



REGIONAL SEAS

UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

*Marine Mammals Plan of Action:
evaluation of its development and achievements*

UNEP Regional Seas Reports and Studies No. 102

599.5
MAR

UNEP 1988

Note: This document was prepared by Ms. Andrea Matte-Baker of the Follow Up and Evaluation Section of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) under project FP/5102-86-02. The evaluation was commissioned by the Oceans and Coastal Areas Programme Activity Centre of UNEP as a contribution to the development of the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals.

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNEP concerning the legal status of any State, Territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The document contains the views expressed by the author acting in her individual capacity and may not necessarily reflect the views of UNEP.

For bibliographic purposes this document may be cited as:

UNEP: Marine Mammals Plan of Action: evaluation of its development and achievements.
UNEP Regional Seas Reports and Studies No. 102, UNEP, 1988.



UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME

*Marine Mammals Plan of Action:
evaluation of its development and achievements*

UNEP Regional Seas Reports and Studies No. 102

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I INTRODUCTION	1
II CONCLUSIONS	2
III RECOMMENDATIONS	3
IV ANALYSIS	6
- Relevance of the Global Plan of Action	6
- Appropriateness of the Design of the Plan	7
- Impact of the Plan	8
- Effectiveness of the Strategy for Implementation	8
- Efficiency of the Implementation	10
- Catalytic Role of UNEP	10
- Unanticipated Effects	11
- Alternative Approaches	11
ANNEX I The Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals: Main Points	 13
ANNEX II International Organizations, Agreements and Programmes Concerned with Marine Mammals and their Environment	 19
ANNEX III Historical Summary of the Development and Implementation of the Global Plan of Action	 21
ANNEX IV The UNEP Supported Contributions to the Implementation of the Global Plan of Action	 25
ANNEX V Other Major Contributions to the Implementation of the Global Plan of Action	 33
ANNEX VI Terms of Reference and Logistics of the Evaluation	 37

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals was developed between 1978 and 1983 jointly by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in collaboration with other inter-governmental and non-governmental bodies concerned with marine mammal issues, particularly the International Whaling Commission (IWC) and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN). In October 1983, the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) endorsed the principles of the Plan, and in May 1984 the UNEP Governing Council followed suit. The IWC endorsed the cetacean component of the Plan at its annual meeting in June 1984 and in November of that year the General Assembly of the IUCN endorsed the promotion of the Plan as a matter of high priority. This series of formal endorsements officially launched the implementation of the Plan.

2. The basic objective of the Plan was to promote the effective implementation of a policy for conservation, management and utilization of marine mammals which would be widely acceptable to governments and the public. The Plan was built around five concentration areas, namely policy formulation, regulatory and protective measures, improvement of scientific knowledge, improvement of law and its application and enhancement of public understanding. Thirty eight priority actions were recommended as necessary to implement the Plan under these areas. An Annex contained a brief description of over one hundred projects that were designed to take action to the practical level. (See Annex I for a brief description of the main points of the Plan).

3. The Plan was intended to stimulate, guide, assist and where necessary co-ordinate activities of existing organizations giving emphasis to international actions, while recognizing the importance of national actions. The main organizations identified as having an important role in the implementation of the Plan included UNEP, FAO, The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), other specialized agencies of the United Nations, the CITES Secretariat, IWC, the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR), IUCN, The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) as well as governments and non-governmental organizations in general. (Annex II lists all the major organizations, as identified in the Plan, having an interest in marine mammals).

4. The implementation of the Plan has gone through two distinct stages - an initial attempt to get the plan moving, followed by a phase of carrying out specific activities. (See Annex III for a brief description of the different stages of implementation).

5. The contributions of the different organizations involved have ranged from specific contributions by UNEP (See Annex IV for a brief description of UNEP supported projects), some of which have been carried out in close collaboration with IUCN, to more general contributions by organizations such as FAO, IWC and WWF which can be considered as being carried out within the framework of the Plan. (See Annex V for a listing of the major contributions of other actors).

6. As it is now over four years since the Plan was endorsed, UNEP considered that it would be useful to conduct an in-depth evaluation to assess the achievements and shortcomings of its implementation, and to make recommendations on the future implementation of the Plan in general as well as on the future orientation of UNEP's contributions to it. In making the evaluation the relevant files within UNEP and other organizations were analyzed and personal contacts made with staff of UNEP, FAO, IWC, IUCN as well as other organizations interested in the Plan. (Annex VI describes the terms of reference and logistics of the evaluation).

II. CONCLUSIONS

7. In general terms progress in implementing the Action Plan has not been satisfactory: there has been a limited adherence to it and many of the recommendations have yet to be carried out or have been only tackled in a partial manner. Four main reasons are adduced for this lack of progress; they are : (1) changing government priorities and a certain lack of political clarity and will to act, (2) universally severe budgetary constraints, (3) the Plan itself did not provide a sufficiently clear framework for action, (4) insufficient efforts were made to promote implementation by all potentially active collaborators. A summary of the main conclusions of the evaluation is presented below:

(i) The impact of the Action Plan on the conservation, management and utilization of marine mammals has not yet been significant. There is no clear evidence that the Plan has been very influential or that the status of marine mammals has improved during the period since the Action Plan was first approved. The status of large cetaceans has stabilised somewhat but this has been as a result of the moratorium on whaling proclaimed in 1982, before the Plan was endorsed.

(ii) The effectiveness of the implementation of the Action Plan has also not been fully satisfactory, being impaired by : (1) the failure to establish sufficiently strong institutional arrangements that could support the promotion, catalysis and coordination of action; (2) the lack of a clear policy framework for action; (3) the lack of a clear strategy for implementation of the plan, with carefully determined priorities, targets and time frame; (4) the decision to concentrate on projects, rather than on mobilizing governments, international institutions and the public for strategic action; (5) the lack of a secure source of funding for the programmes of action.

(iii) The efficiency in carrying out the actions that were implemented has been uneven. Undoubtedly some of the contributions were carried out in a timely manner, but the same cannot be said for the projects supported by UNEP. In all cases there have been very serious delays, and most of the expected outputs are not yet available. In mitigation, one can surmise that internal reorganizations in UNEP negatively affected the early stages of implementation.

(iv) UNEP's coordinating and catalytic role, performed through its acting as the Secretariat to the Plan, has been less vigorous than expected. By failing to set up appropriate policy, advisory and supportive structures, UNEP was unable to tackle the main functions of the Secretariat. There was very little leadership and guidance for the implementation; no sustained efforts were made to coordinate action, other than trying to elicit proposals for projects; no attempt was made to systematically monitor progress and finally, only limited action was taken in promoting information exchange and public relations.

(v) UNEP's intellectual input was significant when the Plan was being developed, but subsequently its contributions have diminished. In particular, not enough attempts have been made to identify areas needing priority attention and to identify opportunities for influencing or catalyzing actions that could have a meaningful impact on the status of marine mammals.

(vi) Financial support from the Environment Fund, though modest, should have been sufficient to influence positively the implementation of the Plan. However, the funds were not put to the most effective use, inasmuch as only a few small projects were supported. While they may be useful in themselves, they do not in most cases constitute important contributions to the furthering of the main objectives of the Plan.

(vii) The contributions of the other major agencies interested in the implementation of the Plan have likewise been limited. FAO, as one of the original promoters of the Plan, should have had a very visible role but in effect has made only modest contributions. The undeniable

budgetary constraints to which it has been subject to in the last few years have had an influence, but the failure to deal with perceived contradictions between the needs for development of fisheries on the one hand and for the conservation and management of marine mammals on the other has probably been the determining factor in this lack of action.

(viii) The contribution of IWC has been very positive within the possibilities that its role allows. Other organizations such as the InterAmerican Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC), have also made useful contributions within their areas of concern.

(ix) IUCN has made some useful contributions to research, through its network of scientists and through the Species Survival Commission. However, not enough has been done by the IUCN Secretariat to take the best advantage of this contribution and place it firmly within the framework of the Plan. The independent contribution of the IUCN Secretariat has been limited by financial constraints to those actions carried out in collaboration with UNEP, which, as pointed out above, have not been successful for the most part. WWF has been active, particularly in the realm of protected areas.

(x) The contribution of governments within the framework of the Plan has been notably absent. This is not to say that they have not made positive contributions to the conservation, management and rational utilization of marine mammals. Indeed, many have been active and have promoted both international and national action, but without reference to the Plan, in spite of repeated calls for collaboration on the part of UNEP.

(xi) Non-Governmental Organizations of all types have been very active in promoting and implementing actions that are in the spirit of the Action Plan. However, all this activity has taken place outside of the framework of the Plan. This in itself is an indication that the Plan has only played a minor role in influencing the international community.

(xii) The Action Plan is still relevant in principle, particularly in terms of its overall goal to conserve and manage marine mammals. However, changing circumstances necessitate a renewed political commitment and the definition of new priorities which respond more to the needs of today. It is clearly urgent to put the Action Plan on its feet again and the recommendations that follow are intended to assist in this.

8. The overall lesson learnt is that if a plan of action that involves the international community is to be successful, there are certain necessary conditions that must be met. If these conditions are not met, then the plan will remain only a hollow document, a symbol perhaps of good intentions but not a vehicle for positive change. The first requirement is political will and a formal commitment, both on the part of governments and international institutions to take action. The second requirement is that the Plan itself be substantively of high quality and be backed by appropriate institutional and financial arrangements.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

Specific recommendations concerning the Global Plan of Action

9. As a matter of urgency, the Plan of Action should be reviewed and made more responsive to the needs of the present, and its implementation promoted in a renewed manner. This will entail redefining the substantive, financial, strategic and institutional underpinnings of the Plan and reestablishing firm commitments to its implementation. The recommendations below are intended to assist in the task:

(i) As a matter of the first priority the substantive framework of the Plan should be reviewed and updated. In order to assist this process, the following actions are recommended:

- (a) conduct a review and assessment of the current status of marine mammals, and of the policy, legislative, management and conservation actions currently being carried out by governments, international agencies and NGOs;
- (b) on the basis of this assessment, identify the critical elements of conservation and management that need to be given attention now setting a hierarchy of priorities. The five areas for action originally identified by the Plan are still relevant, but it is suggested to concentrate on those areas which can produce the greatest positive changes: policy interventions; fostering public awareness and support; promoting legislative and protective measures, in that order;
- (c) review the existing substantive framework of the Plan and identify the recommendations that are still valid;
- (d) within each of the critical areas chosen for attention, define goals to be attained therein within the medium range period of five years and identify the strategic actions that should be undertaken. Preference should be given to those actions that will have the greatest impact and promote the overall objectives for that area;
- (e) outline a minimum programme of action that will help attain the goals. It is recommended to initially draw up a two year programme.

