close proximity. Animal grazing and the dumping of waste is also a problem around coastal wetlands, such as Gares Bay.

A catalogue of examples of bad practice can be made for Bermuda: the area known as Castle Harbour (a large semi-enclosed marine sound) is subjected to abysmal waste disposal/dumping practices; there is industrial encroachment on Devonshire Marsh, a marsh wetland area which is also a nature reserve; there is industrial development along, and discharge into the Pembroke canal drainage system. Protected cave areas suffer from the effects of golf course maintenance, quarrying too close to karst cave systems and sewage leaching.

In BVI, a lack of livestock control measures pose a threat to protected areas.

In St Helena, areas adjacent to protected areas contain invasive species which are a constant threat, including forestry species. Problems are also often incurred when cattle escape from adjacent land.

ASC: pressure on these sites is minimal

In the Falkland Islands the practice of shooting of Johnny Rooks is widespread and long-line fisheries off South America affect the Falklands' own fish populations.

Fortunately, due to their low human populations and relative isolation, there are no activities adversely affecting protected areas in the Pitcairn Islands or the British Indian Ocean Territory (unless one includes illegal fishing in the latter area in this category).

O. Restoration and recovery

Paragraph 8f. Degraded ecosystems should be restored and recovery plans for threatened species should be developed and implemented.

Are there projects in progress to restore degraded ecosystems and populations of threatened species, and are there examples of continued degradation or threat?

There are a range of restoration projects in place in several Territories, most led by NGOs in Gibraltar and the Caribbean. Apart from Bermuda and some South Atlantic Territories, there appear to be relatively few projects led by local governmental bodies. There appear also to be a lack of projects in Territories without a resident population and for which UK Government is directly responsible.

In Gibraltar, the GONHS has projects planned to eradicate exotic plants and to control vegetation succession, but lack of funding is impeding progress. These threats continue and are becoming increasingly worrying. Feral cat control is also required. One project that is progressing, carried out by GONHS under contract to the Gibraltar Government, is the control of yellow legged gulls *Larus cachinnans*, which are adversely affecting some areas of vegetation (where they nest), and affecting species such as Barbary Partridge on whose young they prey. Control of the Barbary Macaque population will also be necessary as they cause erosion in areas of importance for endemic plants. Currently GONHS is in discussion with Government about being contracted to control macaques. The Gibraltar Botanic Gardens, with GONHS support, is carrying out a major project to re-seed the Great Eastern Sand Slopes with native plants now that their use as water catchments is no longer necessary and the corrugated iron sheeting is being removed. This is under contract to the Government and the Ministry of Defence.

CI: Grand Cayman Blue Iguana (see above)
Some removal of exotic invasive trees in the QEII Botanic Park

In Anguilla, NGO efforts are working towards the achievement of this objective: the Sand Dune Rehabilitation Pilot Project began in October 1997, and in January 1998 the Anguilla National Trust launched a Sea Turtle Recovery Programme.
There is also an informal proposal for the establishment of a Botanical Garden for endemic and medicinal plants (this was devised as a follow up by a former student on the Darwin Initiative Plant Conservation course at Kew). Working with the help of Fauna and Flora International, the National Trust has ensured that the iguana population has been surveyed and a conservation plan for the iguana is being developed. Also, this partnership is implementing a survey of the Anguillan Snake in 1998. The Trust is also considering carrying out a survey of the island's bat population, depending upon the organisation's human resource capacity.

Before the onset of volcanic activity in Montserrat, the National Trust had secured funding for the regeneration and conservation of the wetland comprising Fox's Bay Bird Sanctuary. Although funding for the Montserrat Biodiversity survey was halted by the British Government, some of this was rescued, and augmented by British NGOs to allow an examination of the effect of the volcano on the status of the endemic Montserrat oriole. There is also a Little Bay Reef Protection Project.

In the BVI, the flamingo restoration programme and the Anegada Rock Iguana project are continuing examples of attempts not only to rehabilitate endangered or threatened species but also to attempt to address habitat restoration efforts. Furthermore, advocacy remains an essential tool since the declaration of important areas for the conservation of such species is key for the long-term viability of rehabilitative efforts. However, it is of concern that mangrove areas continue to be degraded, and proposals are still being made to damage further areas by built development, such as that at Beef Island (see L)

TCI: No

In the Falklands, the Falkland Government's Department of Agriculture has a programme to encourage the restoration of Tussack grass. Falklands Conservation is also assisting the Department of Agriculture with the reintroduction of native plants to the wild.

