

Tourism Towards 2002

International NGO Workshop preparing for

- **The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) COP 6**
- **The International Year of Ecotourism 2002**
- **The World Summit on Sustainable Development ("Rio + 10")**

New Delhi, 24-26 September 2001

Organized by

- **Equitable Tourism Options (EQUATIONS), Bangalore, India &**
- **Ecological Tourism in Europe (ETE), Bonn, Germany**

Supported by

- **German Federal Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation and Reactor Safety**
 - **United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP)**
-

REPORT

INTRODUCTION

A. Background

Workshop Background:

The background for this workshop were several significant international processes that linked tourism, sustainable development & biodiversity:

- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) COP 4 (Bratislava, 1998) and COP 5 (Nairobi, 2000)
- Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) Action Programme on Tourism and Sustainable Development (CSD-7, New York, April 1999)
- International NGO Workshop on Tourism and Biological Diversity in Berlin, March 2000
- UN Declaration of the "International Year of Ecotourism" (IYE) 2002
- International Expert Workshop, Dominican Republic, June 2001, on **CBD Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism and Biodiversity.**

Further, given the scheduling of three major events in 2002 namely:

- The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of Parties [COP- 6],
- International year of Ecotourism (IYE 2002)
- The World Summit on Sustainable Development (Rio +10)

This Workshop was convened to discuss initiatives for

- Reflection on and discussion of international processes and decisions on tourism, biological diversity and sustainable development among representatives of NGOs, Indigenous Peoples and international organisations from the South and the North.
- Formulation of statements on the proposed **CBD Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism and Biodiversity** and on the International Year of Ecotourism 2002
- Discussion of possibilities for NGO to influence international processes affecting tourism in 2002.

The workshop sought to bring to the attention of peoples, communities and nations, the importance of engaging with conventions and charters adopted by their governments mostly

without their participation and consent. The need to work at local, national and international levels was important since tourism is an activity that cuts across all bio- diverse and cultural regions and its impact is felt on all forms of life whether sensitive eco-regions, flora and fauna and communities. It was agreed to undertake coordinated efforts to campaign and pressurize governments and decision-making bodies at national levels so that the agreements reached in these fora are implemented on the ground.

A primary concern of the participants was to discuss amendments to the draft **CBD Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism and Biodiversity** for activities related to sustainable tourism development and to discuss the mandate of UNEP on the International Year of Ecotourism 2002 with particular reference to its relevance to southern countries.

The impacts of tourism on environmentally sensitive regions, the involvement of the primary stakeholder - the Indigenous Peoples and local communities in tourism development issues and the need to focus on the sharing of benefits from tourism in the local economy were areas of concern.

The workshop reviewed and made amendments to the Draft Guidelines (prepared in the expert workshop on Biological Diversity and Tourism held at Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic between 4 to 7 June 2001) on the basis of inputs given by the participants as well as NGOs around the world who were unable to participate. It was felt that regardless of the strengths and weaknesses of the Guidelines, it is important as a tool to assist in containing tourism impacts. The guidelines could always be improved upon at the level of implementation. We believe that the document endorsed by this workshop will form the basis of a platform for united action. These Draft Guidelines will have to negotiate Subsidiary body for Scientific Technical and Technological Advice [SBSTTA] and COP - 6 on the issues concerning biodiversity. The Guidelines will then be presented to the Commission for Sustainable Development [C S D] where we will have the opportunity to negotiate all other concerns through the multi-stakeholder process leading to Rio+10. Therefore it was necessary to discuss a call for action to NGOs for collective efforts on these issues at the World Summit on Sustainable Development-2002.

The unequal power equations in the global economy and the emerging challenges to national economies through multi-lateral agreements like General Agreement on Trade in Services [GATS] were highlighted. The need to emphasise sustainable tourism to avoid further distortions and destruction to national economies, biodiversity, communities, peoples' and their organisations through current mass tourism was emphasized. The need to combat the current move to limit the role of civil society in the tourism discussion and debate was also stressed.

It was strongly felt that NGOs expand the network on these issues and link them to other people's organizations and networks working on fronts that are different but complementary.