(ii) An essential prerequisite for action under the Plan is the definition of a policy framework. While keeping some of the elements of a species based perspective, a more integrated approach to the conservation and management of marine mammals is recommended, stressing overall resources management within an ecosystem or regional approach. Policy stances on specific issues such as catch quotas, fisheries/mammals interactions and others should also be defined.

(iii) An explicit strategy and revised programme for implementing the Plan should be developed. This should outline the sequence of events, the actions that have to be undertaken at different stages of the process, the means by which cooperation and coordination shall be obtained and the promotional efforts that will be carried out.

(iv) As part of the strategy, it is suggested that ways should be devised in which comprehensive programmes, such as the worldwide initiatives on National or Regional Conservation Strategies, the UNEP Regional Seas Programme, FAO initiatives in marine resources management, IUCN and WWF Protected Areas and Coastal Areas Management programmes could be taken advantage of and influenced to give greater consideration to marine mammals. In addition to this, ways and means of assisting the dissemination of basic information on marine mammals should be found, for example, through already established endeavours such as, the FAO fact sheets for species identification and the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) data books.

(v) An explicit financial plan should be developed for the priority actions identified. In particular, ways and means should be suggested on how to approach the major donors and sources of funds, and how to launch a funding campaign for the Plan, or portions of it.

(vi) As a matter of urgency, it is necessary to establish the institutional arrangements which will support the promotion, coordination and management of the Plan. In principle, the recommendations of the Plan are sound, but it is necessary to reaffirm what the functions of each of the support structures will be. It is important also that sufficient time and effort be devoted to making these structures perform effectively. It is suggested that the following minimal functions be considered;

- (a) The Secretariat, under the guidance of the ad-hoc Planning and Coordinating Committee, shall have the responsibility for day-to-day actions to promote the Plan, monitor progress and coordinate implementation. It shall also serve as a clearinghouse for information which it should widely disseminate among appropriate audiences.
- (b) The ad-hoc Planning and Coordinating Committee shall have as a principal function determining policy issues, fixing priorities; outlining a programme; searching for sources of funding, coordinating action and promoting the Plan.
- (c) The ad-hoc Scientific Advisory Committee shall provide an expert view on the status and opportunities in the conservation and management of marine mammals and give advice on priorities.

(vii) Immediate attention should be given to the establishment of a network of institutions, policy makers and scientists which have an interest in marine mammals and which could collaborate actively in the implementation of the Plan. A useful model to follow in terms of the nature, mode of operations and mechanisms for its establishment could be the network supporting the programme for pollution monitoring and research in the Mediterranean (MEDPOL) under the Mediterranean Action Plan.

(viii) In order to ensure that the Plan will have the necessary support, there should be formal agreements as to the role that each agency will play in the coming years and the way in which each agency is prepared to contribute to the Plan. UNEP in particular, as the Secretariat to the Plan, and in keeping with its catalytic and coordinating function within the UN System, should outline its contribution clearly. Governments should again be approached to obtain their commitment and support. As to the involvement of NGOs, these should be the subject of a separate campaign to elicit their general cooperation.

(ix) Immediate action should be taken to complete pending activities, particularly those funded by the Environment Fund. In particular:

- (a) Speed up the process of establishing a mechanism for incorporating the IUCN network of marine mammals scientists, policy makers and institutions into the framework of the Plan.
- (b) Finalize all the pending activities and produce the final project reports.
- (c) Begin publications under the Marine Mammals Technical Report Series, taking those manuscripts that are already available under the UNEP projects and in the IUCN Species Survival Commission Specialist Groups on Marine Mammals and deemed relevant and useful.
- (d) Set up a mechanism for the regular publication of the Plan Newsletter "The Pilot" and redefine its functions very clearly in terms of goals, content and audience.

Specific recommendations for UNEP action

(i) UNEP should define clearly what its future contribution to the Plan of Action for Marine Mammals will be, in terms of

- (a) discharging the role of Secretariat to the Plan

(b) supporting specific actions through the Environment Fund. Here it is suggested that priority be given to:

- policy level leverage at the international and national level
- promotion of compliance with international agreements
- promotion of cooperative ventures and comprehensive approaches
- fostering greater public awareness and eliciting public support
- supporting the publication of technical and information material

(ii) UNEP should examine with attention the recurring problems in regard of project management and of its relations with supporting and cooperating agencies and introduce corrective action.

(iii) UNEP should reconsider the manner in which it supports action plans in general, defining a policy that gives greater emphasis to policy level leverage, coordination of strategic actions and judicious catalysis of critical actions.

General recommendations concerning Action Plans

Action plans formulated by the international community have not always been well defined or structured. It is therefore recommended that UNEP assist in improving the process by preparing guidelines for the preparation of action plans, similar to those already prepared for its Regional Seas Programme (Regional Seas Report and Studies Series, No. 15, 1982), and based in part on the experience gained in the implementation of the present Plan.

IV. ANALYSIS

10. Information which provides the factual basis for the analysis presented below on the achievements and shortcomings in the implementation of the Global Plan of Action, appears in: Annex I - The Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals: Main Points; Annex II - International Organizations, Agreements and Programmes concerned with Marine Mammals and their Environment; Annex III - Historical Summary of the Development and Implementation of the Global Plan of Action; Annex IV - The UNEP Supported Contribution to the Implementation of the Global Plan of Action; Annex V - Other Major Contributions to the Implementation of the Global Plan of Action.

Relevance of the Global Plan of Action

11. The concept of having a common framework around which the international community could organize concerted global action to conserve and manage marine mammals was and remains relevant. What is less certain, however, is whether the best mechanism for providing such a framework should be an action plan.

12. In recent years, there has been a proliferation of action plans in the international system, and many of them have not been well conceived nor effective in guiding action. This fact has perhaps contributed to the growing scepticism as to the utility of these plans. As a consequence, much of the action called for has been carried out outside of the official framework of the plans. This is, in large measure, what has occurred with the Plan on Marine Mammals.

13. In spite of this, there are good reasons to promote common and global action for marine mammals, and provided the Plan can offer useful suggestions on policy, priorities and strategies, it will be followed. If, in addition, specific advantages are offered to those who operate under

the aegis of the Plan - for example access to a clearing-house of information, facilitation of contact among interested parties working in the field, and access to a functional financing system (not necessarily a source of funds) then the Action Plan on Marine Mammals can be truly relevant.

Appropriateness of the Design of the Plan

14. As can be seen from the examination of the Plan itself, the document was less than satisfactory in its conception and presentation.

15. The overall goal of conserving, managing, and utilizing marine mammals in a wise manner, so that they could yield the greatest sustainable benefit, was a good point of departure. The decision to group actions around five major areas of concern - policy formulation, regulatory and protective measures, improvement of scientific knowledge, improvement of law and its application, and enhancement of public understanding, was well grounded. However, from this promising point of departure, the rest of the Plan fell short of outlining a coherent set of actions that could lead to the goals it had set for itself. In addition, the definition of primary and secondary objectives and of principles to guide implementation of the Plan was too general to give operational content to the actions recommended.

16. The recommendations themselves referred, for the most part, to very specific and self-contained actions. There is no evidence here of a strategic intent either in the individual recommendations or in all the recommendations taken as a group. The main problem was that, given the nature of the Action Plan, it would have been useful if the recommendations could have outlined categories and types of actions that would guide and in effect give a common theme to independent actions. In addition, the recommendations were not articulated in a coherent fashion, but rather, were somewhat randomly allocated under each of the five areas of concern. What is notable here is that in many cases the recommendations do not appear to contribute directly to carrying out the general tasks and achieving the goals defined for that particular area of endeavour. Finally, the specific nature of the recommendations required some sort of direct coordination and financial support which was not defined clearly.

17. The series of project proposals annexed to the Plan gives an indication of a strong bias, reflecting perhaps the interests of the group which was involved in the drafting. While the proposals themselves were of interest and scientific merit, they addressed very specific issues which in fact were peripheral to the recommendations, and even the overall goals of the Plan. It is notable that most of the proposals refer to scientific research and that for example only one proposal each is made for legislative action and increasing public awareness.

18. The fact that there was no serious attempt to provide for the financial requirements of the Plan and annexed projects in a realistic manner, indicating in precise terms where the funds were expected to come from, was a serious omission that, to a significant degree, has determined the lack of success in implementing the Plan.

19. Finally, the long-drawn process of preparation of the document, over six years, during which time government priorities and public opinion were changing, undoubtedly also contributed to its unstructured nature, as did the fact that responsibility for drafting the document was transferred mid-way.

20. It should be noted in mitigation of this negative state of affairs that neither FAO nor UNEP - the main architects of the Plan - had much experience in developing frameworks of this nature. Structuring a compromise document, as the Plan clearly was, is not easy. Still, the UN and in particular, UNEP, bears the responsibility for having designed a document, that could not provide the leadership or guidance that was expected. One can only conclude that it is not surprising that such a flawed document did not provide inspiration for action.

Impact of the Plan

21. The impact of the Plan would probably have been greater if the momentum generated in the mid-seventies, after the conference of the Human Environment in 1972, and the Bergen Consultation in 1976 had been sustained. The delay between these two events, and the actual completion of the draft Plan in late 1983 contributed no doubt to a certain loss of interest, and perhaps even confidence, in what the UN system was able to do for the conservation and management of marine mammals.

