



Grenada LBS Awareness & Implementation Workshop

Date: April 6-7, 2009
National Stadium, St. George's, Grenada

Draft Report

Background

Grenada faces major threats to local watersheds and the marine environment including: uncontrolled forest clearance; encroachment by farmers; use of agro-chemicals such as fertilizers, pesticides and weedicides; siltation of rivers and dams; poor land use practices; indiscriminate waste disposal; pollution; land tenure rights; and, unplanned developments.

The Land-based Sources of Marine Pollution (LBS) Protocol of the Cartagena Convention is a regional agreement for the prevention, reduction and control of marine pollution from land-based sources and activities. It provides a framework for addressing pollution based upon national and regional needs and priorities. It adopts an approach which focuses upon addressing the sources of pollution, including the application of most appropriate technologies and best management practices. It also promotes the establishment of pollution standards and schedules for implementation.

At least nine countries must ratify this Protocol before it can have legal force and effect, but thus far only six countries have ratified. The Workshop will assist Grenada in its deliberations related to ratification of this Protocol.

The Ministries with responsibility for the Environment and Agriculture in collaboration with the Ministry of Finance, Planning, Economy, Energy, Foreign Trade & Cooperatives, with the support of the Global Environment Facility-funded Integrating Watershed and Coastal Areas Management (GEF-IWCAM) Project, held a Land Based Sources of Pollution Awareness and Promotion Workshop at the National Stadium in St. Georges, Grenada, on the 6th – 7th April 2009. See Workshop Agenda, Appendix 1.

Workshop Objectives

The objectives of the Workshop were to:

- raise awareness of the LBS Protocol,
- examine its implications for Grenada, and

- discuss its implementation.

The Workshop also sought to initiate the development of a master plan for a watershed at risk in Grenada. It is hoped that this master plan will guide the design and implementation of appropriate measures to minimize the risk posed to life, property and the coastal zone as a result of pollution, accelerated land degradation and flooding.

Stakeholders from Government, and other non-governmental agencies, including private sector and community-based organizations participated in the Workshop

Day 1:

Opening Ceremony

Participants were welcomed by Chris Joseph of the Environment Department of the Ministry of Works. Vincent Sweeney, Regional Project Coordinator, GEF-IWCAM Project, also welcomed the participants, saying that the GEF-IWCAM Project supported the Workshop as well as the participation of a number of agencies because it recognized the importance of Grenada's eventual ratification of the LBS Protocol. Christopher Corbin reiterated this and pledged the support of UNEP's Caribbean Regional Coordination Unit as well as the assistance of the LBS Regional Activity Centres (RACs) in Cuba (CIMAB) and Trinidad & Tobago (Institute of Marine Affairs). The Honourable Sylvester Quarless, Minister of State (with responsibility for the Environment), Ministry of Works, Physical Development, Public Utilities and the Environment, opened the Workshop, noting the presence of representatives of a number of government agencies as well as the private sector and Non-governmental Organizations; he hoped that discussions over the next two days would be constructive and fruitful.

Introduction of Participants

Participants introduced themselves and the organizations they represented. See Participants List, Appendix 2.

Introduction to the GEF-IWCAM Project

Mr. Vincent Sweeney, Regional Project Coordinator of the GEF-IWCAM Project provided some background on the Project, focusing upon its role in the LBS Protocol. The Project objective is to assist Caribbean Small Island Developing States to adopt an integrated approach to watershed and coastal areas management. He introduced the various components of the Project. Component 1 (Demonstration, Capture and Transfer of Best Practices), Component 3 (Policy, Legislative and Institutional Reform for IWCAM) and Component 4 (Regional and National Capacity Building and Sustainability for IWCAM), in particular are relevant to supporting the objectives of the LBS Protocol.

The RPC stated that resources had been identified within GEF-IWCAM to assist in the development of model guidelines and reforms. Linkages between national IWCAM reforms and similar requirements for LBS should help countries meet their ratification requirements through a funded and resourced process available through the Project. In addition resources had been identified to assist with the preparation of Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) plans, which under the Global Programme of Action (GPA) have been linked. The Project can therefore support National Programme of Action (NPA) planning, as part of IWRM planning in support of the LBS Protocol.