It is important to note that this Workshop was to be held between 16-18 August 2001 (it was first announced in the 'iye2002' list serve on 27 June 2001). In a subsequent process of registration there were strong feelings from some of those who responded to the invitation that the time available for preparations for the Workshop was limited, especially since the main text of the **CBD Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism and Biodiversity** from the Santa Domingo Experts Workshop would be available only by the first week of August and therefore a request for postponement was sought.

An announcement of the postponement of the Workshop to its present dates 24-26 September 2001 was made on 20 July 2001. As the workshop agenda was tight, participants were requested to prepare for the workshop by studying these documents and

by formulating their comments and main points of criticism in advance. They were requested to send in the same to the organisers.

The September 11 event in the US, led to anxiety and expectations of a further postponement. Based on discussions between the organisers and the sponsors, it was decided to go ahead with the Workshop in September. This was considering the timing of this Workshop being critical to processes into which it was feeding into, and the fact that the host organisation and many participants had made firm arrangements.

B. Attendance

Participants/invitees were representatives of NGOs or individual consultants working in the fields of international policies, Community based tourism, sustainable tourism, ecotourism, biodiversity and/or ecosystem management and peoples movements and came with the mandate to sign the statements to be adopted at the workshop on behalf of their respective organisations. Representatives of intergovernmental organisations and certain select industry based associations and Institutes were also invited.

NGOs/ Individual consultants attended the workshop from the following countries: Ecuador, Gambia, Germany, France, Hong Kong, India, Philippines and Yugoslavia.

Representatives of the following non-governmental organizations and intergovernmental participated in the Workshop:

Non-governmental organizations and other Individual Consultants: Centre for Responsible and Sustainable Tourism Development, Ecological Tourism in Europe, EcoVentures, ECOSS, EQUATIONS, Ecumenical Coalition on Third World Tourism, FURARE, Foundation for Conflict Resolution, Gambian Tourism Concern, Jagrut Goenkaranchi Fauz, Thanal Conservation Action & Information Network, Tamil Nadu Environmental Council.

Intergovernmental organizations: United Nations Environment Programme

Other invitees who were unable to attend were from : Red de Turismo en Sostenible en America Latina (Costa Rica), Tourism Investigation & Monitoring Team (t.i.m.-team) Thailand, Blinkwater Sanctuary programme and IUCN South Africa, Indigenous Peoples Biodiversity Network, International Support Centre for Sustainable Tourism Canada, Rethinking Tourism Project USA, Wildlife Institute of India, Kashtakari Sangathana India, and All India Indigenous People Coordination Council.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

The Workshop opened at 1000 hrs on Monday, 24 September 2001.

Introductory remarks were made by Mr K.T Suresh, Coordinator EQUATIONS on behalf of the host organisation, Ms. Nina Rao, Southern Co-Chair of the NGO Tourism Caucus of the CSD and Mr Michael Meyer of ETE the co-organiser

Welcoming the participants, Mr K T Suresh said that this was not often that critical and international conferences on tourism, which had significant impact on the South, were held in the South and that EQUATIONS was privileged to host this meeting. The Workshop would focus on the impacts of tourism on environmentally sensitive regions, the involvement of the primary stakeholder - the Indigenous Peoples and the local communities in tourism development issues and on the sharing of the benefits from tourism in the local economy, while reviewing the CBD guidelines and influencing the IYE processes and feeding into it our concerns.

He added that the year 2002 was a defining moment for tourism because several global processes were underway which the NGO community needed to involve itself in, dialogue about and probably more often than not forced to react.

Ms. Nina Rao welcomed the participants and noted that the WTO/OMT and UNEP has taken a unusually proactive role in the promotion of tourism. She further noted that the General assembly proclaimed the year 2002 as the International Year of Ecotourism. The year also coincided with the International Year of Mountains as a result of efforts made by FAO to strengthen its concern about widespread mountain destruction. Acknowledging the fact that 15%-20% of the tourism is mountain tourism, it is incongruous that the International Year of Mountains has been disassociated from the IYE. She said that workshop represented an important platform for Southern NGOs to first look at the guidelines and also at the context in which they were formulated.

Mr. Michael Meyer welcomed the participants and thanked to Equations who organised and hosted the workshop in New Delhi. He thanked to the German Ministry for the Environment and the United Nations Environmental Programme for the generous support to this workshop, to enable participants to be prepared for the addressed topics. Further he explained to the participants the potentials of this workshop for influencing other processes, such as the CBD and CSD, and especially the World Ecotourism Summit (WES) by forwarding the results of this workshop. Therefore this workshop will also serve as one preparatory meeting for the WES. He wishes all participants a fruitful discussion and is looking forward to the results of the workshop.