22. As matters stand there is very little evidence that the Plan has, in any significant way, contributed to inspire and mobilize those groups that have an interest in marine mammals. Within the UN system and among its close collaborators, general references were made to the Plan. However, much of the action actually undertaken did not respond directly to the recommendations (as can be seen from the cross examination of the recommendations and the activities carried out thus far by several organizations), and thus, they cannot be rightly considered as being under the aegis of the Plan. Other organizations, particularly governmental ones, and NGOs, rarely mention the Plan, acting more in accordance with their own agendas.

23. In spite of this apparent lack of influence of the Plan, much action is being undertaken in relation to research and promotion of conservation and management of marine mammals. However, the evidence of what the status of marine mammals is currently, is not clear, but it can be said with reasonable confidence that it has probably not improved appreciably since the Plan was endorsed. The main factor in protecting whale populations was the 1982 Moratorium, which it should be noted, comes up for discussion in 1990. The creation of the Indian Ocean Sanctuary has also been influential within the sphere of its action. Both these initiatives however, predate the Plan, although some of the actions carried out under it have been supportive of these endeavors. In spite of these positive actions, it appears that the situation of marine mammals has, in some places, continued to deteriorate during the time frame of the Plan's existence. This is certainly a setback which points out, more than ever before, the need for corrective action.

Effectiveness of the implementation

24. The effectiveness with which the Plan was set up for implementation and was supported by institutional structures, was very limited, and has negatively conditioned the final results.

25. UNEP accepted to act as the Secretariat to the Plan and designated one staff member to carry out these functions on a part-time basis. This has clearly been insufficient to discharge the responsibilities of the Secretariat. In addition, it is apparent that not enough thought was given to the implications of such a task. From the way UNEP has discharged its work, it is clear that there was a confusion between UNEP's functions as the Secretariat, with responsibilities for promoting and coordinating the Plan, and UNEP's role as an agency contributing to the implementation by supporting projects designed to respond specifically to the recommendations. In point of fact, these functions became merged, with the latter predominating.

26. The other structures called for in the Plan, namely, the ad-hoc Planning and Co-ordinating Committee and the ad-hoc Scientific Advisory Committee, were not established. The Consultative Meetings convened in 1985 did not really fill in for the functions of the Co-ordinating Committee. The first meeting had a pragmatic approach, being convened primarily as a means of soliciting project proposals that could set the implementation of the Plan moving. The meeting recommended that a policy paper (called for in Recommendation 2), should be prepared. The paper was commissioned and the draft made available in mid 1985. The draft however was not found to be satisfactory by UNEP, and inexplicably no further action was taken, either to revise the paper or commission a new one. Thus, when the second meeting was convened, policy issues were not discussed. This was an important strategic mistake because the necessary policy framework for the

Plan was lacking. Finally, the review meeting (Recommendation 38) was never called, thus removing any corrective action that could have been introduced mid-way through the implementation. Without this policy framework the Secretariat of the Plan was not able, as is natural, to guide the process of implementation in a substantive manner.

27. The roles of different agencies contributing to the implementation was never defined explicitly, nor were formal agreements drawn up that would bind the players to definite contributions, whatever their nature. This would have given reality to the endorsement of the Plan by these agencies. As it turned out, once the Plan was approved, responsibility for its implementation was handed over to UNEP and, henceforth, to a significant degree, it was considered "UNEP's Plan". Even at this point, no systematic effort was made to recruit the support of all the agencies and bodies identified in the Plan as being able to make a contribution. It is true that extensive correspondence was sustained by the Secretariat of the Plan with some of those organizations identified as having an interest in marine mammals. However, the correspondence with NGOs did not show itself to be an effective means of recruitment. Governments in particular have been notable for their absence, in spite of the fact that they endorsed the Plan at the Governing Council of UNEP and other fora, and they were repeatedly approached by UNEP to actively support the Plan and declare their substantive and financial contributions. When comparing the current list of contributors with the original list of potential contributors, one is struck by the fact that so few have actually participated in the implementation of the Plan.

28. As there were no firm financial provisions for implementing the Plan, funding for projects was expected to come from the Environment Fund. When these funds were not forthcoming - UNEP making it clear that it could only contribute US\$400,000 for the first biennium of the implementation, as opposed to the US\$12 million budget foreseen by the Plan - the other players lost interest. This might have been avoided if greater attention had been given to financial issues and there had been a strategy for raising funds outside of the framework of the Environment Fund.

29. Examining the implementation of the recommendations of the Action Plan, it is clear that action was not overly effective. A problem here is the difficulty in determining what has actually been done. The Secretariat of the Plan did not monitor progress consistently, and therefore, information available is not complete and it may be that more was done to implement the recommendations that appears here.

30. The major recommendation on preparing a paper outlining the policy framework for future action, was not completed, as was mentioned earlier. Until this is done, it will be very difficult to have a clear concept of how to proceed. Progress in implementing the recommendations referring to regulatory and protective measures has been rather modest. This has taken place mainly through preparation of some reports and support to a few government initiatives. It is doubtful whether this approach is the most effective way of contributing to the recommendations specifically, and in a more general manner, to the global promotion of effective ways to protect of marine mammals. In respect of improvement of scientific knowledge, there has been limited progress. Several of the actions recommended were considered by the different agencies involved in the Plan but as yet no concrete steps have been taken. At issue here is how to draw together all the global research efforts into a system that can provide the necessary information to design effective ways to protect and manage marine mammals. In respect of improvement of law and its application, progress has been very limited, mainly calling attention to marine mammals in a general way, for example, in the UNEP Regional Seas programmes and protocols. To a certain degree, legislative issues were well addressed by work such as the FAO/UNEP "Compendium of National Legislation on the Conservation of Marine Mammals" prepared in 1983 before the endorsement of the Plan. The real challenge however, is how to promote a global legal system for protection and regulation that can be enforced, at both the regional and national level. Modest progress has been obtained in carrying out the recommendations regarding enhancement of public understanding, through the publication of a UNEP booklet on marine mammals, production of posters and stickers and videos,

and publication of articles in magazines (*Ambio*) and News Bulletins (*The Siren*, and *The Pilot*). It is doubtful that such limited action could contribute significantly to raising awareness worldwide.

31. In retrospect, it is clear that it would have been necessary to draw up a strategy for implementation, based on the Plan certainly, but interpreting it in a more organized manner, outlining priorities, identifying strategic leverage points, fixing responsibilities, and drawing up a time schedule which could have given an orderly progression to action. Instead of this, the decision was made by default: in order to get the Plan moving a series of projects, supported by UNEP, were quickly approved, eventually constituting the almost entirety of the implementation of the Plan. This was a strategic mistake. By choosing to implement the Plan through projects rather than global programmes, the opportunity to use the Plan as an instrument of leverage and maximization of action was missed. Furthermore, the actual choice of projects for support shows clearly that there was no concept of "critical actions", that is, actions which could have a decisive influence on the protection and management of marine mammals.

32. A good share of the responsibility for these problems lies with UNEP and in particular, with its management, which clearly underestimated the responsibilities that came with the acceptance of becoming the Secretariat to the Plan and furthermore did not give the necessary policy guidance. A possible reason for this policy void is the fact that at this time, there occurred in UNEP a series of internal reorganizations - moving the responsibility for the Plan from the (now) Office of the Programme, to the (now) Oceans and Coastal Areas/Programme Activity Centre (OCA/PAC), and transferring the latter from Geneva to the UNEP Headquarters in Nairobi. The period of adjustment to this major reshuffle took place at the precise time when the implementation of strategy should have been developed.

Efficiency of the implementation

33. The efficiency with which those actions that did take place under the Plan were carried out, appears to have been extremely low. Not much can be said of the specific contributions of the agencies other than UNEP, and to a lesser degree, IUCN in the joint projects it carried out with UNEP. One factor which in the past perhaps had some influence in the performance of the latter was the institutional restructuring in IUCN and WWF that took place in 1985. The period of adjustment is now past, and in the future, matters should proceed more smoothly.

34. In respect of the management of the UNEP projects the complete lack of efficiency with which they were carried out was remarkable. Implementation has been characterized by extreme delays, time overruns being of the order of twice or more over the time originally designated for the purpose. While many of the draft reports were available within the stipulated time periods, failure to reach agreements on trivial points of detail resulted in almost none of the reports being yet completed. This in turn has meant that as of now, the Marine Mammals Technical Report Series, that was to have been a major contribution of UNEP to the implementation of the Plan, has not yet seen the light of day, even if there is material on file. This inefficiency, as well as difficulties in co-operating with other organizations, is a serious problem. It has, to a degree, invalidated the direct contribution of UNEP to the Plan, and bespeaks of deeprooted problems in internal management procedures.

Catalytic role of UNEP

35. In a general manner, the catalytic role of UNEP has been effective, in the sense that UNEP was one of the promoters of the idea of developing an action plan for the conservation and management of marine mammals. UNEP's role in the actual preparation of the Plan was also decisive, and it elicited the close collaboration of other agencies interested in marine mammals, particularly, FAO, IWC and IUCN.

36. In the sense that the endorsement of the Plan should have led to concerted action on the part of the major players, UNEP's catalysis has been ineffective. Most of the organizations concerned have not increased their involvement with marine mammals. For example FAO's contribution has even diminished from the time of the preparation of the Plan. Other organizations, such as the IWC, and WWF have essentially continued with the same programmes they had before the endorsement of the Plan.

Unanticipated effects

37. The Plan itself has not had any unforeseen effects. What was not anticipated however, was the fact that the international situation would change as much as it has. While concern for marine mammals is still high, certain factors, such as the moratorium on whaling, the boycott on fur seals, fluctuations in other marine resources (fisheries), have all contributed to lessening the importance of the Plan, either by defusing previously tense situations or deflecting attention to other more pressing problems, essentially changing the nature of the game. The unforeseen severity of the financial crisis affecting international systems generally diminishing funds available for the Plan, was also not foreseen at the time of its endorsement.

Alternative approaches

38. The general approach to the overall goals of the Plan needs to be substantially modified. The reasons for the inappropriateness of the current approach are described throughout this section. The alternatives will consist principally in applying a more globally oriented and strategic approach and instituting the specific modifications that are set out in Section III, Recommendations.

ANNEX I

THE GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION FOR THE CONSERVATION,
MANAGEMENT AND UTILIZATION OF MARINE MAMMALS:
MAIN POINTS

Below are described the main points of the Plan, presented in abridged form.