St Helena has several restoration projects in progress, within Diana's Peak National Park and Peakdale Gumwoods. There are also species recovery programmes being carried out, including seed orchards. However, a threat exists on "crown wastes" from regenerating exotic species. Although "crown wastes" are in "recovery phase" after the removal of goats, many isolated populations of endemics are still threatened by violation and the invasion of exotics.

TdC: Main threats likely to originate from natural causes, e.g. land slips, or from oil disaster at sea.

In Bermuda, the NGO, Save Open Spaces is running a programme to encourage the replanting of endemics; there is also a ban on Fish Pots in operation. There are examples of restored ecosystems, such as Nonsuch Island, with its Cahow population. There is a Skink Project within the Bermuda Biodiversity Plan, and the Bermuda Government's Department of Parks are clearing areas of Walsingham tract of introduced plants, thus allowing endemics and natives to re-establish themselves.
Threats include constant encroaching land development in Bermuda, which threaten native and endemic reforestation and continues to fragment open spaces; introduced plants, and poor waste disposal practices.

In the Pitcairn Islands, a rat eradication project took place on three islands (Pitcairn, Oeno and Ducie) in 1997, to protect seabirds. However, the encroachment of introduced plants is still a continuing threat.

BIOT: N/A

P. Regulation and control of risks to biodiversity

Paragraph 8g of the Convention requires means to be established to regulate and control risks, e.g. invasion of alien species, natural disasters, contamination etc**.**

Most Territories have some form of regulation in respect of importation of alien species, although the effectiveness of implementation is unclear in many. There is little information in respect of wider risks, including accidental introductions and natural disasters.

The Nature Protection Ordinance (1991) covers all relevant aspects of this requirement in the Gibraltarian legislation.

Means are also established in the Cayman Islands, but the opinion is that these are not very effective.

There are no such means established in Anguilla, but the Government's Agriculture Department has found it necessary to save guinea corn (sorghum) and pigeon pea (*Cajanus cajan*) seeds. Much has also been learnt about plant recovery and restoration from the experience of Hurricane Luis in 1995. During 1996 and 1997 there was great vigilance on the part of Customs Officers to ensure that no food/plant products were allowed in to worsen the mealy bug epidemic; biological controls (beetles) are in place locally for this.

TCI: There are regulations to control risks in the Turks and Caicos Islands, but these are limited to protected areas and fisheries. Consequently, invasion by alien species, contamination, etc cannot be in any way controlled with these restricted measures.

Montserrat's Agriculture Department has legislation which governs the importation of species to the island, but there are no planned measures to combat natural disasters.

The Falkland Islands do not have regulatory or restrictive means in place yet, but it is hoped that this will be part of new legislation, to be enacted later this year.

In St Helena, controls are being put in place for introduced pest species. There is an urgent need for alien plant species control. Legislation already exists for control of alien plants, but it is not put into practice because of the cost to the local Government.

TdC: Yes, strict control on import of alien species and phytosanitary certificates required for the import of fresh produce.

Measures are in place in Bermuda. The Department of Agriculture & Fisheries inspects all imported produce; there is also a strict animal and plant quarantine. CITES regulations are in place. There is an oil spill contingency plan. However, again, there are questions whether regulations are adequately enforced. One opinion is that, owing to previous natural disasters and deforestation, it is assumed that further damage to native species will be insignificant, so that aggressive alien species are not controlled.

BIOT Measures are reported as in place to prevent importations through authorised arrivals, although details are not available..

Q. Alien species

Paragraph 8h. The introduction of alien species should be prevented, and alien species threatening natural systems should be controlled or eradicated.

Whilst control measures are generally legislated, in only a few situations are measures in place to control those already present.

In Gibraltar, the Nature Protection Ordinance forbids the release of alien species within the territory's nature reserves. However, in practice, this may still happen. GONHS feels it is necessary to control the importation of certain species of pets and is preparing proposals to this effect to the Government.

Bermuda has a range of legislation and practices at hand to restrict and control alien species. However, alien species predominate. The island eradicated the Mediterranean fruit fly several years ago, The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries currently inspects all imported produce for pests, and a phytosanitary certificate is required. There is strict quarantine in place for all introduced animals; rodent control is implemented, there are also attempts made to round up and neuter feral cats. In addition, building codes, especially in urban areas, limit the nesting areas of pigeons.

The Cayman Islands Department of Agriculture has several import restrictions now in place for potential vectors of Pink Mealybug, and grass turf imports are banned. However, it is felt that this is too late, as the islands have already had a wide variety of imported plant pests, prior to the restrictions.

