

# IUCN-WCPA TASK FORCE ON OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES

**COLLATION OF CASE STUDIES SUBMITTED TO THE TASK FORCE (2016-2017)**

## **NOTE**

This is a collation of case studies submitted to the IUCN-WCPA Task Force on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for consideration as potential OECMs.

The case studies have neither been edited nor fact-checked and remain the intellectual property of the authors. Whether or not these areas qualify as OECMs will depend on more rigorous evaluation on a case-by-case basis using the draft Guidelines and rapid assessment screening tool. All the case studies have been included as they show the range and diversity of situations for consideration as OECMs.



# CONTENTS

## 1. NORTH AMERICA

- Strait of Georgia Glass Sponge Reef Fishing Closures, British Columbia (Canada) - Sabine Jessen
- Checleset Bay Ecological Reserve, BC (Canada) - Sabine Jessen
- Rockfish Conservation Areas, British Columbia (Canada) - Sabine Jessen
- 30 Coral Closure, off Newfoundland and Labrador (Canada) - Sigrid Kuehnemund
- Network of Areas of Particular Environmental Interest in the Clarion Clipperton Zone in the Pacific, in the International Seabed Area of the Eastern Central Pacific between Mexico and Hawaii (USA) - Kristina Gjerde
- Ha'ena Community-based Subsistence Fishing Area, Northwestern coast of Kaua'i, Hawaii (USA) - Mimi D'Iorio
- National Water Reserves Program (Mexico) - Ninel Escobar
- Areas Voluntarily Destined for Conservation (Mexico) - Andrew Rhodes
- Fishing Refuge Areas: Akumal, Quintana Roo (Mexico) - Andrew Rhodes
- Forest Management (Mexico) - Andrew Rhodes
- Program of Payment for Environmental Services (Mexico) - Andrew Rhodes
- Units for the Conservation, Management and Sustainable Use of Wildlife (Mexico) - Andrew Rhodes
- Private Protected Areas Certification (Mexico) - WCPA Private Protected Areas Specialist Group
- Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem, Northwest Atlantic, NAFO Regulatory Area (outside 200 mile limit) - Kristina Gjerde

## 2. SOUTH AMERICA

- Forest Code (Brazil) - Allison Pritchard
- Bitá, Protected River, Colombian Orinoco Basin (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- Special Management Area of Afro Colombian Communities of the upstream of the Amurrupe River, Risaralda (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- Jaba Tañiwashkaka de la Linea Negra, Sierra Nevada of Santa Marta (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- Robles conservation corridor reaches four municipalities: Duitama (Boyacá), Encino, Charalá and Coromoro (Santander) (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- Civil Society Natural Reserve "El Oasis" (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute

- Civil Society Natural Reserve “El Silencio” (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- Water Reciprocal Agreements, a Case of Payments for Ecosystem Services (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- “El Morron” Rural property of the Municipality of La Celia, Risaralda Department (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- Dos Quebradas, Napoles Site Natural Municipal Park, Local Protected Area (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- Traditional Fishing Exclusive Zone. Chocó coast, Chocó Department (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- Cerro Sancancio, City of Manizales, Caldas Department (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute
- Complejo de Humedales del Abanico del Río Pastaza (Peru) - Marina Rosales
- “El Breo” Conservation Concession (Peru) - Jeff Pradel

### 3. EUROPE

- Scapa Flow (UK) - Dan Laffoley
- Part of Hope Quarry, Peak District National Park, Derbyshire (England) - Nigel Dudley

### 4. AFRICA

- Hunting Zones in North Cameroon (Cameroon) - Paul Scholte
- Yélisoubé, Loos Islands, Conakry (Guinea) - Alkaly Doumbouya
- Mabaso Community Stewardship Project, KZN Province (South Africa) - Onkemetse Nteta