1. OBJECTIVES OF THE PLAN

(i) The basic objective of the Plan is to promote the effective implementation of a policy for conservation, management and utilization of marine mammals which is widely acceptable among the governments and peoples of the world.

(ii) The long-term objectives of the Plan are directed toward:

- (a) Prevention of further extinctions resulting from human activities;
- (b) Maintenance in optimal states of populations of marine mammals and restoration to such states of those which have been depleted or otherwise severely reduced by human activities;
- (c) Ensuring that any exploitative use of marine mammal populations leaves options for alternative future uses;
- (d) Ensuring that any exploitative or low-consumptive use of marine mammal populations is conducted in a humane manner and with the minimum disruptive effect;
- (e) Ensuring that sympathetic consideration is given to sectors of human communities which are dependent on marine mammals, so as not to disrupt their cultures or cause undue economic hardship.

(iii) To provide the necessary conditions for the achievement of these primary objectives, the following secondary long-term objectives must also be pursued:

- (a) Ensuring continuing research on the nature of marine mammals and the ecosystems they inhabit, to provide a better basis for future actions;
- (b) Ensuring a broad understanding by the general public of the nature of marine mammals, that can be reflected in the policies and practices of Governments.

In connection with the objectives, it was suggested (Recommendation 1) that a definition of optimum population levels should be agreed upon, stating which definition to use.

2. SPECIES COVERED BY THE PLAN

The following groups of marine mammals species were considered by the Plan:

- (i) The cetaceans (whales and dolphins) covering: (i) Odontoceti and (ii) Mysticeti
- (ii) The pinnipedes (whales and sea lions) covering: (i) Otariidae and (ii) Phocidae

(iii) The sirenians (dugongs and manatees)

(iv) Some otters (marine and sea otters)

3. PRINCIPLES

Six basic principles were established for the Plan:

- (i) It should serve to stimulate, guide, assist and where necessary coordinate the activities of existing organizations.
- (ii) While emphasis must be given to international actions, nations should be assisted in the identification of problems and the implementation of solutions;
- (iii) Solutions to problems should be based on a clear identification and appraisal of existing threats;
- (iv) Solutions to conservation problems should be based on the results of appropriate research in the natural sciences, integrated with knowledge derived from other fields of study;
- (v) Improved policies for the conservation of marine mammals must take account, among other things, of their ecological role in the oceans and of any particular features they may have which call for special consideration;
- (vi) Implementation should be based on recognition of cultural and ecological variety in various regions and situations, and requires sensitive and flexible responses to the needs of human societies which may be affected by conservation measures.

4. AREAS OF CONCENTRATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Plan defined five areas of concentration and proposed 34 recommendations concerning them.

A. Policy formulation

The Plan highlighted the importance of scientifically defining clear objectives for conservation and management of marine mammals (Recommendation 2).

B. Regulatory and protective measures

The Plan defined several categories into which regulatory and protective measures should fall, namely: limitation or prohibition of harvesting animals and of deliberate killing for other reasons; prevention of unnecessary or incidental killing; protection from unnecessary disturbance (harassment) and adverse environmental changes. 15 recommendations for action were made (Recommendations 3 through 17) directed principally at the compilation of historic data series, reviewing harvesting operations, and compiling data on catches and trade as well as the situation that obtained in respect of threats to marine mammals, including interface with fisheries; effects of contamination and other man induced environmental changes; the identification of specific protective measures and objectives and practices for management, the promotion of protective measures; controlled scientific sampling, identification of shared resources.

C. Improvement of scientific knowledge

The Plan recognized the importance of providing a sound scientific basis for conservation and management, identifying several main areas for research, including population, ecosystem, conservation and management studies; socio-economic and anthropological studies and studies of adaptations of marine life. 5 specific suggestions (Recommendations 18 through 22) were made in respect of the need to prepare a clear set of priorities and costing for research, the improvement of information systems, provision of training, setting up systems for public participation and the undertaking of independent studies of the scientific basis for conservation measures.

D. Improvement of law and its application

The Plan stressed the importance of legal measures in the protection and management of marine mammals, suggesting 10 specific actions (Recommendations 23 through 32) which could assist in strengthening the existing and somewhat inadequate legal machineries. The recommendations urge governments to take action and international organizations to assist them in the task. It is also suggested to produce inventories of legislation, upgrade existing legal instruments, including expansion of World Heritage lists, encourage participation in CITES and ensure that the requirements for marine mammals set out in the Convention on the Law of the Sea are met. Establishment of protected areas and sanctuaries and ensuring that legal provision are taken into account in their operations is also suggested. In addition, co-ordination of measures is urged as well as holding a workshop to clarify the legal aspects of the conservation and management of marine mammals.

E. Enhancement of public understanding

The Plan recognized the vital role of a good public understanding in the achievement of the objectives of the Plan and stressed the use of different methods, including media campaigns, posters, photos, publications, etc. It made 3 specific suggestions (Recommendations 33 through 35) for immediate action, including the determination of the best ways to launch campaigns for public awareness, the production of informative material and the production of a regular information bulletin.

5. ARRANGEMENTS AND SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN

The Plan made 3 suggestions (Recommendations 36 through 38) for ways in which the implementation could be supported, namely through an ad-hoc Planning and Co-ordination Committee, the establishment of a full time Secretariat and the convening of a review meeting at the end of the first biennium to review progress and consider future action.

6. RESPONSIBILITIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The prime responsibility for action was identified as belonging to governments, the United Nations system (UNEP, FAO, UNESCO and other relevant specialized agencies) Intergovernmental bodies (IWC, SCAR) and Non-Governmental Organizations (IUCN, WWF).

7. PRIORITIES

The Plan categorized the purposes for which the recommendations were intended, namely, dealing with urgent situations, gathering necessary information and the improvement of the

conditions for conservation of marine mammals. The types of action to be taken were classified as organize, study, act, represent, catalyze, meet, finance and plan.

8. DRAFT FINANCIAL PLAN

The following summary and costing of projects in support of the Plan of Action was presented. It was accompanied by the relevant fact sheets describing them in detail. The potential donors were considered to be all countries with an interest in the conservation, management and utilization of marine mammals.

MM 1 R	Review of harvesting operations on marine mammals which are not under international control	US\$ 40,000
MM 2 R	Determination of safe catch limits for marine mammals and scientific sampling in protected areas	US\$ 100,000
MM 3 R	Assistance to developing countries in training of additional marine mammal scientists and in the protection of threatened marine mammal populations	US\$ 1,150,000
MM 4 R	International co-ordination and support for the FAO/UNEP Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals	US\$ 340,000
MM 5 R	Development of information systems and research capabilities to support conservation-based management practices for large cetaceans	US\$ 3, 83,000*
MM 6 R	Development of information systems and research capacities to support conservation-based management practices for small cetaceans	US\$ 2,687,000
MM 7 R	Development of information systems and research capacities to support conservation - based management practices for pinnipeds, sirenians and some others	US\$ 4,246,000
MM 8 R	Legal aspects of marine mammal conservation	US\$ 95,000
MM 9 R	Examination of means of increasing public awareness of Marine Mammals	US\$ 100,000
	Total cost for 1984-1985	US\$11,842,000

* As in original document

9. PROJECT PROPOSALS ANNEXED TO THE PLAN

The Plan had an Annex that presented 118 fact sheets on specific project proposals designed to implement the Plan, covering the following topics:

(i) Scientific research, including determination of status of different populations of marine mammals and determination of population dynamics, interactions, distribution, balance and ecology and other matters of scientific interest. Some proposals also were concerned with research methods (88 fact sheets).

(ii) Management aspects including collection of historical data, determination of safe catch limits, methods for reducing incidental catch and mortality, effects of pollutants and debris and other threats that affect the management process (25 fact sheets)

(iii) Education and training (2 fact sheets)

(iv) Coordination of the implementation of the Plan (1 fact sheet)

(v) Legal aspects of marine mammals conservation (1 fact sheet)

(vi) Public awareness (1 fact sheet).

ANNEX II

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, AGREEMENTS AND PROGRAMMES
CONCERNED WITH MARINE MAMMALS AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT

Below is presented the list, as it appeared in the Plan, of the different entities that were expected to have an interest in or be relevant to the implementation of the Plan.

A. UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

1. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
2. The Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas
3. The United Nations Conference on The Human Environment
4. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
5. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO): (i) Committee on Fisheries (COFI); (ii) Regional fisheries commissions and councils established under FAO:(a) General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean (GFCM), (b) Indo-Pacific Fisheries Commission (IPFC); (iii) Other FAO regional bodies concerned to a minor degree:(a) Indian Ocean Fisheries Commission (IOFC), (b) Committee for the Eastern Central Atlantic Fisheries (CECAF), (c) Regional Fisheries Advisory Commission for the Southwest Atlantic (CARPAS), (d) Western Central Atlantic Fisheries Commission (WECAFC), (e) The Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Information System (ASFIS) linked with UNEP's INFOTERRA.
6. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO): (i) Division of Oceanography and the Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC); (ii) The Man and the Biosphere Programme (MAB); (iii) Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage
7. The International Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) [now the International Maritime Organization (IMO)]
8. World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
9. Co-ordinating Mechanisms: (i) Administrative Committee on Co-ordination (ACC); (ii) Inter-secretariat Committee on Scientific Programmes Relating to Oceanography (ICSPRO); (iii) Ecosystems Conservation Group (ECG); (iv) International Co-ordinating Council of the Programme on Man and the Biosphere (MAB); (v) Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Pollution (GESAMP)

B. OTHER INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (IGOs) and AGREEMENTS

1. International Whaling Commission (IWC)
2. International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)
3. Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)
4. International North Pacific Fisheries Commission (INPFC)
5. International Baltic Sea Fishery Commission (IBSFC)
6. Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (I-ATTTC)
7. North Pacific Fur Seal Commission (NPFSC)