In Anguilla, the common iguanas *Iguana iguana* that arrived on the island during Hurricane Luis are posing a threat to the indigenous iguana, *Iguana delicatissima*. The former are being captured as a part of the conservation strategy of the indigenous iguana and are kept as pets/an attraction by friends of the Anguilla National Trust.

In the Turks & Caicos Islands, regulations are in place (National Parks Regulations (1992), Fisheries Protection Regulations (1989)), but these cover only the protected areas.

Montserrat imposes a ban on the importation of products from countries which are affected by alien species, e.g. the Mealybug, from the Windward Islands.

Falklands Conservation has a feasibility plan outlining a way forward to bring an eradication programme for cats, rats, and mice on the offshore Falkland Islands; this is still to be implemented.

In St Helena effort is being put into manual clearance programmes of alien species within the national park. A recent project for "crown wastes" failed to receive EU funding but there are plans to re-write and submit this. There are no plans in place as yet for preventing the introduction of plant species, but there is an integrated pest management project, which incorporates plans preventing the of entry of invertebrates to the island.

Outside the village of Edinburgh of the Seven See, Tristan's only inhabited area, there are no invasive species of any note, except rats and mice which arrived with a ship wreck in the last century. Their presence is a continuing threat to the survival of a number of rare birds. Rodent eradication, however, is expensive. A limited control is maintained by poison which itself is a further threat to biodiversity. A project is required to study the rodent problem and propose eradication techniques.

PIT: See Section V

BIOT: Limited phyto-sanitary rules regarding import of seeds & plants.

R. Conservation and local communities

Paragraphs 8i to 8m relate to developing the correct general conditions to allow conservation to take place, respecting local communities.

To what extent are local communities empowered and assisted to conserve biodiversity and benefit from it's sustainable use?

The extent to which local communities are empowered and assisted to conserve biodiversity, and/or to benefit from using it in a sustainable manner varies considerably between the Overseas Territories. Government involvement in this initiative is limited to one or two examples, thus:

in the BVI, the Conservation and Fisheries Department interacts directly with fishermen in the management of fish stocks and catch;

in St. Helena, assistance would be offered, if communities took the initiative themselves to request it; .

This happens little in the Cayman Islands, and examples of communities being assisted to conserve biodiversity are getting less as major international financial powers begin to dominate the Territory. The National Trust provides a voice to represent local communities, but other such voices are limited.

BVI: There are few examples of community involvement in the conservation of terrestrial biodiversity in the BVI.

ANG: A proposal for National Resource Inventory has been submitted to UNDP GEF Small Grants Programme (aspects of which may exceptionally be open to UK Overseas Territories in some circumstances) and to the OECS Natural Resource Management Unit. The ANT has planned a public awareness campaign for January - March 1998.

TCI: Very limited involvement

FAL: It is suspected that Falkland Islands Government have the power but do not know they should be using it!

MON: Campaigns such as tree planting (fruit trees and charcoal producing trees) are organised and local communities are encouraged. Other education and awareness programmes are developed as time and funding is available.

TdC: Eco-tourism offers the best incentive to the Tristan Islanders

BER: Through the BBP, a community wide effort to promote the conservation of the Bermuda Skink is being developed. BAMZ/BZS makes annual presentations to local marine operators to encourage environmentally friendly operating practices showing the benefits for the ecotourist market.
- "Keep Bermuda Beautiful" organises annual clean-ups
- Save Open Spaces supports a replanting programme for endemic cedars
- Many schools and community groups have "trashathons" to clean up areas

PIT: Conservation Officer recently appointed from community.

BIOT: N/A

S. *Ex situ* measures to support *in situ* conservation

Article 9 encourages *ex situ* conservation where this is supportive to *in situ* measures.

Are *ex situ* conservation measures being taken and, if so, are they supportive of *in situ* measures? (*ex situ* relates to any location outside the natural habitat, whether within, or outside the country).

There appear to be a wide range of *ex situ* projects available in several Territories.

G: Yes - There is an active propagation and re-introduction programme for the Gibraltar Campione (*Silene tomentosa*) jointly run by GONHS and the Gibraltar Botanic Gardens with some plants at Kew. Other native (including endemic) species are likewise in cultivation. There is a red fox re-introduction programme. GONHS are looking for funding to start a Barbary Partridge breeding programme.

CI: Some *ex situ* breeding of Grand Cayman Blue Iguanas in the U.S.A. is now being integrated with efforts in Cayman, with breeding exchanges and repatriation of offspring planned.

ANG: *Ex situ* conservation measures are being considered for *Iguana delicatissima* with some offshore cays, and larger hotel lands identified as possibilities

TCI: No

BVI: Measures in place for the rehabilitation and conservation of the Anegada Rock Iguana incorporate the provision of a headstart facility for the eventual release of reared iguanas back into their habitat. Furthermore, there is a programme of advocacy for the delineation of areas deemed for the protection of this species in their natural habitat.