### 5. ASIA

- Hutan Harapan, Sumatera (Indonesia) - Agus B. Utomo
- Community-based MPA: Ay and Rhun Island, Maluku (Indonesia) - Hesti Widodo
- *Tana’ Ulen* Lapan River (Indonesia) - Cristina Eghenter
- Mount Candalaga Dumut ICCA (the Philippines) - Terence Dacles
- Danjungan Island (the Philippines) - Terence Dacles
- Mount Apo KBA (the Philippines) - Nicole Bendsen and Günter Mühlbauer

### 6. PACIFIC

- Bradfield Field Training Area, Northern Territory (Australia) - Marc Hockings
- Cable Zone, Hauraki Gulf, Southwest Pacific Ocean (New Zealand) - Marc Costello

- Zaira Community, Vangunu Island, Western Province (Solomon Islands) - Joe McCarter and Simon Albert

1.

**NORTH AMERICA**

**Strait of Georgia Glass Sponge Reef Fishing Closures, British Columbia (Canada) – Sabine Jessen**

<b>Overview</b>	
<p>Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM</p>	<p>Full, legal, bottom-contact fishing closures were put in place to protect nine glass sponge reefs in the Strait of Georgia, off the southern coast of British Columbia. The fishing closures prohibit all bottom contact fishing activities, including bottom trawling, bottom long line, and trap fisheries (prawn and crab), within 150m off the reefs. The closures cover all fishing activities: commercial, recreational and aboriginal (food, social, ceremonial). The buffer zone was determined following consultation with the commercial and recreational fishing sectors, conservation groups and First Nations. Initially a 200m buffer was proposed in keeping with the proposed “adaptive management zone” around the Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound MPA. It is worth noting that the original recommendation by government scientists was for a 5-8km buffer zone for the MPA.</p> <p>Thought to have gone extinct around 40 million years ago living glass sponge reefs (bioherms) were first discovered in British Columbia in 1987. Just a handful of living glass sponge reefs have been found in British Columbia and only a single small reef in Alaska. The reefs are a very important biogenic habitat, creating refugia and nursery habitat for commercially important and threatened species, including rockfish, spot prawns, halibut and herring. In addition to this ongoing scientific studies of the reefs are revealing the significant role the reefs play in nutrient cycling and filtering bacteria from water when they feed. Glass sponges are very fragile and easily crushed by fishing gear. As filter feeders the reefs are also vulnerable to sedimentation, which can smother and choke the sponges, reducing their ability to filter feed and effectively starving the sponges.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
<p>What size is the area?</p>	<p>There are closures around fourteen glass sponge reef bioherms totaling 51km<sup>2</sup> (breakdown for individual reefs below)</p>