8. Permanent Commission of the Conference on the Use and Conservation of the Marine Resources of the South Pacific (CPPS)
9. Antarctic Treaty
10. Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR)
11. The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Seals
12. International Commission for the Southeast Atlantic Fisheries (ICSEAF)
13. Mixed Commission for Black Sea Fisheries (MCBSF)
14. Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)
15. Commission by the Agreement between Canada and Norway on Sealing and Conservation of the Seal Stock in the North-west Atlantic (1971)
16. Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMSWA)

C. MULTILATERAL AGREEMENTS UNDER REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

1. Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere (1940)
2. The African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
3. South Pacific Commission
4. The European Economic Community (EEC)
5. The Council of Europe
6. The Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitat

D. INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (INGOs)

1. International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN): (i) The Species Survival Commission (SSC); (ii) Conservation Monitoring Centre (CMC)
2. World Wildlife Fund (WWF)
3. International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU)
4. Bureau of International Whaling Statistics (BIWS)

ANNEX III

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN OF ACTION

1. Marine mammals have been considered as resources for centuries. However, increasingly sophisticated methods of hunting, pollution, general degradation and encroachment of habitats and growing human populations have all contributed to their decline. Concern for the plight of marine mammals culminated in the early seventies, when whales became the symbol of threats to the environment and the responsibility of mankind towards other species. This concern was formally expressed at the Conference on the Human Environment in 1972, where recommendations were made for the protection of marine mammals, calling for a ten year moratorium on whaling.
2. This challenge was taken up by the IWC, which initiated the International Decade for Cetacean Research (IDCR) to examine the status of whale stocks globally. At the same time the FAO, through the Advisory Committee of Experts on Marine Resources Research (ACMRR) started a review of the status of marine mammals. This review culminated in 1976 in Bergen, at the Scientific Consultation on Marine Mammals sponsored by both FAO and UNEP. The proceedings and scientific papers of the meeting, presenting all available information on marine mammals, was published in four volumes on "Mammals in the Seas", and remains a classic on the subject.
3. During this period, the Governing Council of UNEP approved several decisions concerning the oceans and marine mammals, including Decision 33 (III) Oceans: Conservation of Marine Mammals in 1975, Decision GC 59(IV) on Protection of Whales in 1976, Decision GC 88(V) on Oceans, Section B on Whaling in 1977. These decisions called attention to the need for cooperation in the protection of marine mammals.
4. The time was ripe to become more active in the field of marine mammals protection and, in 1978 it was considered necessary to draw conservation efforts together in a systematic manner. Thus, FAO and UNEP commenced collaboration on the preparation of a Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals. The preparation process involved many collaborating organizations, such as IWC and IUCN. Several drafts were prepared and circulated to governments for comments. The process was long drawn, lasting for over 6 years.
5. While the draft was being discussed, two important events took place. In 1979, the IWC initiated the creation of the Indian Ocean Whale Sanctuary, where whaling was limited within a designated zone. That same year, a zero catch quota was issued for sperm whales and finally, in 1982, the decision to impose a moratorium on commercial whaling till 1990 was reached. Interested organizations including FAO, IUCN and WWF continued work on issues related to marine mammals during this period, contributing to the overall goals that were being set for the Plan..
6. The Action Plan was in the meantime completed, and was endorsed by the 15th Session of the FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) in October 1983. There was considerable "support in principle for the general aims of the Plan", but it was stressed that it would be "necessary to update and modify the Plan during the implementation". The Governing Council of UNEP, at its 12th Session in May 1984 "endorsed" the Plan "as a timely and valuable framework for policy planning and programme formulation by the international community". In June 1984, the 36th annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) endorsed the cetacean component of the Plan, and in November 1984 the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) also endorsed the Plan at its General Assembly in Madrid and adopted a conservation programme which included "conservation of marine species, especially mammals" and "promoting the conservation of coastal and marine living resources".

7. The portfolio of 118 projects annexed to the Plan, and the draft financial plan calling for a minimal package of nearly US\$12 million prompted a certain concern on the part of the Governing Council of UNEP. Therefore, in its decision endorsing the Action Plan the Governing Council requested the Executive Director of UNEP "to promote a broad based response"...to the Plan..."drawing upon the capabilities of existing institutions" and requested, as a means of "securing additional financial commitments in support of the Plan", "to circulate to potential donors fact sheets on individual projects" identified for the implementation of the Plan. It also requested to investigate the possibility ... "of adopting a regional approach to the funding". UNEP duly contacted governments in July 1984 and February 1985, soliciting their support and collaboration in the implementation. There was very limited response however, as only 17 replies were received, and most of these were noncommittal. Other means of raising funds were considered internally by UNEP, but no concrete steps were taken to approach funding in an aggressive manner.

8. Following the endorsement of the Plan, and the creation in UNEP of the Secretariat of the Plan - in the form of one UNEP staff member working half-time - consultation meetings were held to discuss implementation. In March of 1985, the First Consultative Meeting on the Protection of Marine Living Resources was held in Geneva. It was attended by 14 organizations (FAO, UNESCO, UNEP, the World Tourism Organization (WTO), the CITES Secretariat, the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES), IWC, SCAR, IUCN, WWF, Connecticut Cetacean Society (CCS), Costeau Society, European Association for Aquatic Mammals (EAAM), Greenpeace). The purpose was to review the ongoing and planned activities in the United Nations System and of selected intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations with an interest in the Action Plan. 51 ongoing projects that could be considered as contributions to the implementation of the Plan were reviewed and an additional 19 new proposals were discussed, of which 8 were selected by UNEP for consideration for funding. At the time UNEP outlined criteria for selecting proposals for funding by the Environment Fund, stating that projects should: be a direct contribution to the achievement of the goals of the Action Plan and the System-Wide Medium-Term Environment Programme of the UN (SWMTEP); be ongoing activities that could easily be expanded; be activities for which funding was already earmarked; be activities requested by individual countries or regional intergovernmental bodies; be activities to assist developing countries, including training; be activities having a regional orientation; be pilot projects. This statement on criteria was designed to clear up misunderstandings as to the nature and extent of financial support that UNEP could provide for the implementation of the Plan. Several suggestions were made at the meeting, including that regular consultative meetings be held. The most important decision was that immediate action should be taken on Recommendation 2 of the Plan, which called for a review of relevant concepts and alternatives for global objectives for conservation of marine mammals leading to the formulation of policy directives. UNEP commissioned the report but the document was never completed and UNEP did not take further steps, not even presenting the draft to the Second Consultative Meeting, as requested.

9. The Second Consultative Meeting was held in Gland in October 1985. It was attended by 15 organizations (IOC/UNESCO, UNEP, ICES, SCAR, IWC, IUCN, WWF, IATTC, International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW), CCS, Vlaamse Vereniging voor de Besturing van de Zeezoogdieren (VVBZ), Greenpeace, Whale Centre, Monitoring International/Fund for Animals, Sea Shephard International (SSI)). Once again the purpose was primarily to review ongoing and planned activities, as the policy discussions could not proceed in the absence of the required policy document. 24 proposals for possible funding were considered. UNEP suggested that a meeting with Government Permanent Representatives to UNEP might ensure a wider acceptance of the Plan, and could provide information on programmes in countries, which could be considered as a contribution to the implementation. The consultative meeting expressed some scepticism on the usefulness of this approach, but did not rule the possibility out, leaving it to the Secretariat. Another suggestion was to hold an international conference to promote the Plan. The consultative meeting suggested that it would be better to postpone the conference till such a time when there were real achievements to discuss. It was pointed out that the review meeting recommended by the Plan could perform a similar function. The consultative meeting also agreed that action should be taken to ensure better

coordination of activities, possibly through a formal review procedure, and that it was also necessary to assign some kind of priority to actions. Once the consultative meeting was concluded, UNEP considered its recommendations internally, but no decisive action was taken.

10. During 1985, UNEP approved 10 projects to be supported by the Environment Fund, as joint efforts with various organizations including IUCN, SCAR, IATTC and national organizations. Most of the attention of UNEP was henceforward focussed on the implementation of these projects. After this period, no new projects were approved. The other agencies made contributions to the implementation during this period, such as the preparation, by FAO, of a reports to COFI (1985, 1987) on unintentional entanglements of marine mammals in fishing nets and debris, as well as a review of contaminants in marine mammals in 1987, by ICES/IOC/UNEP. The IWC carried out some studies on whales and generally pursued its policy objectives through its annual meetings. IUCN and WWF pursued their programmes on parks and protected areas. In the absence of systematic monitoring of action by the Plan Secretariat, there is very little data on actions by governments and NGOs, but it is common knowledge that many governments continue to show concern for marine mammals, either in terms of their protection or for their use as a resource and have taken action in this sense. NGOs in the North in particular, have been very active and continue to raise public awareness and put pressure on governments.

11. In April 1987 the Fifth Interagency Meeting on Oceans and Coastal Areas Programmes was held in Rome. Among other things, the implementation of the Action Plan was discussed, outlining progress to date. Recognizing that implementation had been slow, it was suggested to call a consultative meeting for late 1987 or early 1988 to consider future plans for the implementation of the Plan, including the definition of a policy on marine mammals to be presented for approval by governments; the examination of the present status of regulatory and protective measures; the consideration of scientific research through the Scientific Committee of IWC and the Species Survival Commission of IUCN; the building of a network of institutions and individuals participating in the Action Plan; improvement of legislation on marine mammals and the enhancement of public understanding through publications of a Marine Mammal Action Plan Report and Studies Series. The Meeting was not held as planned and is now convened for late 1988.

ANNEX IV

THE UNEP SUPPORTED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE GLOBAL PLAN OF ACTION

Below is a brief description of the activities supported by the Environment Fund and which constitute the contribution of UNEP to the implementation of the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals.

Activity 1: Support to the Secretariat of the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals

UNEP is charged with acting as the Secretariat to the Plan. The functions of the Secretariat were only very loosely defined by the Plan, and UNEP did not explicitly further define its role. UNEP appointed a staff member to act as the Secretariat, but contrary to the recommendations of the Plan, this was only on a half-time basis. As part of its contribution UNEP has endeavoured to coordinate implementation, principally through the medium of the two consultative meetings it has convened, also taking advantage of interagency meetings and extensive correspondence for the purpose. The promotion of the Plan has been carried out through the distribution of the Plan of Action document in six languages and the dissemination of promotional material on marine mammals (a special issue of *Ambio* in 1986, a video cassette on "Whales and Whaling", a film on small cetaceans currently under preparation, in collaboration with the Television Trust for the Environment (TVE) and other material produced under the UNEP Support Project described below). Overall, the evidence shows that the manner in which UNEP has discharged its function as Secretariat has not been overly vigorous or imaginative.