MON: Measures are available for emergency *ex situ* captive breeding of Montserrat Oriole if the volcanic situation requires it.

StH: Yes - Seed orchards established for 11 rare species to provide source of seed seedlings for re-introduction and restocking populations. Plant nursery for the propagation and multiplication of species for restoration programmes and species recovery programmes.

BER: BAMZ/BZS have initiated a skink capture husbandry programme with the intent of establishing a captive breeding population. The facility also undertakes wildlife rehabilitation of injured birds and sea turtles. The department of Agriculture and Fisheries are conducting research into the viability of a scallop stock enhancement programme.

PIT: No

BIOT: No

TdC: n/a

ASC: no

T. Integration of conservation of biological resources into national decision making

Article 10 requires the integration of conservation and sustainable use of biological resources into national decision making, and that adverse impacts on biological diversity should be limited. Traditional cultures should be supported in practices compatible with sustainable use and to implement remedial action in degraded areas. Co-operation between government and the private sector should be encouraged to develop sustainable use.

Are there examples of cases supporting or opposing the provisions of this Article?

The situation in respect of the integration of conservation into national decision making is variable. Most attempts appear to be taking place in the South Atlantic Territories, and there appear to be very limited attempts in most wider Caribbean Territories.

G: No

CI: National decision making appears to be dominated by short term profits, with no regard to sustainability - e.g. Land use plan to cater for a human population which doubled in the last 15 years; tourism plan calls for ever increasing numbers of visitors requiring ever more facilities; road construction is accelerating, economic planning ignores long term sustainability issues.

ANG: The Anguilla Cultural Education Festival is held in February. One of the objectives is to examine traditional practices for their sustainability or unsustainability and, though the Festival is supported by the private sector, its planning and organisation do not take place in the realm of decision-making. Outcomes include renewed attention to medicinal plants, the culinary arts and food preservation.

TCI: No

FAL: There is co-operation between Government and private land owners on tussac restoration - very small scale. They think they are trying to do this with oil industry - but approach is weak.

MON: Not at the moment.

StH: - Marine and coastal resources inputs
- Integrated pest management project

ASC: no

TdC: All decisions regarding the interaction between the traditional way of life of the Islanders and the biological diversity of the islands are considered by the Island Council. The Council is informed of the conservation implications.

BER: Many of the fisheries regulations provide sustainable use - bag limits, mesh sizes etc. Agriculture Acts & Legislation as well as National Parks Acts & Legislation may also support the provisions of this article, but information is lacking.

PIT: Harvesting of hardwoods on Henderson Island is acceptable within the World Heritage management framework, and actions under the plan would make it sustainable..

BIOT: Conservation commitments are included in the 1997 statement by the Commissioner, and are included in the plans of the US forces.

U. Provision of economic incentives for conservation

Article 11. Economically and socially sound measures should be adopted to act as incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity.

Are there any economically and/or socially sound measures being brought into practice as an incentive to conserve, or use biological resources in a sustainable way?

There appear to be very few economic measures being brought into practice as an incentive to conserve. The few exceptions relate to South Atlantic fisheries and to a few protected site projects run by NGOs

G: No

CI: Department of Environment is attempting to establish carrying capacity limits to marine park use, and to establish/fine tune catch limits for Conch, Spiny Lobster, Nassau Grouper, Whelk. To date, political support has been lacking <u>despite</u> involvement and support by local fishermen.

ANG: No real measures yet, but aspects of the ANT's public awareness campaign target landowners to think about using conservation strategies to develop tourist attractions. Also, for the first time an admission fee is

being charged by the Trust to visit the current exhibition *A Glimpse of Paradise,* which focuses on Anguilla's Marine Resources and Maritime Heritage.

TCI: A user fee has been introduced for visitors using the protected areas - the money will be used to promote conservation. More general measures lacking.

MON: Not at the moment

BER: No

PIT: No

BIOT: N/A

ASC: Fisheries are the subject of detailed studies funded by FCO/DFID. Eco-tourism is proposed but does not really happen yet.

TdC: The development of eco-tourism is being pursued as a means to widen the economic base of the island's economy. This is an incentive to conserve Tristan's natural resources. The mainstay of the economy is fishing. This is carefully managed to ensure its sustainability.

V. Research and training

Article 12. Research and training, particularly for the special needs of convention. A programme for scientific and technical training in aspects of the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity should be developed. Scientific co-operation should be enhanced.