	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1128 247 1680 279"><b>Bioherm Name/ Location</b></th> <th data-bbox="1682 247 2049 279"><b>Size (km2)</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 280 1680 312">Foreslope Hills</td> <td data-bbox="1682 280 2049 312">0.89</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 314 1680 346">Outer Gulf Islands</td> <td data-bbox="1682 314 2049 346">2.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 347 1680 379">Outer Gulf Islands</td> <td data-bbox="1682 347 2049 379">1.62</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 381 1680 413">Halibut Bank</td> <td data-bbox="1682 381 2049 413">7.35</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 414 1680 446">Sechelt</td> <td data-bbox="1682 414 2049 446">7.82</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 448 1680 480">East of Hornby Island</td> <td data-bbox="1682 448 2049 480">3.08</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 481 1680 513">Howe Sound-Queen Charlotte Ch.</td> <td data-bbox="1682 481 2049 513">5.85</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 515 1680 547">Howe Sound-Queen Charlotte Ch.</td> <td data-bbox="1682 515 2049 547">0.70</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 549 1680 580">Gabriola Island</td> <td data-bbox="1682 549 2049 580">0.72</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 582 1680 614">Outer Gulf Islands</td> <td data-bbox="1682 582 2049 614">1.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 616 1680 647">Howe Sound - Defence Islands</td> <td data-bbox="1682 616 2049 647">0.96</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 649 1680 681">Parksville</td> <td data-bbox="1682 649 2049 681">2.71</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 683 1680 715">Howe Sound-Queen Charlotte Ch (alt.)</td> <td data-bbox="1682 683 2049 715">7.71</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1128 716 1680 748">Sechelt - alternative</td> <td data-bbox="1682 716 2049 748">8.23</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Bioherm Name/ Location</b>	<b>Size (km2)</b>	Foreslope Hills	0.89	Outer Gulf Islands	2.85	Outer Gulf Islands	1.62	Halibut Bank	7.35	Sechelt	7.82	East of Hornby Island	3.08	Howe Sound-Queen Charlotte Ch.	5.85	Howe Sound-Queen Charlotte Ch.	0.70	Gabriola Island	0.72	Outer Gulf Islands	1.33	Howe Sound - Defence Islands	0.96	Parksville	2.71	Howe Sound-Queen Charlotte Ch (alt.)	7.71	Sechelt - alternative	8.23
<b>Bioherm Name/ Location</b>	<b>Size (km2)</b>																														
Foreslope Hills	0.89																														
Outer Gulf Islands	2.85																														
Outer Gulf Islands	1.62																														
Halibut Bank	7.35																														
Sechelt	7.82																														
East of Hornby Island	3.08																														
Howe Sound-Queen Charlotte Ch.	5.85																														
Howe Sound-Queen Charlotte Ch.	0.70																														
Gabriola Island	0.72																														
Outer Gulf Islands	1.33																														
Howe Sound - Defence Islands	0.96																														
Parksville	2.71																														
Howe Sound-Queen Charlotte Ch (alt.)	7.71																														
Sechelt - alternative	8.23																														
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The fishing closures are defined by polygons, which encompass the entirety of each reef with a 150 m buffer. The polygons were designed with minimal corners and simplistic shapes for optimal coverage and enforcement. The coordinates for the closures were made publicly available and included in the ground fish integrated fisheries management plans (IFMPs) for each area.																														
<b>3. Governance Type</b>																															
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	The closures were designated federally by the Fisheries, Oceans and Canadian Coastguard who have jurisdiction over marine fishing activities and the water column. The closures were designated through a "Fishery Notice" and included in the Integrated Fisheries Management Plans (IFMPs) which are produced for each fishery. First Nations have constitutionally protected rights to access resources. DFO policy states that "after conservation needs are met First Nations' FSC rights and treaty obligations to First Nations have																														



	<p>first priority in allocation decisions”. As all bottom contact fishing activities will have detrimental impacts on the reefs, no bottom-contact fishing activity is deemed to be consistent with the conservation objectives of the fishing closure and so all First Nations bottom-contact fisheries, including Food, Social and Ceremonial (FSC) are prohibited. Restrictions on First Nations fishing activities came into effect on 1 April 2016. At least one First Nation voiced strong support for the closures.</p>
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	To the best of our knowledge. First Nations consultations were bilateral so we do not know the discussions and outcome for each Nation.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area’s governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	The Fishery Notice and IFMP sets out the area’s governance and conservation management arrangements.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	The Fishery Notice states that the closure will be in place “Until further notice”. DFO staff has indicated the intention for the closures to be permanent however as it is implemented as a fisheries closure it lacks the firmness of legislated protections and could be overturned at any time. IFMPs for crab and groundfish are renewed annually and prawn and shrimp trap and trawl fisheries are renewed every two years. The
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year-round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area’s management objectives?	The management objective is the protection and conservation of the glass sponge reefs.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Implicit. The closures are intended to protect the reefs, which comprise a few species, however the reefs support a great many more species and so protection of the reefs would benefit the biodiversity conservation of a number of species.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take	Protection of the glass sponge reefs is the primary objective and it

primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	supersedes all other considerations. As per DFO policy, First Nations FSC fisheries, although constitutionally protected rights are not consistent with the conservation objective and therefore not permitted.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The closures are intended to protect the reefs, which comprise a few species, however the reefs support a great many more species and so protection of the reefs would benefit the biodiversity conservation of a number of species.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness in terms of adherence to the regulations, is measured through regular patrols of the areas by DFO enforcement. Reef surveys will also be conducted to monitor reef health and biodiversity (see below).
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	The reefs are to be surveyed over the summer, this will be used to provide a baseline for future monitoring of reef health. There are obvious issues in using current survey data as a baseline for reef health and we hope that DFO will take into account "shifting baselines".
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	<p>The fishing closures only address bottom contact fishing activities and do not dictate any other marine or coastal activities that occur near the reefs. Bottom contact fishing activities were deemed to be the most significant threat to the reefs. The closures were intended to protect the reefs from damage from direct impact and also from indirect impacts like sediment plumes.</p> <p>The reefs are still at risk from other activities, in particular anchoring (of recreational, commercial and/or industrial vessels) and the laying of underwater cables, which are pressing threats. These activities can cause direct harm if they contact the reefs and can impact the reefs indirectly by scouring sediments. Some reefs are at greater risk than others in terms of these activities due to their proximity to recreational areas and population centres.</p>

	<p>Since 1972 there has been a federal moratorium in place regarding offshore oil and gas exploration and production in British Columbia, however the moratorium is not legislated and therefore could be easily overturned. It is not known how seismic testing and drilling would affect the sponges but in the least, sedimentation issues are likely.</p> <p>Other fishing activities still occur in the water column above and around the reefs. Midwater trawling data shows that groundfish are occasionally caught, which shows that the gear must periodically (unintentionally) touch the seafloor (Boutillier reference). Therefore there remains a significant risk of damage. Even where pelagic and surface fishing activities do not directly affect the sponge reefs there may be ecological effects through removal of biological matter and the resultant consequences on nutrient flow and cycling to deepwater ecosystems. These connections are poorly understood but present a great enough concern that the IUCN guidelines for applying protected area management categories to MPAs strongly advises against vertical zoning (Day et al). Their position also reflects the challenges with managing and enforcing vertical zoning.</p> <p>The fishing closures also do not prohibit other activities such as dumping, dredging or coastal developments or nearshore activities (such as outflows and point source pollution, dock construction, etc.) that would also potentially affect the reefs.</p>
--	--

**Checleset Bay Ecological Reserve, BC (Canada) – Sabine Jessen**

Overview	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	Provincial Marine Parks and Ecological Reserves are already included in Canada’s official protected area statistics as MPAs. However, the provincial

	<p>government does not have jurisdiction over maritime activities like fishing, shipping, and oil and gas development. Therefore the ability of a provincial protected area to effectively protect biodiversity is questionable, without federal engagement. For this reason, CPAWS does not consider them to be fully implemented MPAs.</p> <p>Ecological reserved are established to “preserve representative and special natural ecosystems, plant and animal species, features and phenomena”<sup>1</sup> and the principal uses are for research and education. Ecological reserves can be terrestrial, marine or a combination thereof. There are over 20 ecological reserves in BC with a marine component. Ecological reserves are not created for recreation but many are open to low impact, non-extractive activities.</p> <p>Checleset Bay Ecological Reserve (CBER) is almost entirely marine and has the largest marine component of all ecological reserves in BC at 331km<sup>2</sup>. The original purpose of CBER was to provide high quality habitat for the reintroduction of sea otters.</p> <p>The primary role of the CBER is to protect a representative marine ecosystem on the west coast of Vancouver Island.</p> <p>The secondary role is to protect a high diversity of marine habitats that in turn support a high diversity of species from algae to sea otters and northern sea lions, whales, porpoises, pinnipeds, seabirds, finfish and shellfish. There are also a number of terrestrial mammals that use the islands.</p> <p>The tertiary role of CBER is to protect and preserve cultural heritage features including archaeological sites, tied to a rich heritage for First Nations and settlers.</p> <p>The quaternary role is to support opportunities for scientific research on sea otters.</p>
--	---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/eco\\_reserve/](http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/eco_reserve/)