Activity 2: UNEP Support to the Implementation of the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals (internal project 5103-85-09)

1. The project outlines the contribution of UNEP to the support of the implementation of the Plan. The expected duration of the project was from November 1985 to July 1986, for a total of US\$88,000. It was revised to extend the duration till August 1988 and increase the cost to US\$125,834.
2. The principal objective of the project was to mobilize NGOs, IGOs and national institutions which are involved in matters relating to marine mammals, in a concerted effort to ensure the implementation of the 38 recommendations of the Action Plan on Marine Mammals, and through these organizations encourage the involvement of the general public.
3. The expected outputs included public awareness material, consisting of posters, stickers and booklets distributed to organizations to enable them to improve their information campaigns; an established network of organizations/institutions collaborating in the implementation of the Action Plan; a report on harvesting operations on marine mammals which are not under international control; a report describing an assessment of ongoing marine mammals programmes/activities and their potential contribution to the Action Plan; a review of the present knowledge of existing and potential interactions between marine mammals and finfish, squid and krill in the Southern Ocean.
4. Progress in the implementation has been uneven. Some publicity materials had been produced early in 1985, consisting of a booklet on "Marine Mammals", produced in English, Spanish and French, as well as a poster and stickers. These have been widely distributed to around 100 organizations and 1200 individuals, and countries. Progress in the other activities has been much slower. The preparation of guidelines for NGO public awareness campaigns has suffered extreme delays, but is now finalized, and it is expected that publication will take place shortly. The report on harvesting operations is available and will be considered for publication. The report

describing ongoing marine mammals programmes is also available, but has not been published. The review of the interactions between marine mammals and finfish, squid and krill is not yet available. A review of contaminants in marine mammals has been published.

Activity 3: IUCN's Contribution to the Implementation of the Global Plan of Action for the Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals (5103-85-07)

1. The project outlines the contributions of IUCN to the Action Plan, carried out with the support of the UN Stamp Trust Fund, administered by UNEP. The initial duration was from August 1985 to December 1986, for a total cost of US\$286,000, with IUCN contributing US\$206,000. The project was revised twice to reflect changes in budget and extension of duration.

2. The specific objectives of the project were to: (a) promote environmentally sound management of marine mammals worldwide, (b) increase the ability of policy makers, managers, scientists and concerned groups of individuals, particularly in developing countries, to deal with issues on marine mammals conservation and management, (c) ensure initiation of new project activities contributing to the Action Plan funded from sources other than the Environment Fund of UNEP, (d) increase the awareness of the general public, particularly in developing countries, on the necessity of marine mammal conservation.

3. The principal expected outputs were: the establishment of a network of institutions supporting the implementation of the Plan; the preparation of a directory of scientists and scientific institutions relevant to the Plan; production of technical reports related to marine mammals; publicity and information material including a quarterly newsletter "The Pilot", a tape slide show and photo exhibit and a list of past, ongoing and planned IUCN/WWF projects contributing to the Plan. These outputs were slightly changed in the course of the project revisions.

4. Implementation of the project has been very difficult. There have been serious delays in the delivery of outputs and repeated failure by UNEP and IUCN to come to an agreement on different aspects of the project. It also appears that there are problems in the current project management procedures in both organizations. In the event, the following sequence can be described.

Action (i) Establishment of a mechanism for continuous liaison between the IUCN/WWF network of associated organizations and UNEP.

The idea was to incorporate into the Plan the IUCN network of experts, and in particular, the five Specialist Groups (cetacean, seal, sirenian, otter, polar bear) on Marine Mammals of the IUCN Species Survival Commission. While the network is involved in activities related to the Plan, no formal mechanism for participation has been devised, nor has full advantage been taken of its potential for contributing actively in the implementation.

Action (ii) Collection, collation and review of outputs of ongoing and planned projects of the IUCN/WWF network which are related to marine living resources/marine mammals.

The idea was to use reports prepared within the IUCN/WWF network for publication under a Marine Mammals Technical Reports Series. Suggestions were presented to UNEP by IUCN in late 1986, together with a series of reports for consideration. UNEP found the reports unsuitable, but no definitive reaction ensued from UNEP, and, to date, nothing has been published.

Action (iii) Preparation and implementation of a programme of joint IUCN/WWF/UNEP public awareness activities.

A proposal was presented to UNEP in late 1986, suggesting modes of collaboration between IUCN and UNEP only. The options included an overview of the basics of the global campaign which identified the targeted public, and described the possibilities open for an information campaign through printed materials, visual aids and the media. Three costing options were presented. UNEP did not react forcefully, and, to date, no further action has been taken.

Action (iv) Production, publication and distribution of a joint IUCN/UNEP newsletter on marine mammals.

The first mock-up of the newsletter "The Pilot" was presented to UNEP in October 1985. There were exchanges of views on the style and format, and the wish of UNEP to retain editorial control. Discussions were protracted, both parties failing to reach an agreement, till finally, the first issue was published in June 1987. Since then, no more action was taken till September 1988, when discussions began concerning the preparation of the second issue, which is expected to be available at the end of November.

Action (v) Preparation of a compendium of experts, consultants and institutions working in the field of marine mammals.

The first draft of the compendium was sent to UNEP in September 1986. It contained most of the relevant material, but needed some further work on sorting of categories and finalizing the presentation, including the credits. No final agreement was reached till July 1988, when the camera ready copy of the manuscript "Marine Mammals Specialists Directory" was sent to UNEP by IUCN.

Action (vi) Provision of expert and consultative services to marine mammal activities of UNEP.

The project called for IUCN to maintain an active liaison with potential consultants in order to respond to the needs of UNEP and UNEP funded projects in implementing the Action Plan. To date, little progress has been made in this area. Specific consultative services were discussed, but the parties never reached an agreement.

Action (vii) Provision of training through and organization of training courses and workshops.

No progress has been made under this activity. No definite training programme was formulated by IUCN and UNEP did not step in to provide guidance.

Action (viii) Preparation of proposals for projects and project documents contributing to the Action Plan.

IUCN was successful in generating proposals in 1985. All in all, 17 proposals were submitted to UNEP, but due to lack of funds in UNEP, these proposals were not followed up. A list of the IUCN/WWF past and ongoing activities was presented to the first consultative meeting in 1985. To date, nothing more has been done.

Activity 4: Distribution Status and Management of the West Indian Manatee in Selected Countries in the Caribbean (5103-85-03)

1. The project was conceived as a joint activity undertaken by UNEP and IUCN. It was initially scheduled to take place between July 1985 and March 1987, for a total cost of US\$93,010, of which UNEP was expected to contribute US\$30,010.
2. The short-term objective of the project was to ensure conservation and rational management of the West Indian manatee in the Wider Caribbean by: (a) raising the awareness of the local people about the threats to the species, (b) increasing the ability of local personnel in survey and conservation techniques, (c) assessing the distribution, abundance and management practices of the West Indian manatee in selected Caribbean countries.
3. The programmed outputs were three country reports for Colombia, Cuba and Venezuela, on the present status of manatees in the surveyed areas, including recommendations for management and additional research requirements. It was intended that the reports would be published in the Marine Mammals Technical Reports Series. An additional expected output was the training of two local experts in surveying techniques in each of the selected countries.
4. The project has suffered from changes in plans, delays, misunderstanding on substantive issues and financial management and a general failure by UNEP and IUCN to reach timely agreements. The Caribbean Trust Fund did not provide the funds as expected, and therefore the Colombian and Cuban studies were dropped. The report for Venezuela was virtually complete in December of 1986, in both Spanish and English. It showed that very few manatees are present there, and it was surmised that a similar situation exists in Colombia and Cuba. This helps to highlight how little is known about this species and how much still needs to be done. At this point, there was a protracted correspondence between all parties concerned - the researchers, IUCN and UNEP, and questions of the clearance of the document arose. An opportunity to present the report to the Caribbean Action Plan Meeting in April 1987 was therefore missed. To date the report has not been finalized nor published. In addition to the draft report, one scientist was trained in Venezuela.

Activity 5: Investigation of the Distribution and Status of the Burmeisters Porpoise, Phocoena Spinipinnis, in Peru and Chile (5103-85-04)

1. The project was conceived as a collaborative effort between UNEP and IUCN. The initial duration was from July 1985 to December 1986, at a total cost of US\$320,600, with UNEP contributing US\$80,000, IUCN US\$24,600 and the rest by the counterparts in Peru and Chile, and the University of Guelph, Canada.
2. The objective of the project was to encourage improved management practices to ensure conservation of the species Phocoena Spinipinnis and increase the ability of local scientists in marine mammal survey and management techniques.
3. The output of the project was envisaged as two separate national reports describing the status of the species Phocoena Spinipinnis in Chile and Peru. At the end of the project it was also planned to hold a small workshop to discuss the results.
4. The implementation of the project has been problematic. The studies progressed as planned with minor delays and preliminary drafts were available by mid 1987 but it was not possible to obtain significant results in Chile, as it appears that populations there are limited. Changes in plans regarding the workshop which was to be expanded into a full-fledged international meeting have also delayed the completion of the project. Throughout this period there was extensive correspondence on the part of UNEP and IUCN, but much of this took place at cross purposes, with answers not forthcoming, or coming only after protracted delays. Several venues and modalities

for the workshop were proposed, and it is now agreed that it will involve all countries in the Southeast Pacific Region. The Permanent Commission of the South Pacific (CPPS), IUCN and UNEP, will jointly convene the meeting which was expected to be held in Lima in November 1988, but has now been postponed.