See presentation titled: *'The GEF-IWCAM Project; Opportunities for Ratification and Accession to the LBS Protocol'*, Appendix 3.

Introduction to the LBS Protocol

Mr. Christopher Corbin, AMEP Programme Officer, UNEP CAR/RCU, gave some background on the Cartagena Convention and the Land-based Sources of Marine Pollution (LBS) Protocol, describing the benefits it would have for Grenada upon ratification. In 1987 Grenada had signed the Cartagena Convention and was now considering ratification / accession to the one of its three protocols, the LBS Protocol. The LBS Protocol has as its objectives to reduce pollution through establishment of effluent and emission limitations and/or best management practices, and, the exchange of information on land-based pollution through cooperation in monitoring and research.. It had so far been ratified or acceded to by six countries and would come into force upon ratification by at least nine. While describing country obligations (e.g. National Planning including the use of Environmental Impact Assessments, Integrated Coastal Zone and Integrated Management and Environmental Monitoring and Assessment) upon ratifying / acceding to the Protocol, he also stressed the many benefits to which countries would then be entitled (among them new technologies, training and technical support).

Grenada should seriously consider these benefits as well as the fact that actions required to help them meet obligations under the LBS Protocol are similar to those required to move them towards meeting the Millennium Development Goals and several other Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). Ratification would moreover help Grenada to set priorities in the face of many issues, to obtain additional financial resources through regional collaboration and to find cost-effective solutions. He again pledged the support and assistance of the UNEP CAR/RCU office.

See presentation titled: *'The LBS Protocol – Dispelling the Myths'*, Appendix 4.

Panel Discussion: Benefits of the LBS Protocol to Grenada

The panel discussion which focused on the benefits of the LBS Protocol to Grenada was moderated by Christopher Joseph of the Ministry of Environment. Three panelists, Donna Spencer of GEF-IWCAM, Christopher Corbin of UNEP CAR/RCU and Alphonsus Daniel of the CWWA, raised many points, including:

- A description of the process followed within Trinidad & Tobago leading to accession. The National Cabinet-appointed Committee shared its views and unanimously recommended ratification. This Committee was reformulated to develop the National Programme of Action (NPA) after ratification. Stakeholder involvement was considered important in developing the NPA. Sensitization needs to be opportunistic and relentless. Economic and health impacts must be stressed.
- Try for some quick successes. Use what is “sexy” to the policy-makers (such as is done for climate change).
- CWWA is committed to sit on any committee that comes out of the workshop deliberations and to support the process.

Questions raised for the panelists included:

- What were the selling points for the Government of Trinidad & Tobago? *Response: Consistent representation by the IMA helped to reassure the government that what was being promised would be delivered (such as funding and technical assistance)*
- How was inter-agency collaboration facilitated in Trinidad & Tobago? *Response: A timeline was set by Cabinet which propelled the process forward, even though*

not all agencies were fully on board. Even in St. Lucia, all sectors were not fully on board but all saw that it could address some of their concerns. Designation of a lead agency was very important (to drive process; as “champion”). Small incentives helped to keep committee members engaged in St. Lucia (through small pilot/community activities).

- How were stakeholders engaged? *Response: Local level was involved in finding the solutions (e.g. pig-farmers upstream impacting on fishermen downstream)*

Status of IWRM, the LBS Protocol and considerations for Grenada

Dr. Christopher Cox, Programme Director, the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI) defined Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM), explaining what an IWRM plan is and its links to other strategies and plans, such as National Environmental Management Systems (NEMS). He described the structure of a typical IWRM plan and outlined the process which might be followed. Grenada had, he said, begun by developing an IWRM Roadmap, i.e. a description of the steps required in the development of a national IWRM plan.