	The north-east portion of CBER is included in a Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA)(see other case study) .
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	The marine component of CBER is 331.50km <sup>2</sup> in total, (an additional 15km <sup>2</sup> is terrestrial, comprising 40 small islands)
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The map showing the park boundary and coordinates are available on the BC Ministry of Environment website <a href="http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/eco_reserve/checleset_er/checleset_bay_map.pdf?v=1466697569277">http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/bcparks/eco_reserve/checleset_er/checleset_bay_map.pdf?v=1466697569277</a>
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	Ecological reserves are implemented by the BC provincial government under the Ecological Reserves Act. The provincial government does not have jurisdiction over activities that occur in the water column, which includes fishing, marine transportation or oil and gas activities. DFO has established a Rockfish Conservation Area that overlaps the northern portion of the ecological reserve and prohibits the following activities according to Haggerty (2014). <sup>2</sup> The <b>recreational fishing activities</b> prohibited are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• groundfish by hook and line</li> <li>• salmon trolling, jigging or mooching</li> <li>• spearfishing</li> </ul> <b>Commercial fishing activities</b> prohibited are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• groundfish bottom trawl</li> <li>• groundfish hook and line for halibut, inside rockfish, outside rockfish, lingcod, dogfish</li> <li>• sablefish by trap</li> <li>• salmon trolling</li> </ul>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.davidsuzuki.org/publications/RockfishConservationAreas-OurCurrentStateofKnowledge-Mar2014.pdf>

	<p>Outside the RCA, there are no restrictions on fishing activities in the rest of the ecological reserve.</p> <p>First Nations have constitutionally protected right of access.</p> <p>The purpose statement for CBER states the Provincial government intends to work with Fisheries and Oceans Canada to seek cooperation regarding the management of fisheries and with First Nations to “reach a mutual understanding of ecological reserve management interests.”</p>
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	The purpose statement for CBER states the Provincial governments intention to work with DFO to seek cooperation regarding the management of fisheries and with First Nations to “reach a mutual understanding of ecological reserve management interests.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area’s governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	The Purpose Statement for the CBER outlines management issues and conservation objectives. The Ecological Reserves Act outlines the legal framework and jurisdiction for ecological reserves including restrictions on disposition, permit requirements, conservation objectives and power to make regulations.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	An ecological reserve established under the Ecological Reserves Act is legislated and not easily overturned. Fishing restrictions in place through the Rockfish Conservation Area are established through fishing closures and may be overturned at any time.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year-round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area’s management objectives?	<p>The primary role of the CBER is to protect a representative marine ecosystem on the west coast of Vancouver Island.</p> <p>The secondary role is to protect a high diversity of marine habitats that in turn support a high diversity of species from algae to sea otters and northern sea lions, whales, porpoises, pinnipeds, seabirds, finfish and</p>

	<p>shellfish. There are also a number of terrestrial mammals that use the islands.</p> <p>The tertiary role of CBER is to protect and preserve cultural heritage features including archaeological sites, tied to a rich heritage for First Nations and settlers.</p> <p>The quaternary role is to support opportunities for scientific research on sea otters.</p>
<p>Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?</p>	<p>Biodiversity conservation is an explicit objective.</p>
<p>If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?</p>	<p>The CBER does not have jurisdiction to address conflicts regarding fishing activities, including shellfish harvesting. According to the purpose statements the CBER does have “cooperative management arrangements for commercial fishery closures specific to the reserve: Harvesting is prohibited for anchovy, surf perch, pile perch, sea cucumber, geoduck, horseclam, octopus, scallop, red and green urchins.” However no supplementary information is available pertaining to the nature and permanence of these fisheries closures. According to a 2011 analysis of fishing activities permitted within MPAs the following fisheries are permitted within at least part of CBER: Bottom Trawl, Clam, Crab, Halibut, Herring SU, Midwater Trawl, Opal Squid, Prawn Trap, Rockfish H&amp;L, Sablefish, Sardine, Schedule 2, Shrimp Trawl, Surfperch, and Tuna. <sup>3</sup> For the portion of the CBER that falls within a Rockfish Conservation Area (RCA), only certain fisheries are restricted and restrictions do not apply to First Nations. There are concerns about enforcement of rockfish conservation areas, especially in more remote locations like Checleset Bay. The CBER can address impacts from tourism and recreation: vessel landing along the shoreline of CBER is restricted and permits are required. The Purpose Statement also includes an objective to work with the Ministry of Forests to ensure upland activities do not impact the ecological reserve and mitigate</p>