Activity 6: Study of the Biological Requirements and Establishment of Critical Habitats for the Monk Seal *Monachus Monachus* (5103-85-06)

1. The project was conceived as a joint activity between UNEP and IUCN. The original duration was envisaged to be from July 1985 to February 1986, at a total cost of US\$60,930, of which UNEP was to contribute US\$37,130.
2. The objective of the project was to increase the awareness of governments of the Mediterranean on the physical and biological needs of the Mediterranean Monk Seal.
3. The expected output was a report describing the habitat requirements of the Mediterranean Monk Seal, based on field surveys in several countries in the region. The assessment of the possibility of reintroducing it in localities where it is extinct was to be part of the report. The report was to be reviewed by a workshop and subsequently published under the Marine Mammals Technical Reports Series.
4. The project suffered considerable delays, and changes of plans. Preliminary reports were ready in late 1986 and preparations were made to hold a joint Expert Consultation on the Management of the Mediterranean Monk Seal in April of that year. However no agreement was reached by UNEP and IUCN on the details, and in particular on the exact nature of the meeting and the desirable participation. Extensive correspondence ensued, with the meeting being postponed several times till it was finally held in Athens in January 1988. The First Meeting of the Scientific and Technical Committee of the Mediterranean Action Plan considered the report in May 1988. It is expected that further action on the Monk Seal will be undertaken under the Mediterranean Action Plan. This "handing over" of responsibilities is an encouraging development which should be replicated in other projects.

Activity 7: Status and Conservation Needs of Dugongs (*Dugong-Dugon*) in the East African Region (5103-85-03)

1. The project was conceived as a joint activity between UNEP and IUCN. The initial duration was expected to be from July 1985 to March 1986, at a cost of US\$70,300, with UNEP contributing US\$38,000, IUCN US\$20,800 and the US Fish and Wildlife Service US\$11,500.
2. The short-term objective of the project was to promote conservation and rational management of the remaining population(s) of Dugong dugon in the East African Region by bringing to attention of the proper authorities the distribution and status of remaining populations of Dugong dugon, their habitat requirements, and causes of population decline.
3. The expected outputs consisted of a consolidated report for the East African Region describing the survey results and management plans for dugongs including recommendations for regulations, public education and alternatives to their traditional use or incidental killing. It was expected that the report would subsequently be used by governments for management purposes. A separate report appraising the survey methodology used and developed by the project was also expected.
4. The implementation of the project suffered an unprecedented amount of difficulties, including delays in scheduling and obtaining reports from the consultant, difficulties in funding, badly planned survey methods. (The report on this latter is available). These difficulties were accompanied by protracted four way exchanges between UNEP, IUCN, the IUCN Regional Office and the

Kenya consultant. The result has been further delays, with the draft report for Kenya only being made available for review by IUCN in September 1988. Some action has been taken by IUCN on gathering data in other East African countries, on the basis of which a consolidated report is expected to be prepared shortly.

Activity 8: Benign Research on Whales (Sri Lanka) (5103-85-01)

1. The project was conceived as a joint activity between UNEP and the National Aquatic Resources Agency (NARA) of Sri Lanka. The initial duration of the project was from January 1985 to March 1986, at a cost of US\$60,000, with UNEP contributing US\$60,000. The project has been revised twice to reflect changes in implementation.

2. The short-term objectives of the project were to survey the distribution of whales, dolphins and dungongs in Sri Lankan waters, identify methods to reduce by-catch of marine mammals in fishing nets, train local scientists in benign research, increase awareness among local people of the potential value of marine mammals to tourism.

3. The principal expected outputs of the project included a report describing the effect of different fishing methods on the by-catch of dolphins, and on the seasonal distribution and abundance of whales off Trincomalee, to be used for updating the IUCN/CMC Cetacean Database. A booklet of marine mammals of Sri Lanka, as well as a general increased level of knowledge about benign research methodologies among NARA research staff, and an understanding by the private sector of the potential tourist value of marine mammals was also expected.

4. From the start, there were problems in the implementation, characterized by gross delays. Although the findings were available by mid 1986, NARA did not have the staff capacity to produce a report that could be published. Therefore UNEP resolved that a consultant should be engaged to assist in finalizing the report. Negotiations on possible individuals and dates have been underway ever since. The civil strife in Sri Lanka has been adduced by UNEP as part of the problem in getting a consultant to visit NARA, but the protracted nature of the negotiations and failure to act is difficult to explain. To date, no concrete action has been taken by UNEP, and the report is not yet finalized.

Activity 9: Promotion of Co-operation Among Latin American Nations in the Assessment and Reduction of Dolphin Mortality in the Eastern Pacific Ocean (5103-85-02)

1. The project was conceived as a joint activity between UNEP and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC). It was initially scheduled to take place between August 1985 and December 1986, for a cost of US\$871,275, with UNEP contributing US\$60,000. The project has been revised 3 times to extend duration and revise costs.

2. The objectives of the project were to: (a) achieve a significant increase in the use of dolphin saving procedures by tuna fishing vessels in the Eastern Tropical Pacific by the end of 1986, (b) increase the ability of researchers and others to assess both dolphin populations and the impact of the tuna fisheries on these populations, (c) improve regional cooperation among Latin American States participating in the tuna fisheries to safeguard the tuna associated dolphin populations.

3. The expected outputs were to prepare reports from observer trips describing the effects of information campaign among fishing crew, and obtain data on the number and species composition of dolphins encountered relative to the number of species composition of dolphins accidentally caught. Training of Latin American nationals in marine mammal biology and ecology, population assessments and conservation activities as well as the training of observers was an important expected result. Initially around 55 people were to be trained.

4. There were several adjustments of plans throughout the project, many delays and misunderstandings about financial reporting procedures. In spite of these problems, the project has produced good results. The observer trips have been conducted, and reports on the sightings and the information campaigns prepared. However, the expected assessment is not available yet. The courses sponsored by UNEP and the IATTC trained 128 students in the identification and assessment of abundance and how to deal with the tuna/dolphin problems and dolphin mortality. There is yet no data on whether there has been any reduction in dolphin mortality, but encouraging events, such as Mexico's acceptance to receive observers on fishing vessels could produce positive results later.

Activity 10: Satellite Observations on Free-living Seals (5103-85-05)

1. The project was conceived as a joint venture between UNEP and the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (SCAR) and other collaborating organizations including the UK National Environment Research Council and the US National Marine Fisheries Service. The total cost was of US\$72,000, of which UNEP was expected to provide US\$35,000.

2. The short-term objective of the project was to increase scientist's ability to monitor the movements and feeding behaviour of marine mammals in remote and inaccessible areas through the development and testing of satellite compatible telemetry systems.

3. The expected output was to provide a proven device for general application in all environments where seals occur, with potential application to the open seas worldwide. The devices were expected, with minimal modification, to be applied to studies of large whales and sirenians. A manual for the design of sensor/transmitter combinations for specific purposes was also to be prepared. It was expected to publish the reports in the Marine Mammals Technical Reports Series.

4. To date the project has not been fully completed. There were difficulties in developing and placing the devices, and the technical reports are not yet ready.

Activity 11: A Study of Dugong Movements Using VHF and Satellite Telemetry (5103-85-10)

1. The project was conceived as a joint activity undertaken by UNEP in collaboration with the James Cook University of Queensland, Australia. It was initially scheduled to take place between June 1986 and December 1987, for a total cost of US\$64,800, of which UNEP was expected to contribute US\$10,300.

2. The short-term objectives of the project were directed to: (a) obtain information about dugong movements and habitat usage in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park necessary for the development of a management plan through the use of VHF and satellite telemetry; and (b) determine the usefulness of monitoring dugong movements by VHF and satellite telemetry.

3. The expected results of the project included preliminary data on the movements of dugongs in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, and a methodology for the measurement of dugong movements by VHF and satellite telemetry.

4. There were delays in the implementation, and some difficulties with the hardware construction, but by mid 1987, part of the reports were completed. It was expected that by early 1988 the final reports would be available, but to date, they are not.

ANNEX V

OTHER MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PLAN OF ACTION

Below are described some of the contributions to the implementation of the Plan of Action. Only those of major contributors are listed, as supplied by them. Many other organizations have also contributed indirectly to the aims of the Plan, but information available to the evaluator through the Secretariat to the Plan is not sufficiently complete or systematic to warrant inclusion.

1. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)

(i) A series of reports have been produced by FAO concerning legislation and technical aspects of the interphase between fisheries and marine mammals and debris, as a direct contribution to the Plan of Action, including:

- "Compendium of National Legislation on the Conservation of Marine Mammals" (FAO/UNEP 1983). (A compilation of texts of national laws exists also, unpublished)
- "World Review of Interactions between Marine Mammals and Fisheries" (FAO Fisheries Technical Paper 251, Rome 1984)
- Paper distributed at the 16th Session of the FAO Committee on Fisheries (April 1985) "Unintentional Entanglements in Fishing Nets and Debris"
- Report to the 17th Session of the Committee on Fisheries (May 1987) on "Protection of Living Resources from Entanglement in Fishing Nets and Debris"
- "World Review of Marine Mammals Entanglement in Fishing Gear and Plastic Marine Debris" (being completed)

(ii) Other indirect contributions are the FAO species identification fact sheets some of which refer to marine mammals, and some of the fisheries statistics which are useful inasmuch as they can be related to marine mammals.

2. International Whaling Commission (IWC)

(i) IWC has sponsored a number of activities in recent years which can be considered to be direct contributions to the implementation of the Plan of Action. These include studies and scientific research on cetaceans and on technical aspects related to an indepth evaluation of whale stocks, including:

- Right Whale Workshop (Boston, Mass., June 1983)
- Galapagos Sperm Whale Study grant (Whitehead, 1987-89)
- Eastern North Pacific Humpbacks (Ferrari, 1988-89)
- Indian Ocean Sanctuary Expert Meeting (Seychelles, Feb. 1987, assisted by UNEP funding)
- Contract Study on Sightings (SMRU, 1986-87)
- BIWS Whale Catch and Whale Catching Databases (IWC Secretariat - continuing activity)
- Photo-Identification Workshop (La Jolla, CA, May 1988)
- Radio Tagging Grant (Swartz, 1987-89)
- DNA Fingerprinting Contract Study (Dover, 1987-89)

(ii) The IWC is also committed to a number of broader concerns involving continuing activities which have a bearing on the Plan:

- Comprehensive Assessment of whale stocks, understood by the IWC Scientific Committee as an in-depth evaluation of the status of whale stocks in the light of management objectives and procedures.
- Revision of present management procedures.
- Continuation of the Second IDCR programme, particularly the series of Antarctic minke whale sighting cruises.