Grenada had, he said, made significant progress, having already prepared a Draft IWRM Roadmap, ratified a National Water Resources Policy, and defined legislative and institutional arrangements. Following initiation of the process, a Steering Committee was being established in addition to process management team. A stakeholder involvement plan was being developed and implemented. Here he underlined the importance of having a communications strategy. Next steps involved conduct of a Situational Analysis and an IWRM Plan Framework, and evaluation of IWRM Plan options.

Dr. Cox also discussed the similarities between IWRM Planning and the development of National Programmes of Action (NPAs) which are promoted by the Global Programme of Action (GPA). He stressed that while IWRM is an overall national framework, the NPA focuses on both fresh and marine water pollution at watershed level. He gave the example of CEHI's recent work to develop a Watershed Plan of Action in the Demerara watershed in Guyana. Grenada might find such an approach useful.

See presentation titled '*IWRM and Links to LBS Protocol's National Programme of Action for Grenada*', Appendix 5.

Implementation of a Watershed Activity to address the LBS Protocol

Trevor Thompson of the Land Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture made a presentation that introduced the St. John's Watershed which was being considered for development of a Watershed Master Plan to address the LBS Protocol. This Watershed Management Planning approach will be used as a template that could be replicated in other high-risk watersheds in Grenada and the Wider Caribbean SIDS.

After describing the St. John's Watershed he discussed many of the issues affecting it. These include erosion and resulting sedimentation which affects Grande Anse Beach and its reefs negatively, and repeated flooding of communities in the lower watershed area. In addition there are manufacturing (e.g. soft drinks, detergent), agricultural, housing, mining and other activities which are also causing pollution. The area would be toured later in the day by Workshop participants.

A three-step approach, to be led by an Inter-agency Collaborative team and to take place over 18 months, is envisaged: 1) initiation and scoping; 2) design and implementation of control measures; 3) a monitoring and evaluation mechanism. He stressed that the entire effort should

be cross-cutting and integrated and that training for various stakeholders would be an integral part of it. There was a recognition that policy and decision makers need to be guided by guidelines that encourage integrated management, that legislation needs to be revamped, and that successful cases need to be promoted.

See presentation titles '*Implementation of a (Watershed) Activity to Address the LBS Protocol, Grenada*', Appendix 6.

Open discussion followed.

Field Trip to St. John's Watershed

A field trip to the St. John's watershed, in which the capital, St. Georges, is located, took place on the afternoon of April 6, at which time participants were able to view the various activities taking place in the watershed, many of which are sources of pollution and other environmental risks. Highlights of the field trip included visits to water treatment works, including intakes and treatment plants. A number of commercial and institutional activities were also taking place near to the river and were known to be polluting the river. These activities included automotive repairs, cement block manufacturing, laundries, soft drink bottling, quarrying and health care facilities. A lot of poverty was also observed within the watershed, evidenced by squatting.

The Ministry's Communications Officer participated in the fieldtrip and video footage was taken along the way. Interviews were also conducted with Christopher Corbin, Trevor Thompson and Christopher Joseph while in the field.

Following the fieldtrip, Chris Corbin and Vincent Sweeney participated in a 30-minute discussion with a moderator on the LBS Protocol and the GEF-IWCAM Project which had been arranged by the Environment Department for the filming of their first episode in a new television series on the environment called "Environment Grenada".

See Appendix 7: Photos taken on the visit to the St. John's Watershed.

DAY 2:

Recap of Field Trip to St. John's Watershed

Trevor Thompson highlighted the following aspects/observations of the previous day's fieldtrip to the St. John's Watershed:

- wide range of activities impacting the lower watershed in particular
- problems exacerbated by the effects of the hurricanes (esp. loss of vegetation and damage to nutmeg plantations)
- problems caused by some human interventions (e.g. alteration in the course of the river has increased flooding in the River Road area)
- there is some knowledge of the kinds of pollution but more analysis is needed
- need for increased public awareness of existing threats to health (a 'selling point' of the LBS Protocol)
- the provision of clean drinking water is a challenge
- striking level of poverty and high unemployment in watershed communities

He concluded by saying that political support would, hopefully, be an outcome of this Workshop because despite its visibility and efforts in the past to clean up the river, some funded by private enterprise, there had been little progress.

