



Report of the IAPA workshop 23rd – 25th 2018, Georgetown



IAPA: Integration
of Amazon
Protected Areas



Figure 1: Participants from Peru, Colombia, Suriname and French Guiana

The **sub-regional meeting of the Integration of Amazon Protected Areas (IAPA) Project** took place on the **23rd to 25th of October 2018 in Georgetown, Guyana**. The Amazon Vision gathers professionals of the National Systems of Protected areas of eight countries and French Guiana. It works as a space for capacity building and technical work related to the updating and evaluation of conservation opportunities, management effectiveness, financial sustainability and governance of protected areas for the Amazon Biome.

The IAPA team, from the REDPARQUES Amazon Vision, organised this meeting in Guyana in order to facilitate the participation of the Guianas. Travelling difficulties and language barriers often prevented participants of the Guianas to attend the regional IAPA meetings. This workshop gathered around 25 participants from Peru (1), Colombia (1), Guyana (10), Suriname (4), French Guiana (3) and the IAPA team (6).

The **objectives** of the workshop were to:

- Exchange experiences and lessons learned about regional initiatives in the Amazon Biome related to protected areas and their integrated landscapes.
- Share the progress and results of the IAPA Project in the frame of the Amazon Vision of REDPARQUES
- Identify good practices in protected areas.



The opening presentations all addressed the importance of the Amazon Biome and the need for cross-border and multi-sectorial approach to tackle the various issues threatening its integrity. The Guiana Shield Facility and RENFORESAP project were also presented as sub regional initiatives. The presentations were followed by a working session on the identification of possible synergies between these regional initiatives, ongoing national projects and the Amazon Vision strategic plan. For this session, participants were divided into 3 groups with a representative of each country in each group. This enabled everyone to have a global vision on the common actions of each country and initiatives. A detailed feedback from the IAPA team is expected on this session.

As for the “Conservation Opportunities” session, it consisted of a presentation of the threats and vulnerability of the Amazon Biome followed by conservation measures. Recommendations were also made such as including climate change and resilience criteria for the planning and management of protected areas systems in future conservation policies and strengthening the connectivity between new and existing protected areas. The first day ended with a presentation of the Aichi target 11 for the biome and for the 3 countries. The methodology to assess each country’s fulfilment (quantitatively and qualitatively) was presented. A feedback is also awaited from the IAPA team who compiled each country’s information on the assessment of the Aichi Target 11.

The session on Aichi Target 11 ended on the second day, followed by a session of the description of the Management effectiveness protocol which aims at having a common language to analyse the regional impact of conservation and a common thinking for the Amazon Biome. The generic indicators are: governance, climate change, socio-environmental impact evaluation, management strategies and protected areas’ conservation objective achievements. An example of its application is available via the following link: <http://arccg.is/1KPCzC>

A discussion panel also took place where representatives of each country had to answer 3 questions on lessons learned and challenges in landscape approach regarding governance, land-use planning, co-management agreements, sectorial approach and capacity development. The outcome is as follows:

1. What are the main challenges working at the cross-border landscape level?

- Documents being in different languages
- Border problems: no real agreement on official borders
- Difficulties with visas and official documents



Figure 2: Representatives of each country to the discussion panel



- It takes a lot of time for working with all communities in all countries until finally reaching a MoU after a lot of years
- There are different committees and consultative bodies adding to the other difficulties
- There is a need to strengthen capacity building
- There are different visions of land planning
- In remote area (if trans-boundary PA): difficulties to travel to these areas and to find resources persons for collaborations
- Financial challenges

2. What are the most important elements to consider in the articulation of the protected areas with the other actors and sectors in the territory?

- Each country has its own procedures
- The economic benefits of Protected Areas are not the same for all countries
- There should be a sense of permanency in the institution that operates in the region
- More awareness is needed on the meaning of protected areas
- There should be more high level management committees with all relevant stakeholders including indigenous communities, more technical exchanges and an increase in building relationships with all the agencies involved.
- Optimise the efforts among agencies and boost synergies if agencies are working on the same activities (joint implementations).
- There should be a clear definition of what is traditional use and commercial use

3. What are the lessons learned and/or success factors of the work and relationship with indigenous and local communities?

- Guyana: There is a need for consensus with initial discussions with communities before deciding on a representative from the community.
- Suriname: There is a consultation committee with the district commissioner
- French Guiana: There is a consultation process at the beginning
- Colombia: There is a permanency at the regional level with the team working with the communities (multi-sectorial approach). There is a signed agreement between the team and the community which stays in the event of a change of staff or team.
- Peru: There is sharing of the consultations and sessions of interactions.



The second day ended with a working session on the best practices and their lessons learned in relation to the integrated management of protected areas in the Amazon biome. During this session, each country had to present a good practice starting with the antecedents (problem, opportunities), the stakeholders involved in the experience, the results produced, the challenges faced during the implementation of the actions, the opportunities that facilitated the actions and the lessons learned. The workshop was concluded on the third day with a field trip to the Mangrove Heritage Trial Tour, a rehabilitation site for mangroves.



Figure 3: End of the field trip to the Mangrove Heritage Trial Tour

Useful inks:

[Geovisor](#) (WWF Colombia): *Geovisor* of Conservation Opportunities in the Amazon Biome under Climate Change Considerations.

GONINI – National Land Monitoring System of Suriname: www.gonini.org

Protected Areas and Climate in the Amazon (Redparques): <http://amazonprotectedareas.org/>