3. International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)

A direct contribution to the Action Plan has been a report prepared in collaboration with the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission (IOC) and UNEP:

- "Review of Contaminants in Marine Mammals (ICES, 1987).

4. International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN)

(i) The direct contributions of IUCN to the implementation of the Plan of Action include Secretariat actions, (some of which are already mentioned in Annex IV) as well as some of the work of the Species Survival Commission. These include:

- Establishment of a network of IUCN Marine Mammal experts making regular contributions to the Action Plan, (169 specialists).
- Coordination of the IUCN contribution to the Plan.
- Production of Global Directory of Marine Mammal Experts and Institutions.
- Gathering material for the UNEP publication series on marine mammals.
- Producing "The Pilot", the newsletter of the Marine Mammals Action Plan.
- Implementing field projects concerning the status and conservation of the Mediterranean Monk Seal, the West Indian Manatee, the East African Dugong, the Burmeisters Porpoise and Hector's Dolphin.
- Supervising field projects on the Mediterranean Monk Seal (Mauritania), the Juan Fernandez Fur Seal and Hooker's Sea Lion.
- Holding of specialized meetings on different issues concerning marine mammals.
- Joint UNEP/IUCN meeting to agree on a regional management plan for conservation of the Mediterranean Monk Seal (under the Barcelona Convention/Protocol for Protected Areas).
- Publication of studies and meeting proceedings concerning marine mammals.
- "Action Plan for the Conservation of Biological Diversity, 1988-1992: Dolphins, Porpoises and Whales" (IUCN/SSC Cetacean Specialist Group, NOAA, American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums, WWF, 1988). Other plans for seals, sirenians and otters are under preparation.
- Production of Cetacean and Sirenian Specialist Groups Newsletters.
- Establishment of a Cetacean Specialist subgroup to address techniques of qualitative analysis.
- Establishment of a mechanism for field collection of marine species data using the IUCN-SSC network; archiving and computer processing of the data; maintaining an interactive computerized data-base.

(ii) In a more indirect manner, IUCN also contributes through the work of the Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas, and some of the work of the Commission on Environmental Law and through the programme on marine and coastal areas. Action here includes:

- Support to the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas (Tunis)
- Identification and Establishment of a Protected Area System (Oman)
- Identification and Conservation of Cultural Marine Habitats (Saudi Arabia)
- Coastal Zone Management Plan for the Capital Area (Oman)

5. Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF)

The WWF International has carried out a number of activities between 1984-88 that are contributions to the implementation of the Plan of Action. The total amount of the expenditures on these activities is approximately of US\$2.5 million, and cover actions in the fields of policy, scientific research, conservation and public information.

(i) Direct contributions to the implementation of the Plan of Action include both general interventions concerning marine mammals, as well as more specific projects dealing with particular species:

- Participation of Scientific Advisors in IWC
- Americas - First Symposium on Aquatic Mammals
- Antarctica - Joint IUCN/SCAR Symposium
- Antarctica - Representation at Meetings
- Whale Conservation
- Conference on Whales
- Assessment of Exploited Populations of Whales
- Research on North Atlantic Right Whale
- Seminar on Whaling/Role of Norway
- Implementation of Moratorium on Commercial Whaling
- Indian Ocean Whale Sanctuary Management and Research Programme
- Mexico - Behavioural Ecology of Gray Whales
- New Zealand - Hooker's Sealion
- Mauritania - Cap Blanc, Conservation and Management of Monk Seals
- Conservation of Small Cetaceans along the Brazilian Coast
- Chile - Ecological Investigation of the Juan Fernandez Fur Seal
- Chile - Distribution Survey and Conservation of the Marine Otter

(ii) Activities that have contributed indirectly to the implementation of the Plan of Action include action taken under the marine and wetlands programmes, as well as specific projects to conserve and manage critical habitats and protected areas. These include:

- Coordination of the Marine Programme(IUCN)
- Conservation of Marine Living Resources
- Wetlands Workshop on NGO Activity
- Wetlands Information Programme
- Awareness Campaign for WWF/IUCN Wetlands Programme
- Providing Guidance to WWF/IUCN Wetlands Programme
- Conservation of Wetlands - Influencing Aid Agencies
- Environmental Database on Wetland Interventions
- Sustainable Development through Wetlands Conservation
- Afrotropical and Neotropical Wetlands Database
- Brazil - Development of Wetland Conservation Programme

- Guinea-Bissau - Mangrove Conservation Programme (Manatees/Dolphins)
- Indonesia - Marine Conservation Programme
- Honduras - Gulf of Fonseca, Conservation of Mangroves
- The Wadden Sea Conservation Programme
- Turkey - Protection of Breeding Grounds for Loggerhead Turtles/Monk Seals
- Greece - Awareness Programme on Nesting Beaches of Loggerhead Turtles/Monk Seals
- Mali - Development of Reserves in the Niger Delta
- Mauritania - Banc d'Arguin National Park
- Mauritania - Establishment of Diawling Reserve
- Thailand - Provision of Support for Tarutao National Park
- Ecuador - Galapagos, Management Plan for Marine Protected Areas (Whales/Seals)
- Peru - Paracas National Reserve

ANNEX VI

TERMS OF REFERENCE
AND
LOGISTICS OF THE EVALUATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Under the general guidance and overall supervision of the Director of OCA/PAC, the evaluator will prepare an analysis of the achievements and shortcomings of the Global Plan of Action for Conservation, Management and Utilization of Marine Mammals since it was adopted in 1984, and formulate recommendations for the future orientation of UNEP's efforts in the implementation of the Action Plan. Specifically, the evaluator will:

- (a) analyze the general progress in the implementation of the Action Plan;
- (b) identify the contributions and roles played by various organizations in the implementation of the Action Plan;
- (c) evaluate the impact, if any, made by the Action Plan on conservation, management and utilization of marine mammals;
- (d) analyze the role played by UNEP in co-ordinating and financially supporting the Action Plan, particularly the impact of this role and the intellectual input provided by UNEP;
- (e) identify the main problems and shortcomings encountered in the implementation of the Action Plan, including their causes;
- (f) analyze and evaluate the substantive results (outputs) of UNEP-supported projects and activities relevant to the Action Plan and their significance to the main goals of the Action plan;
- (g) compare the envisaged timetable of activities of UNEP-supported projects with the actual delivery of the outputs, and identify the causes of experienced delays;
- (h) evaluate the administrative and financial management of UNEP-supported projects, identify their shortcomings and the causes of these shortcomings;
- (i) analyze the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of procedures used in the implementation of the Action Plan;
- (j) assess the continuing relevance of the Action Plan for the conservation and sustainable utilization of marine mammals;
- (k) identify the critical elements of the Action Plan requiring priority attention; and
- (l) prepare recommendations for concrete steps to be taken in order to achieve the main goals of the Action Plan and to improve its administrative, financial and scientific management and co-ordination.

2. The main sources of information which may be needed by the evaluator will be the relevant files of OCA/PAC as well as personal contacts with the Director of OCA/PAC and with OCA/PAC's programme officer in charge of the Action Plan. The evaluator will also have to seek the views,

through personal contacts with the secretariats of IUCN, FAO, IWC and WWF in order to acquaint himself with their activities (some of them supported by UNEP projects) relevant to the implementation of the Action Plan.

LOGISTICS

A series of interviews were conducted during the course of September/October, including:

UNEP

S. Keckes, Director, OCA/PAC
B. Nielsen, Programme Officer, OCA/PAC
N. Koshen, Fund Management Officer, OCA/PAC
A. Manos, Director, MEDU
R. Olembo, Deputy Assistant Executive Director, OEP
M. Bjorklund, Programme Officer, OEP
A. Brough, Acting Assistant Executive Director, F&A
N. Otobe, Fund Management Officer, F&A

FAO

A. Lindquist, Assistant Director-General, A.i, Fisheries Resources & Environment Division
D. Menasveta, Assistant to the ADG, FR&ED
H. Naeve, Senior Fishery Resources Officer
M. Savrin, Senior Fishery Liaison Officer
N. Scialabba, Fishery Resources Officer
J. Tschirley, Environment Officer, Environment & Energy Programme Coordinating Centre

IWC

R. Gambell, Secretary to the Commission
G. Donovan, Scientific Editor

IUCN

M. Holdgate, Director-General
M. Cockerell, Director, Operations Division
D. Elder, Marine Programme Officer
S. Edwards, Executive Officer, Species Survival Commission
U. Hiltbrunner, Project Officer

WWF

C. de Haes, Director-General
P. Kramer, Director, Conservation Division
H. Jungius, Conservation Division

WCMC

J. Thornback, Head, Species Conservation Monitoring Unit

Imperial College of Science and Technology

J. Gulland, Renewable Resources Assessment Group (RRAG)
S. Northridge, RRAG

Independent Experts

S. Holt, Consultant
N. Meith, Maximedia

DOCUMENTATION REVIEWED

A variety of documents were reviewed, including, among others:

(i) Specific documentation concerning the Plan proper, including the Global Plan of Action; Reports of the Consultative Meetings on the Protection of Marine Living Resources (March and October 1985) and Annexes; Report of the Fifth Interagency Meeting on Oceans and Coastal Areas (April 1987).

(ii) Reports of Governing bodies, including legislative and programme reports of UNEP, FAO, IWC, IUCN.

(iii) General documentation concerning the implementation of activities under the Action Plan, principally UNEP and IUCN projects files as well as reports of meetings.

(iv) Technical Reports, including those emanating from UNEP supported projects, FAO and IUCN reports and others.

(v) Information and media material.

Issued and printed by:



Oceans and Coastal Areas Programme Activity Centre
United Nations Environment Programme

Additional copies of this and other publications issued by
the Oceans and Coastal Areas Programme Activity Centre
can be obtained from:

Oceans and Coastal Areas Programme Activity Centre
United Nations Environment Programme
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi
Kenya