ITEM 2. AGENDA, FACILITATORS AND ORGANISATION OF WORK

2.1 Agenda

The Workshop adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda and preparatory material that had been circulated to all participants prior to the workshop.

1. Reviewing of the draft **CBD Guidelines for Sustainable Tourism and Biodiversity** for activities related to sustainable tourism development in vulnerable terrestrial, marine and coastal ecosystems and habitats of major importance for biological diversity and protected areas, including fragile riparian and mountain ecosystems. (prepared at the Workshop on Biological Diversity and Tourism held in Santo Domingo, Dominican

Republic between 4-7 June 2001). The workshop would discuss the guidelines thoroughly and make amendments, modify, add, subtract from it based on the views and concerns raised on the floor.

2. Discussions on the **International Year of Ecotourism, 2002**
3. Discussions on the **World Summit on Sustainable Development, 2002** essentially looking at sharing of agendas with other networks in the debate
4. Adoption of statements, modified draft CBD guidelines, Press Release etc.
5. Closure of the meeting.

2.2. Facilitators

At the opening session of the workshop, on 24 September 2001, the following participants were proposed and accepted as the facilitators of the various sessions of the workshop meeting:

For sessions on Day 1 and Day 3 pertaining to Agenda items 1 and 3:

Ms. Nina Rao (India) South Co-chair of the NGO Tourism Caucus , CSD
Mr. Michael Meyer (Germany), ETE

For Sessions on Day 2 pertaining to Agenda item 2

Mr Oliver Hillel UNEP
Ms Janine Tabasaran UNEP

Introductory and closing comments for each day and the workshop as a whole and overall management of the workshop

Mr K T Suresh EQUATIONS
Mr Michael Meyer ETE

2.3 Organisation of Work

The methodology was to have opening presentations and then throw open the issue for discussion and debate. All amendments and statements adopted would be by consensus. Facilitators had the responsibility of ensuring that the task at hand was completed along with ensuring the space for voicing concerns, disagreements in the spirit of building real consensus. It was recognised that since most participants had not made any written submissions for amendments, the facilitators were required to get a line-by-line reading, comment and adoption process.

Minutes of the proceedings of each day would be prepared by a task force and presented for adoption the following day.

ITEM 3. GUIDELINES FOR ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SUSTAINABLE TOURISM DEVELOPMENT IN VULNERABLE TERRESTRIAL, MARINE AND COASTAL AND MOUNTAIN ECOSYSTEMS

The Workshop took up agenda item 1 at the 1st session of the meeting, on 24 September 2001. The basis for discussion was the draft guidelines prepared in Santo Domingo titled "Draft International guidelines for activities related to sustainable tourism development and biological diversity in vulnerable terrestrial, marine and mountain ecosystems" (UNEP/CBD/WS-Tourism/2)

Introducing the process of the CSD-7 1999, (that had tourism as its main agenda), Ms Nina Rao said that it had a participatory framework with four recognized stakeholders – the government, the industry, trade unions and NGOs. It was felt that important stakeholders like Indigenous Peoples, women and children were not given any representation. Such concerns were represented in the CSD 8, and as a result, the CSD 9 formally recognized Indigenous Peoples as a legitimate stakeholder. She believed that the very philosophy of CSD was the multi-stakeholder process. She urged that this be the universal philosophy of participation in *fora* such as WTO, CBD, and the UNEP as well. She further stressed on NGOs to take a position in defining sustainable tourism through a multi-stakeholder process as action plans without this definition would be problematic in the light of agenda 21.