What examples are there of research and training in the identification conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, being provided to the Territory?

There is a very uneven and patchy picture as regards scientific training relevant to the Convention, and the provision of this from overseas. A botanical training course at the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, and funded by the Darwin Initiative, has involved a participant from most of the UK Overseas Territories.

G: A pilot scheme aimed at schools is being introduced next year by the Ministry for Education.

CI: Several at the academic/identification level. Some international NGO support for conservation planning directed to the Trust. Academic collaboration with Canadian institution on sustainable fisheries issues (DOE).

ANG: In addition to those mentioned before, which have involved visiting scientists, Trust staff and some NGO representatives, and there is the *Anguilla Flora Project* - visiting botanists and local naturalist whose work is supported by the ANT and whose efforts have helped the Trust procure an herbarium specimen cabinet, plant identification, listing, categorisation and use.

TCI: No

FAL: Fisheries, but details not known

MON Not at the moment. The plans for this were in the Biodiversity Project that was abandoned.

StH: Sustainable environmental development strategy consultancy and subsequently SEDS Response Committee (local).
Research
- Marine and coastal resource management consultancy
- Endemic plants consultancy
- Crown waste rehabilitation desk study
- UNDP Pasture Project
- Integrated Pest Management Project

TdC: the remoteness of Tristan and the difficulty of travelling to anywhere from the island - the only links are by sea - make this a difficult objective to pursue. Cost is a major factor.

ASC: Very few. No permanent population exists.

BER: Through the BBP, visiting researchers are encouraged and supported to conduct research on the island: this project is currently supporting 43 such projects. Additionally, the Bermuda Biological Station for Research is host to many visiting scientists, and a collaborative effort to ensure that all published materials is exchanged between the two organisations is in place.
There is a Government Conservation Team but some respondents indicated that it is undermanned and subjected to hostility from some members of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries.

PIT: Islanders being taught quarantine procedures to ensure rats are not accidentally re-introduced to islands now rat free.

BIOT: We are not aware as to whether awareness training on biodiversity matters is incorporated into military induction courses for the Territory.

W. Public education and awareness measures

Article 13 encourages measures to promote public education and awareness.

What if any, measures are in place to promote public education and awareness of the biological diversity?

Considerable attempts are being made in respect of public education and awareness. These are being led by governmental agencies in some South Atlantic Territories, but are largely left to NGOs in the wider Caribbean and Gibraltar.

G: None governmental. GONHS uses its media presence and its publications and school programme to do this.

CI: Ongoing efforts by National Trust and local Department of Environment.

ANG: The ANT has just concluded a training exercise with media workers to develop a media strategy and to plan for a public awareness campaign. Anguilla's biological diversity will be part of the campaign and the media strategy includes a number of different types of engagement with the media. ANT has easiest access to radio, but TV and newspapers are also included. There is ample opportunity.

TCI: The National Trust of the Turks & Caicos Islands continues work to develop schools and other awareness programmes, based initially on the endemic iguana, and is starting work with the Education Department to incorporate biodiversity conservation in the social studies curriculum. Previous work by the Education Department had developed a good science curriculum, but lack of resources has prevented implementation.

FAL: Falklands Conservation run an annual beach clean-up near Stanley each year which draws attention to waste/marine debris.

MON This was done primarily by the MNT using a variety of media. Radio, TV, competitions, books, campaigns, school visits etc.

ASC: RSPB assisted with Environmental Education materials. The school is very well resourced. “The Islander” regularly has features of environmental content.

TdC: Part of the school curriculum. Issue of Public Notices on conservation matters in general. Local newspaper features.

StH: Environmental education programme being developed by education department, supported by Environmental Conservation Section (ECS) and WWF. Ecological field study centre being developed. Ongoing awareness programmes by ECS through local newspaper and radio.

BER: The BAMZ/BZS through their education programmes and the BBP and promoting public education and awareness of the islands biodiversity (both through the schools, and through public lectures/presentations)

- The Bermuda Biological Station also has a public lecture series
- The Department of Agriculture & Fisheries and the Ministry of the Environment both promote awareness
- Youth groups - Scouts, Guides, Outward Bound, Duke of Edinburgh Award schemes also promote conservation through projects.

PIT: Natural History Museum attached to the school.

BIOT: Public Displays in *Diego Garcia*

Generally, UKOTCF is developing, as funds allow, a series of posters to raise awareness of the importance of the biodiversity of the UK Overseas Territories, and the need for action to conserve this.

X. Impact assessments

Article 14 requires impact assessments for proposed projects with a view to avoiding adverse effects.