This was followed by a facilitated discussion and a working session to elaborate a watershed management planning initiative which the GEF-IWCAM project would seek to support.

Raymond Baptiste of the Ministry of Agriculture proposed an approach to the Watershed Management Initiative to be guided by five programme components: watershed assessment; education and awareness; facilitation and planning; monitoring; and technology development and deployment. The approach had six goals/actions and these were put forward for consideration during discussion:

1. Ensure that the Watershed Management Initiative is a broad, consensus-based process.
2. Ensure that necessary resources are provided for the implementation of the Watershed Management Initiative.
3. Simplify compliance with regulatory requirements without compromising environmental protection and economic activities.
4. Balance the objectives of water supply management, habitat protection, flood management and land use to protect and enhance the marine environment.
5. Protect and/or restore streams, reservoirs, wetlands and the marine resource for the benefit of fish, wildlife and human uses.
6. Develop an implementable Watershed Management Plan that incorporates science and technology that can be continuously improved.

Development of a Watershed Management Planning Initiative

Dr. Christopher Cox discussed watershed management planning, underlining its importance given the vulnerability of Caribbean island watersheds. This presentation used examples from Dominica, Guyana and St. Lucia to illustrate Hot Spot identification utilizing GIS to arrive at recommended land management regimes. It also identified a number of low-cost measures that could be introduced in order to reduce pollution impacts. These included river-bank stabilization measures and water breaks.

In the case of the St. John's Watershed, pollutant profiling would have to be done and environmental stress reduction indicators and process indicators selected to arrive at a watershed action plan and be able to prioritize.

See presentation titled: '*Watershed Management Planning*', Appendix 8.

Questions from participants followed:

Q. - How can different intervention measures be used to benefit watersheds?

A. - In the case of St. Lucia different interventions make reference to the management of forest reserves, water catchment areas so that there is no pollution, although there is no mention of "watershed" per se. Policy statements need to be translated into day to day operational plans for reference by the various agencies e.g. forestry, agricultural extension, WASCO etc. The Watershed Management Plan should contain a series of recommendations and be a working document. In addition the use of creative measures can be effective (e.g. green banks can effectively hold river courses). There are a large number of technical and other solutions but appropriateness (including cost effectiveness) to the situation is always a consideration. Small scale farmer solutions are not the same as industry.

Q. – In the case of Dominica, to what extent has the government adopted recommendations?

A. - In that case, recommendations were used to halt a development but it has not gone much further than that. Dominica, as an eco-island is more fertile ground for planting seeds of conservation. The difficulty is that if denying use for development, where would compensation for environmental services come in? We need to get to this and present these arguments to the government as well.

Q. - How about legislation regarding intakes on private land?

A. - I cannot say how far they have gotten but longer you wait the more costly it becomes. We need to stress the economic cost of not intervening. For example in the case of this stadium (Grenada National Stadium), what will the cost of not dealing with water pollution be?

Comment – Benedict Peters, Ministry of Health explained that regulation under Public Health Act – 78. Pollution of Streams, if enforced, should cover most activities resulting in pollution of streams. Enacted in 1953 (?); revised in 1990. It should also be noted that the St. John's watershed includes St. Georges so that in each area there should be an officer to enforce. The penalty is a charge of 50 dollars every day until there is conformity. The most recent prosecution was 2 years ago. He also noted that at a recent town meeting government had said it was an opportune time to review legislation; that an environmental court should be set up and fines should be incentives to government to fund the system.

Development of a Watershed Management Planning Initiative – Working Groups

Following this presentation participants were divided into two Working Groups to consider the following questions related to implementation of a Watershed Management Plan for the St. John's Watershed.