Introducing the process of the CBD-Guidelines, Mr Michael Meyer described the discussion and results in several important international conferences since 1997, beginning with the "Berlin Declaration", COP-4 in Bratislava (1998), CSD-7 in New York (1999), COP-5 in Nairobi (2000) and the Workshop in Santo Domingo (2001). Further he described the possible future process, which the CBD-Guidelines definitely or may go: SBSTTA-7 (11/2001), 2nd PrepCom of CSD-10 (01-02/2002), COP-6 (04/2002), World Ecotourism Summit (05/2002), World Summit/CSD-10 (09/2002) and SBSTTA-8 (11/2002). Further he explained to the participants the procedure on how the workshop in Santo Domingo was organised and described the opportunities which are given by the Draft Guidelines for the future process on a wide implementation of sustainable tourism. Also he invited the participants to pay special attention to the information document of the Santo Domingo workshop the "Compilation and Analysis of existing international documents" related to tourism, which is presented at this workshop as an exhibition. Finally Michael Meyer described, that ETE established parallel to the preparation of the Santo Domingo workshop an internet discussion platform (http://groups.yahoo.com/group/CBD_Guidelines) focused only on the CBD-Guidelines.

Discussion Notes /Concerns raised by the participants:

- Given that global institutions reflect unequal power relations between South and North; and given a world in which we enter either as guest or hosts, participant from Hong Kong raised a concern about how we could liberate communities and their aspirations from these distortions.
- Consumers and producers have recognised ecotourism as a way out of the negative impacts of mass tourism. However, numerous experiences have shown eco tourism faces serious problems of market access resulting in their transforming their products to get into the mainstream market. This leads eventually to their being part of the mass tourism circuit. This dilemma should be addressed in the guidelines through something like technical assistance.
- A participant from India, strongly urged the workshop be aware of and consider the impact of conflicts between an 'environmental agreement' like these guidelines and trade related agreements like General Agreement on Trade in Services, within the WTO-OMC. Concern was expressed about the incompatibility of the 'protection to investments' with

that of the 'protection and upkeep of biodiversity' as being enunciated through these guidelines.

- Concern about regulating the multi-national companies that are operating without adhering to any formulated guidelines due to lack of the latter.

While these and other broad concerns were expressed, more specific issues were articulated through the process of amending the draft CBD Guidelines. The workshop was able to work on amending on-line certain sections of the guidelines viz:

Annex I (of the report of the Workshop on Biological Diversity and Tourism)

The introductory section or preamble

Section A. Scope

Section B. Management process steps (Here subsections 1-6 were amended).

These changes have been tracked in the original report of the workshop and are appended to the report of this workshop. We have chosen to leave the amendments as visible tracked changes, to make it easy for the reader to see the inclusions and amendments made. This forms Appendix 1 of our report.

It was not possible, due to paucity of time, to work collectively at the workshop on the following sections of the Draft CBD guidelines

Section B. Management process steps (subsections 7-10)

Section C Notification process and information requirements for notification

Section D. Public education and awareness-raising

Section E. Capacity-building

and Annex II: (Report of the Workshop on Biological Diversity and Tourism)
Recommendations regarding future action to be taken in connection with the DRAFT guidelines

It was agreed that these amended draft guidelines will be placed at a commonly accessible website so that those who participated as well as those who could not and did not can contribute in terms of their own suggestions to the parts that were modified as well as those that remained to be worked with.

ITEM 4. IYE RELATED DISCUSSIONS

The facilitators made a presentation (enclosure Appendix 3) of the definitions of Ecotourism, the role of UNEP, the goals of the IYE, the planning process and different events in the IYE leading to the World Ecotourism Summit (WES) and the expected outcomes. Responses from the floor were invited and discussed. In this context the Open letter of the NGO caucus to UNEP and the Secretary general of the UN (contesting the one sided view of ecotourism and demanding a review of the IYE) was also discussed.

Participants were also invited to contribute specific suggestions and proposals under the 4 main themes of the World Ecotourism Summit. (enclosure Appendix 4).

Discussion Notes /Concerns raised by the participants:

- Concern about the expansion of ecotourism into new (previously untouched) areas, destroying natural resources and livelihood of local communities and Indigenous Peoples.
- Concern on whether ecotourism can significantly contribute to sustainable development, and if so, under which conditions, and to whose benefit.
- Concern that the IYE would end up being a marketing exercise for implementing certification programmes which will be imposed by the North on the South.
- Concern that there is no evidence of UNEP taking cognisance of initiatives – such as the issues and concerns highlighted by Indigenous Peoples movements e.g. There was a resolution adopted by indigenous people at the conference in Panchgani India in December 2000.
- Globalisation as a critical issue is ignored; the work done on IYE does not draw from credible work done by the UNCTAD, in spite of both being sister organizations of UN.
- Ecotourism also brings in the threats of bio-Piracy, linked to privatisation and exploitation of biodiversity driven by an expanding biotech industry. There is need to look at what type of opening it is creating in terms of such threats.
- To be effective the discussions on ecotourism needs to take broader issues of sustainability and tourism into consideration, for instance local effects of the globalisation of tourism and of GATS (opening of markets and foreign investment, local environmental laws, employment, privatisation, economic leakages) and bio piracy. While officially protected areas continue to be a core concern for ecotourism, buffer zones, sacred sites, conservation corridors, and biodiversity-significant areas in general are integral parts of the planning process as well, according to the ecosystem approach.
- In order to separate “real” ecotourism products from green washing, it is useful to produce a set of conceptual clusters and baseline requirements (rather than definitions), on which certification and accreditation processes can be based. Concern about the value for the Southern NGOs of the IYE process and the WES (credibility and legitimacy). Where and how can NGOs have the most effective space for dialogue and influence? Some participants felt the need to participate in the IYE/WES as part of a larger strategy (where the CSD/WSSD and the CBD are also included), and ensure full participation of Southern NGOs in the WES to highlight both concerns and propositions, especially on development strategies.
- Problems of over visitation or distribution of visitors to protected areas are regionally different: in Asia and Latin America, most parks are under visited, whereas in Europe and the US over visitation is significant.
- Under the IYE, should discussions focus just on officially protected areas, or also include degraded/regenerating, or biodiversity-poor ones? Similarly, should emphasis be placed only on public protected areas, or also on buffer zones, endangered species habitat, and production, sacred sites or private areas? For which stakeholders are guidelines produced: industry, NGOs, governments, Indigenous Peoples, consultants or donors? General consensus is that the core focus of the IYE should continue to be ecotourism, biodiversity/tourism links,

effective contribution to conservation, and the equitable participation and benefits of steward communities, avoiding blurring of boundaries.

- Will the same Mass tourism providers do ecotourism once it is approved in Protected Areas? There are no guidelines and UNEP instead of directly promoting ecotourism, needs to have a role in influencing governments to bring out guidelines that will reveal their (government's) approach to ecotourism.
- There is concern that UNEP and WTO may not be effective in ensuring coordination between national Tourism and Environment (Forestry/Natural Resources/Conservation/Parks) departments and strategies with their member countries by current procedures (letters, recommendations) on ecotourism.
- NGOs in the workshop supported the spirit and the concerns of the Open Letter to UNEP, produced under the CSD NGO Caucus, but also felt the need to put emphasis on the implementation of alternative procedures, development strategies and action plans.

Responses/Recommendations/Suggestions:

- UNEP and WTO/OMT should support the implementation of the guidelines, support its adoption at the World Ecotourism Summit, and invite member governments and development agencies to do the same
- Suggestion that WES should have possibility to create a budget for funding on similar lines of FAO allocating budgets for the participation of stakeholders
- UNEP should involve the CBD and CSD structures into the IYE process, especially on the amended (NGO) version of the CBD Guidelines. Furthermore, increased communication and exchange from Southern NGOs with WTO/OMT needs to be facilitated.
- UNEP to open a continuous dialogue (via Internet) for participants not able to attend the preparatory meetings or the WES.
- The IYE could be a forum to lobby for projects or exchange ideas on the Best Practises. Lobbying for the best practices could itself be utilized as an incentive for the industry although this should be approached with caution.
- IFEST as a platform seemed to be at a conceptual stage and the Prep Comm. have not yet created space for such an idea. Hence, there should be a procedure whereby the subsequent Prep Comms should discuss concretely the idea of IFEST.

ITEM 5. WSSD related discussions

On the 3rd day of the workshop i.e. 26 September 2001, participants continued with the amendments to the draft CBD guidelines and its preamble. They also discussed (agenda item 3) the envisaged process to take forward the tourism debate in the WSSD process. Giving a brief round up and approach to WSSD process, the facilitator called to mind the complex interrelated processes while working towards gaining a platform for tourism in WSSD. In response to the presentations made, though sustainable tourism is seen as creative opportunity, IYE platform should also be utilized to discuss the negative impacts of Ecotourism, keeping in mind the fact that the internal economies have external linkages that hinder local communities from seizing opportunities. This idea should be reflected in Global Guidelines and IYE process. Also, acknowledging the fact that in the global economy, tourism is part of GATS (a sub-agreement of WTO) and globalisation institutions like these reflect the unequal power relations between the South and North, the thrust is to get us to completely open up without any subsidies for our domestic industry.