Whilst impact assessments are generally required in theory for major developments (although, surprisingly there are exceptions to this in Bermuda), there are serious concerns about the quality and independence of assessments in at least 7 Territories.

i) Are impact assessments required for proposed projects?

G: Yes - in accordance with EU law. None have so far been carried out. In fact, those projects there have been since the relevant law was introduced have not strictly required them. Those where it appeared they might have been required were carried out after discussion with GONHS.

CI: Yes - but assessments carried out by consultants reporting to developer, and selected by developer, always less than objective.

ANG: Yes - EIAs are required for major projects but there are inconsistencies and concerns about the independence of those contracted to conduct them. The concern stems from a perceived lack of experience in how to interpret the reports and also about the stage at which they are implemented in the developmental process.
E.g. 1 The Forest Bay Marina proposal – assessed as: preliminary work well done
E.g. 2 The Royal Caribbean Cruise Lines proposal for Prickly – assessed as very "slickly" done, i.e. some suggested that it appeared to be intended to mislead or deceive.

TCI: Yes

TdC: Yes, but projects are few and far between. The harbour project.

FAL: - Way back in 1984/85 there was an impact assessment for the Mount Pleasant base/airport.
- New housing/abattoir (not connected) currently need these
- Oil developments (various documents)/ research/ reports)

MON Yes Little Bay Port Development (1996). Carrs Bay Oil Terminal (1997)
Carrs Bay Port Development (1997). Airport Development (1997)

StH: Yes Wind turbine generator propject as part of larger generation load management project.

BER: No - An impact statement is required; an assessment is not mandated, but may be required upon appeal or if the proposed project becomes/is controversial. In such cases assessments will be done, but are not truly objective as data are provided by the developer (examples: Ships Hill & Tynes Bay incinerators).

PIT: No

BIOT: Yes; all projects in Diego Garcia are considered in light of their environmental impact. It is not clear who undertakes the assessment.

ii) Has the quality of these impact assessments been judged independently?

G: N/A

CI: By local Department of the Environment, but their comments are often ignored by the planning authority (which is politically influenced).

ANG: see above

TCI: Yes in theory, but the process is not very open at least in some cases.

FAL: Not sufficiently in most cases

MON: Yes

StH: No

PIT: N/A

BIOT: In most cases, yes

TdC: No

APPENDIX: THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND NOTES

Convention on Biological Diversity
Questionnaire

Background to the Convention

The Convention on Biological Diversity signed by the UK Government in Rio on 5 June 1992 sets out a list of actions for governments to pursue in order to conserve biological diversity and to ensure the sustainable use of those species and habitats being exploited by man. The UK Government ratified this Convention for the UK itself on 3 June 1994. A small number of Dependent Territories were included in UK's ratification at that time (BVI, Cayman Islands, Gibraltar, Jersey, St Helena and Dependencies [Ascension and Tristan da Cunha group])..

Within UK itself, there has been considerable progress in using the Convention, by government, voluntary conservation bodies and many others.

A very important aspect of the Convention is that it requires parties(i.e. countries signing up) not just to conserve biodiversity in a few special places, but to incorporate conservation of biodiversity into planning for all sectors of the economy, whether this is agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism, transport, industry or whatever.

The parties to the Convention meet every couple of years at a formal Conference, which is an opportunity for them to report on progress, and for other countries or non-governmental organisations to check on progress. The next Conference of the Parties is in Bratislava in May 1998.

Forum Report on Progress

The UK Dependent Territories Conservation Forum has been asked to review progress on the Convention in UK Dependent Territories, and to prepare a report of its findings, for use at both the conference of the Parties in Bratislava in May, and at the Dependent Territories Conference in February 1998. This review is relevant to all Dependent Territories, regardless of whether or not they are included in UK's ratification of the Convention. If a Territory is not included, there may still be activities taking place which support some of the Convention's objectives. Conversely, just because a Territory is included in the UK's ratification, it does not necessarily mean that the Convention is being applied in practice. We would like to find out whether this is happening.

We have produced a questionnaire, asking general questions about your country's activities relating to the Biodiversity Convention, and would be most grateful if you would take a few minutes of your time to answer the questions posed. A brief comment with examples if appropriate, is all that is required for each question (but do say more if you want to). It is not essential to answer all the questions if some are too difficult: an early reply would be better than waiting to sort out difficult questions, as we need to prepare our report fairly soon. We would like you to be as honest as you can, as we are keen to highlight both positive progress and to indicate where things are either not happening, or factors which are detrimental to the conservation of your country's biodiversity. Your responses will hopefully provide us with up to date, factual information for the report. We do not intend to attribute respondents names to the final report, unless you specifically wish us to do so. All respondents will receive a copy of the final report when it is produced.