- What steps should Grenada take to implement such a plan?
- What are the critical issues/hazards to be addressed within the watershed? (Consider NPAs)
- Who are the key stakeholders that must be involved?
- What is needed in order to get the necessary buy-in or commitment from key stakeholders and decision – makers?
- How will the plan be implemented (including budget and manpower/ capacity considerations)?
- What can various partners contribute and who should lead the process?

Working Group Presentations / Recommendations:

A number of recommendations were made by the Working Groups in terms of moving the initiative forward. They responded to the goals / actions proposed earlier by the Ministry of Agriculture, which all covered the questions above.

- 1. Ensure that the Watershed Management Initiative is a broad, consensus – based process.**

Group 1:

- Primary key stakeholders (directly involved) include: the Ministry of Works, Communications, Public Utilities and the Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture,

Forestry & Fisheries, the Ministry of Health, NAWASA, Farmers Associations, and small business owners.

- Secondary stakeholders (those who benefit or are in some way impacted) include: the Ministry of Lands, Community Development & Housing, the Ministry of Tourism, the utilities (Cable & Wireless and Grenlec), the Grenada Chamber of Industry and Commerce, the Grenada Hotel and Tourism Association, Non-governmental Organizations, and Community-based Organizations.
- Thought should be given as to how to incorporate various stakeholders

Group 2:

- Identify & Use Existing Community Groups: Social, Cultural, Environmental, Religious;
- Careful Engagement of Political Directorate;
 - Government; Opposition; Constituency Representative;
- Stakeholders must be seen as equal;
- Several agencies: water authority, forestry, health & other key institutional stakeholders from private sector, NGOs and community.
- Established Agencies already have a clear mandate.
- Other agencies can play a support role as well as compliance especially where they will be affected by the interventions.
- Need for Stakeholder Analysis and build on what has been already done
- Lead Agency for implementation: Ministry of Agriculture; with support from NGO/CBO (co-chairing?)
- Stakeholder analysis should identify clear roles & responsibilities but also take into account capacity constraints and ability to influence actions both at the policy level and on the ground in the communities;
- Advocacy must be a central activity;
- Critical need for involving Law enforcement, the private sector and the community who are contributing to the pollution problem;
- Schools should be integrally involved.
- Different approaches must be taken to engage all stakeholders – e.g. one on one discussions, improving enforcement.
- Identify potential media and Ministers that are sensitive to the process, could provide support and also help in the advocacy efforts and bringing the information out to the general public;
- Use of GIS, Environment Grenada etc.;
- Recognition that there will be a cost to this process including advocacy and innovative ways will have to be explored to facilitate this.

2. Ensure that necessary resources are provided for the implementation of the Watershed Management Initiative.

Group 1:

- Levy on all utilities e.g. erecting of antennae and poles in a particular watershed to be used for management of the watershed
- Following assessment, direct payments by utilities and other users (e.g. manufacturers) into a Watershed Management Fund
- Following assessment, in cases of private property, where relevant, setting aside of a buffer zone in lieu of payments?
- Gov't - build capacity of Watershed Management Unit (Forestry Dept.) through increase in staffing, training and larger financial allocation

Group 2:

- potential sources of funding include existing Environmental Projects – IWCAM;
- Regional Agencies – CEHI, UNEP, UNDP, OECS
- MEAs – Climate Change, Biodiversity, LBS Protocol;
- Private Sector – on the ground implementation; adopt a section of the river/watershed;
- Government – Levies, taxes, incentives, tax rebates; concessions; disincentives; fines; polluter pays principle; rewarding best practices e.g. buffer strips – showcasing, awards etc.
- Need to link levies, taxes and incentives to the actual positive and/or negative practice occurring;
- In-kind contribution – technical and human support – especially at the community level;
- These could be supported by policies, agreements and ultimately legislation; Role for lobbying/advocacy – name and shame; boycotting etc;
- Capacity building – streamline and coordinate;
- To promote monitoring – need to demonstrate to the policy makers, the importance of this data and information for improving decision making;

3. Simplify compliance with regulatory requirements without compromising environmental protection and economic activities

