

Report of the Evaluation Team on the Cooperative Marine Science Session

Evaluation Team: Leader, Robert B. Abel, Fort Hancock, New Jersey; C. Isaac Camber, Miami Beach, Florida; Manuel M. Murillo, San José, Costa Rica; Francisco Palacio, Miami, Florida; Albert Veliky, Miami, Florida; Rodrigo Zeledon, San José, Costa Rica.

In two respects, the session on cooperative marine science had little precedent in the GCFI annals. First, we were not only discussing a technology, we were discussing the managerial and political aspects and implications. Second, beyond the situation itself, a future role of the GCFI itself was being considered, at least implicitly.

We erred in attempting to crowd the discussion into a single afternoon. At least two sessions would have been desirable. Such is always difficult to forecast. As was pointed out by the evaluation team, the brevity of the session prevented the inclusion of representatives from additional Central American and Caribbean nations; this may offer guidance for design and conduct next year.

If consensus was searched for, it was discovered, at least in the negative sense, that not a single argument was offered against the use of marine technology as a useful vehicle for regional cooperation. Understandably (since this is, after all, a *fisheries* institute) the preponderant issue concerned fisheries, although maritime commerce, coastal zone management, and recreation did receive some attention. Some mention was made of apparent inability on the part of some nations to locate cooperation in marine science, but the implication related more to the low priority of marine science than a basically uncooperative national doctrine. Again, not only the evaluation team, but members of the audience, pointed out the benefit that may be derived in future discussions from a broader representation (more countries).

Two themes dominated and threaded through the entire discussion. First, the importance of local initiative was stressed. The developing countries must at least partially initiate their own progress, rather than depending entirely on outside support and encouragement. However, as Dr. Zeledon observed, it is in the developed and rich nations' own enlightened self-interest to assist the developing countries. Moreover, it should be desirable for the larger Latin American nations to provide all possible assistance to their smaller neighbors. Dr. Zeledon's thoughtful analysis might well serve as the session's central theme, not only because of its cogency, but recognizing that his personal responsibilities — well beyond marine science — allow him to speak with complete objectivity.

However, the second dominant theme of education and training clearly occupies the thoughts of nearly all of the session's participants. All aspects were discussed, as much by the evaluation team as by the speakers themselves. Coverage included the need for pre-college awareness, scholarship and fellowship program development, additional educational facilities and their regional cooperative use, and, of course, funding. The interesting observation was offered that it is time that industry should examine more closely its latent interest, and therefore its own responsibility for encouraging more education. Perhaps GCFI would provide a reasonable forum for future such discussion.

Both during the presentations and the evaluation, the roles and activities of other related groups such as IOCARIBE, WECAF, and ICLARM were discussed in perspective of collaborative enterprises. Perhaps a deliberate attempt toward a combined meeting might be useful, next year. This should be considered if GCFI seriously contemplates any follow-through to yesterday's session. The Tinker Center at the University of Miami was brought up most often as the useful vehicle for planning cooperative effort.

A final observation: The subject of regional cooperation must be a matter of intense interest, as reflected by the audience, nearly all of whom stayed to the very end.