To help you answer each question, we have also prepared a series of guidance notes, which indicate how the question is related to a specific article within the Convention. If you would like a fuller account of the Convention, whether now, or in the near future, you can write to Sally Nicholson at WWF-UK, which has a range of published material on the Convention.

Please return your completed questionaires and any accompanying notes you feel may be useful to the Forum. You can fax them through on **+44-1296-661363**. Alternatively, those people with email can also receive a copy of this information electronically, and can reply to **sara.cross@ukdtcf.demon.co.uk**

[Note: the space for answers in this Questionaire has been reduced in this Appendix version.]

UK DEPENDENT TERRITORIES CONSERVATION FORUM

Convention on Biological Diversity

Please take a few minutes to answer any of the following questions on which you have information. Some questions make reference to the Articles of the Convention, which are explained in the guidance notes. Please either add your answers to this document and fax back to the Forum on +44 1296 661363, or give the answers on a separate piece of paper, just referring to the appropriate question letters.

Name of Territory:.....

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONVENTION

A. Is your Territory included in UK's ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity? We indicate our understanding of this to be **YES / NO**

B. If your Territory is not included, do you know the reasons for this, real or given? (e.g. lack of information, inadequate legislation to fulfil requirements, active opposition to the concept....)

C. Are there examples of co-operation between your Territory and other countries, with regard to assistance in conserving biological diversity? Please list where this occurs, e.g. transfer of expertise, regional co-operation, funding, formation of consortia, etc...

(see Article 5)

D. Is there a national biodiversity conservation plan for your Territory, or any progress towards this? **Y / N**

(see Article 6a)

If YES, please outline what progress has been made:

E. Is there an integrated development plan for your Territory, which takes biodiversity conservation into account? *(see Article 6b)*

Do any of the plans (for example, tourism, agriculture, or industrial development plans) for other sectors or the economy in your Territory take into account the conservation of biodiversity?

F. Has there been a comprehensive survey of the biological diversity of your Territory, and of the ways that biodiversity can be used, or promoted in a sustainable way? (sustainable use could refer to fishing, agriculture, eco-tourism, diving, etc) *(see Article 7a)*

G. Is there a monitoring programme for biological diversity and its sustainable use?

(see Article 7b)

H. Has there been an official survey of activities which actually, or may potentially damage your Territory's biodiversity, and are these activities being monitored?

(see Article 7b)

Are you aware of activities which threaten biodiversity in your Territory? If YES, please explain them below:

I. Is biodiversity monitoring data routinely maintained and organised by a central registry, in a form suitable for others to use? *(see Article 7d)*

If YES, who is responsible for this registry?

J. Does your Territory have a system of protected areas and are special measures taken to conserve biodiversity in these? *(see Article 8a)*

K. Are there guidelines for the selection, establishment and protection of such sites, or are they being developed? (please explain)

L. What steps have been taken (e.g. in physical planning procedures or land use policies) to conserve biodiversity throughout the Territory, and are there examples of these working or not working in practice?

(see Article 8c)

M. What, if any, steps have been taken to promote the protection of particular ecosystems or populations?

(see Article 8d)

N. Are there examples of good or bad practice in the areas adjacent to protected areas? If YES, please explain:

(see Article 8e)

O. Are there projects in progress to restore degraded ecosystems and populations of threatened species, and are there examples of continued degradation or threat?

(see Article 8f)

P. Are regulations and controls in place to protect your biodiversity from risks, e.g. invasion of alien species, natural disasters, contamination, etc?

(see Article 8g)

Q. What steps are in place to prevent the introduction of alien species, and the eradication or control of those already present and threatening natural systems?

(see Article 8h)

R. To what extent are local communities empowered and assisted to conserve biodiversity and benefit from its sustainable use? *(see Article 8 i-m)*

S. Are ex situ conservation measures being taken and, if so, are they supportive of in situ measures? (ex situ relates to any location outside the natural habitat, whether within, or outside the country). If YES, please explain:
(see Article 9)

T. Article 10 requires the integration of conservation and sustainable use of biological resources into national decision making, and that adverse impacts on biological diversity should be limited. Traditional cultures should be supported in practices compatible with sustainable use and to implement remedial action in degraded areas. Co-operation between government and the private sector should be encouraged to develop sustainable use.

Are there examples of cases supporting or opposing the provisions of this Article?
Please list:

U. Are there any economically and/or socially sound measures being brought into practice as an incentive to conserve, or use biological resources in a sustainable way ? If YES, please explain:
(see Article 11)

V. What examples are there of research and training in the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, being provided to your Territory?
(see Article 12)

W. What, if any, measures are in place to promote public education and awareness of the biological diversity in your country?