Group 1:

- Public education and awareness re. existing regulations as well as reasons for these (i.e. benefits of good practice)
- Improved enforcement of existing laws and regulations
- Provide incentives to those who comply with the law (look at working examples in some of the Caribbean SIDS)

Group 2:

- Is the legislation and regulation adequate? Are fines adequate?; Are they realistic?
- Importance of having the law/regulations in place but with options and alternatives including non-penal measures;
- The name and shame game – publishing of results and infractions.
- What are the constraints? – Enforcement standpoint.
- Recovery of the proposed pilot watershed is possible;
- Incentives: Maintaining buffer zones
- Changes in Land use; attitudes; behavior – Poverty/employment issues
- Public awareness and education – new legislation and regulations!

4. Balance the objectives of water supply management, habitat protection, flood management and land use to protect and enhance the marine environment.

5. Protect and/or restore streams, reservoirs, wetlands and the marine resource for the benefit of fish, wildlife and human uses.

Both groups discussed questions 4.and 5. at the same time as it was felt they were the same issue, essentially.

Group 1:

- Need to consider key benefits of watershed, what is threatened / in jeopardy; benefits were given a relative ranking: (1) source of potable water, (2) livelihoods - subsistence /

- artisanal uses and agricultural production (e.g. nutmeg), (3) maintenance of land and property value (impact of quarrying), (4) recreation / aesthetics.
- In addition, green-based recreation, biodiversity...maintenance of flora and fauna (esp. birds); flood control / mitigation maintenance of flows for absorptive capacity (infiltrative and buffering capacity; implications for sewage management were considered important

Group 2:

With regard to protection and restoration there are complex Interactions:

- Alleviating Poverty
- Housing
- Land Ownership
- Public Sanitation
- Jobs and alternatives provided for existing polluting practices
- Zoning
- Supporting policies, legislation and regulations;

Specific measures to be taken:

- Based on doing a comprehensive pollutant profile: source, type, activity;
- Physical Cleanup
- Awareness & Education;
- Buy back; incentives/disincentives;
- Specific focus on schools;
- Improved enforcement;
- Acquire lands above the dam;
- Improved Housekeeping Practices – Private Industry

6. Develop an implementable Watershed Management plan that incorporates science and technology that can be continuously improved

Group 1:

Determine indicators for each desirable / promoted activity. These activities should be prioritized. Perhaps they should begin with the appointment of an intersectoral committee to lead the process. Consideration could be given to preparation of a relevant project proposal for external funding.

ACTIVITY	INDICATOR
Education & Awareness	Minimum of 4 public awareness consultations amongst stakeholders in SJW area
Digital mapping of all assets	Already completed by Land Use Division
Digital mapping of all issues and hotspots	On digital maps already held by Land Use Division, subsequent mapping by community
Designation / zoning of particular areas for certain uses	Some Land Capability maps already created; to be completed
Review and update / consolidation of existing legislation and regulations	Update legislation regulations to implement the control measures
Installation of storm water management facilities	Reduced levels of siltation by at least 15 percent ...
Establish an effective governance process (e.g. intersectoral committee)	Intersectoral Committee which meets regularly and reports to the relevant minister / authority

Ensure that local legislative, regulatory and institutional framework supports obligations to MEAs	Ministry with responsibility for the Environment (?) ensures that Grenada is signatory to various agreements
--	--

Group 2:

What are the steps to be taken?

- Obtain Buy in of the government (2) Big launch; (3) Competition for schools; (4) Public relations campaign; (5) Get to know your water shed (6) Sign Boards; (7) Caption of a really big thing will happen; (8) Community designed water shed model – see Group 1.

What are the critical Issues?

- Use of inorganic fertilizer; animal slurry; trade effluent, poor agricultural practices; burning; solid waste from factory and homes; pesticides and weedicides; quarrying within the water shed; domestic liquid waste; lack of buffer zones; protection of the catchment areas; spent oil from garages;

Who are the key stake holders?