Discussion Notes /Concerns raised by the participants:

- Concern was voiced about the need to evolve a common strategy for all the five processes identified-the SBSTTA, Prep. Com, COP6 , WES and WSSD. Participant from India highlighted that no other industry has such a pan-human effect and we need to ensure that tourism issues identified here are given fair attention in these global processes. The strategy should address NGOs, the UN and other partner networks through whatever avenues to ensure that the tourism issues become visible.
- Concern was raised about the time slot of 15 minutes purportedly allotted for tourism in the WSSD. Further, the concern was intensified because, instead of the preferred modus operandi of a multi stakeholder process that the WSSD was committed to, this timeslot was allotted entirely to the WTO OMT. Participant from Germany expressed that we could either lobby for more time or for the multi-stakeholder process. Concern for the need to plan strategically to utilise the opportunity presented by the WSSD was expressed. The CBD guidelines and the inputs from the WES process would be obvious inputs into the WSSD. While this would be one perspective, the views and concerns that reflect in a true multi-stakeholder process would be important to feed into the WSSD.
- Concern about lack of coordinated action from NGOs, expressed by participant from Gambia in response to the letter from German NGO network (DANTE). Acknowledging the opportunity after the CSD-7 that created the North and South Caucus, there has been lack of strategy to coordinate the two caucuses for effective action. Lack of time and the pursuance of national agendas have only served to highlight how critical it is to have coordinated, concrete and unified action.
- Concern about lack of North representatives as weakness. The South Co-chair expressed the view that this meeting here was not representative as a number of important representatives were not present. Even in this non representative group there is no consensus on definitions and other issues . But we must use this forum as a platform.

Recommendations/Responses /Suggestions

- In response to NGOs intervention for processes like WES and the COP meeting, participant from India said that NGOs always have the option of a Campaign. We have limited time and therefore need to prioritise. While the IYE is an event for a year; the WSSD would probably set agenda for the next five years (with Agenda 21 being recommendatory in nature). The CBD, being binding on member countries, is therefore a powerful forum – where we should attempt for Tourism something like the Jakarta mandate for the Coast. Hence strategically inputting into the SBSTTA, COP-6 and CBD should be our key focus.
- If we have guidelines that are enforceable, we can to some extent regulate the multinational companies that are plundering our countries and affecting critically the lives of southern communities. Our northern partners have done very successful work on MNCs in their countries – on regulation – and a unified position with them is very crucial to find a common minimum position before WSSD.
- Action should be at two levels: nationally, pressuring governments, and internationally, through the CSD/WSSD CBD processes (where the multi-stakeholder processes have been established as an ingredient in the process)
- In response to the letter from the German NGO network, participant from India said that we should respect the fact that everybody has a right to his or her positions. Nobody should be forced into accepting positions that cannot be taken back to the communities they represent We should use this opportunity to arrive at a common minimum platform of action and to a minimum possible that will give us the flexibility to deal with our crisis in our own ways. Then, the broad external crisis can be dealt as a collective effort. Hence, through the sharing of the letter with UNEP, the NGOs were able to arrive at a common minimum understanding on the year of ecotourism, but a singular approach towards the industry has called for the re-look into the IYE.
- In response to GATS as a critical area that needed attention, participant from Germany recalled that this issue was lobbied for in the CSD, and now it is obvious that trade issues will be ignored in fora like these.

ITEM 6. ADOPTION OF DOCUMENTS

Adoption of the modified opening statement as a preamble, modified draft CBD guidelines {Sections A, B, C (partly)}, Press Release and the adoption of the minutes of each day's proceedings were completed. It was agreed that the sections of the draft guidelines that were not reviewed and modifications suggested in the workshop (for paucity of time) would be responded to by participants and this will be compiled and incorporated into the final report of the proceedings of the workshop.

ITEM 7. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Following the customary exchange of courtesies and acknowledgement of the efforts of participants and organisers to make the workshop a success, the workshop closed at 2.00 pm on Wednesday, 26 September 2001.