X. Are impact assessments required for proposed projects?

If YES, are there examples of these?

Has the quality of these impact assessments been judged independently?

Thank you for your time and effort.

Convention on Biological Diversity

Guidance Notes to assist with the questionnaire

SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Of the 42 articles of the Convention, numbers 1-19 contain the most relevant parts in relation to scientifically based work on nature conservation. The needs relating to each of these relevant Articles is outlined below.

Article 1 states the objectives of the Convention, which are the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilisation of genetic resources.

Article 2 defines the terms used in the Convention. They include:

"Biological diversity" means the variability among living organisms from all sources including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine and other aquatic ecosystems and the ecological complexes of which they are part; this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems.

"Biological resources" includes genetic resources, organisms or parts thereof, populations, or any other biotic component of ecosystems with actual or potential use or value for humanity.

"Sustainable use" means the use of components of biological diversity in a way and at a rate that does not lead to the long-term decline of biological diversity, thereby maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of present and future generations.

These terms are then used frequently throughout the following Articles.

Article 3 recognises the rights of signatory states to exploit resources within their country.

Article 4 states that the Convention will apply within national jurisdiction limits but that, for processes and activities, consideration beyond these boundaries may be required.

Article 5 strives for co-operation between states and between states and international organisations to help conserve biological diversity. *(Qu'n C.)*

Article 6 outlines the need to construct national plans. *(Qu'ns D&E)*

Paragraph 6a is a key part of the Convention in that it states that national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity shall be developed. This may be achieved by adapting existing strategies, plans or programmes to meet the measures set out in the Convention.

Equally important, **Paragraph 6b** says that plans for the conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use must be integrated into other cross-sectoral plans.

Article 7 contains instructions for the elements of a national framework to identify and conserve biological diversity. *(Qu'ns F,G, H, I)*

Paragraph 7a requires identification of components of biological diversity which are important for its conservation and sustainable use.

Paragraph 7b. These components must then be monitored through sampling and other techniques.

Paragraph 7c. Processes and categories of activities which have, or are likely to have, a significant adverse impact on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity should be identified. The effects of these factors should be monitored.

Paragraph 7d Data derived from monitoring should be maintained and organised.

Article 8. This is a key Article in relation to conservation practice and is fundamental to the work of the statutory conservation agencies. *(Qu'ns J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R)*

Paragraph 8a states that a system of protected areas should be established where special measures are taken to conserve biodiversity.

Paragraph 8b. Guidelines for the selection, establishment and management of these sites should be developed.

Paragraph 8c. Biological resources important for the conservation of biological diversity should be managed whether within or outside protected areas.

Paragraph 8d requires promotion of the protection of ecosystems, natural habitats and the maintenance of viable populations.

Paragraph 8e. Environmentally sound and sustainable development should be promoted in areas adjacent to protected areas.

Paragraph 8f. Degraded ecosystems should be restored and recovery plans for threatened species should be developed and implemented.

Paragraph 8g. Means should be established to regulate and control risks

Paragraph 8h. The introduction of alien species should be prevented, and alien species threatening natural systems should be controlled or eradicated.

Paragraphs 8i to 8m relate to developing the correct general conditions to allow conservation to take place, respecting local communities.

Article 9 encourages ex situ conservation where this is supportive to in situ measures. *(Qu'n S)*

Article 10 requires the integration of conservation and sustainable use of biological resources into national decision making, and that adverse impacts on biological diversity should be limited. Traditional cultures should be supported in practices compatible with sustainable use and to implement remedial action in degraded areas. Co-operation between government and the private sector should be encouraged to develop sustainable use. *(Qu'n T)*

Article 11. Economically and socially sound measures should be adopted to act as incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of components of biological diversity. *(Qu'n U)*

Article 12. Research and training, particularly for the special needs of convention. A programme for scientific and technical training in aspects of the identification, conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity should be developed. Scientific co-operation should be enhanced. *(Qu'n V)*

Article 13 encourages measures to promote public education and awareness. (Qu'n W)

Articles 15 and 16 relate to genetic resources and transfer of technology.

Articles 17, 18 and 19 promote exchange of information and technical and scientific co-operation.

The remaining Articles relate to the administration of the scheme and to other aspects not directly relevant to this questionnaire.

WWF-UK
Panda House, Weyside Park
Godalming, Surrey GU7 1XR
Telephone: 01483 426444
Fax: 01483 426409
Website: http://www.wwf-uk.org

Registered Charity No 201707