- Government Ministries: Agriculture, Environment, Forestry and Health;
- Statutory bodies: Water Resource Management; Solid Waste
- Support Ministries: Finance, Tourism
- Private Sector & Umbrella bodies
- Community Groups/NGOs
- Media

What is needed to get the necessary buy in?

- Massive propaganda campaign
- Community consultations
- Bring in persons already involved

How will the plan be implemented?

- Gather data and prioritize. We need help here – review/update of legislation.
- Who should lead the process?
- Ministry of Agriculture, Water management Department with collaboration with other Ministry personnel – Intersectoral Cte.

Discussion of Next Steps

Christopher Corbin of UNEP made the following points on the way forward for Grenada:

- Establish linkages to how the development of this pilot Watershed Management Plan contributes to Grenada meeting its regional and global commitments such as the LBS Protocol and the Millennium Development Goals - reduce vulnerability to Climate Change and alleviate poverty;
- Identify opportunities for obtaining further support from donors, regional and international agencies, private sector, NGOs and civil society based on a set of agreed priorities - very high risk areas; e.g. NOAA's interest in supporting a National Programme of Action for

prevention of pollution from land based sources of marine pollution and activities here in Grenada.

- Characterize where the interventions are needed at both the watershed/local level (practical, low cost, sustainable, culturally acceptable and implementable solutions (have an economic spin off benefit) and also at the national level - e.g. changes in policies, legislation etc. must occur at the national level;
- Opportunity that this initiative can be used as a demo/best practice that can be replicated and/or scaled up at the national level here in Grenada and/or replicated in other countries.
- Therefore mechanisms for Documenting the process and the achievements - build on the small successes.
- Finally - State of Grenada's Coastal Environment - Contribute to overall assessment of total pollutant loads entering the marine environment - UNEP in collaboration with CEHI.

After some discussion the following steps were proposed in order to move the process forward (with those responsible in brackets):

Watershed Management Initiative

- Consolidate/Articulate (Draft) Plan **(CEHI/IWCAM)**
 - Use Workshop Outcome as Background
- Articulate Budget **(CEHI/IWCAM/Government of Grenada (GoG))**
- Identify Resources (UNEP/IWCAM/Others – Partners)
 - CARIWIN (Intern?)
 - CIMH
 - SGU
 - GEF/UNDP Small Grants
 - NOAA
 - IMA
- Establish National Intersectoral Committee (NIC)
- Identify Roles **(NIC/CEHI/UNEP/IWCAM)**
- Engage Stakeholders **(NIC; support from IWCAM)**
 - PA/PE
 - Sensitization
- Establish Baseline Conditions **(IWCAM/CEHI)** utilizing:
 - Students?
 - GoG
 - Community members
- Prioritize Activities **(NIC/CEHI)**
 - Conduct Hotspot Assessments
- Implement Plan **(NIC)**
 - Physical Cleanup
 - Improve “Housekeeping”

LBS Protocol Ratification

- Provide Background on LBS Ratification to GoG **(IWCAM/UNEP)**
- Support GoG through Technical Cooperation Among Countries **(IWCAM/UNEP)**
 - Exchange with St. Lucia
 - LBS Regional Activity Centre at IMA

- Draft Cabinet Note (**GoG/C. Joseph**)

Closure of Workshop

Vincent Sweeney shared with participants that he and Christopher Corbin, accompanied by Chris Joseph, were able to meet with the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, the Honourable Nazim Burke, earlier. Minister Burke was briefed on the purpose of the mission, on the GEF-IWCAM Project and on the LBS Protocol. He confirmed the interest of the government in taking appropriate measures to address pollution of the marine environment and confirmed their desire to ratify the LBS Protocol, once all necessary steps can be taken. UNEP and the GEF-IWCAM Project had agreed to assist as appropriate.

Christopher Joseph closed the Workshop, noting that concrete suggestions had been made on the way forward. The Ministry felt encouraged and pledged its commitment and assistance to the process. Finally, he thanked all Workshop participants.