<sup>3</sup> Robb, C., Bodtker, K., Wright, K. & Lash, J. 2011. Commercial fisheries closures in marine protected areas on Canada’s Pacific coast: the exception, not the rule. Marine Policy (35) pp.309-316

	risks.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	As CBER does not have jurisdiction over fishing activities and vessel traffic it is not able to adequately protect species from disturbance and trophic impacts. It offers some species, some protections.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	BC Parks wardens enforce regulations, however as is the case for DFO enforcement of Rockfish Conservation Areas and fisheries closures, limited funding and logistical capacity restrict management effectiveness. The Purpose Statement includes an objective “In the long term, review the designation to ensure that objectives can be met”. There is no monitoring plan outlined. BC Parks has very, very limited staffing to ensure adherence to regulations.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	All though the CBER has strong conservation objectives and is built on good intentions, it does not have the jurisdiction to prohibit extractive or disruptive activities like fishing and vessel traffic, and therefore it does not effectively conserve biodiversity. It is not clear from the available information whether or how conservation effectiveness is measured.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	CBER – like other ecological reserves in BC – fails to address key activities like fishing and transportation that are known to have multiple and significant impacts on marine ecosystems. Since the ecosystem in question has been affected by activities and continues to be, the ecological reserve designation is not effective or encompassing. Fisheries closures are in place to address some issues but there is a lack of clarity around the nature and permanence of the closures which prevents effective integrated management and impedes proper assessment of the effectiveness of the conservation measure.

**Rockfish Conservation Areas, British Columbia (Canada) – Sabine Jessen**

**Overview**



<p>Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM</p>	<p>Between 2004 and 2007 164 Rockfish Conservation Areas (RCAs) were established throughout the BC coast. According to the Fisheries and Oceans Canada's (DFO) rockfish conservation strategy, 37 species of rockfish caught in fisheries off the BC coast and inshore rockfish (yelloweye, quillback, copper, china, tiger, black, brown, and blue rockfish) are at "low levels of abundance". RCAs were established specifically to protect inshore rockfish.<sup>4</sup></p> <p>RCAs are intended to protect rockfish within their boundaries from accidental or targeted catch by recreational and commercial fisheries. RCAs are largely located in inshore rocky reef areas, and have been established both in remote areas and close to human communities/populations.</p> <p>DFO lists the following recreational and commercial fishing activities as permitted within RCAs, they do not provide a list of prohibited activities. The <b>recreational fishing activities</b> allowed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• invertebrates by hand picking or dive</li> <li>• crab by trap</li> <li>• shrimp/prawn by trap</li> <li>• smelt by gillnet</li> </ul> <p><b>Commercial fishing activities</b> allowed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• invertebrates by hand picking or dive</li> <li>• crab by trap</li> <li>• prawn by trap</li> <li>• scallops by trawl</li> <li>• salmon by seine or gillnet</li> <li>• herring by gillnet, seine and spawn-on-kelp</li> <li>• sardine by gillnet, seine, and trap</li> </ul>
--	---

<sup>4</sup> Yamanaka, K.L., Logan, G., 2010. Developing British Columbia's inshore rockfish conservation strategy. Marine and Coastal Fisheries 2, 28-46.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• smelt by gillnet</li> <li>• euphausiid (krill) by mid-water trawl</li> <li>• opal squid by seine</li> <li>• groundfish by mid-water trawl</li> </ul> <p>The following activities are prohibited in RCAs according to Haggerty (2014).<sup>5</sup> The <b>recreational fishing activities</b> prohibited are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• groundfish by hook and line</li> <li>• salmon trolling, jigging or mooching</li> <li>• spearfishing</li> </ul> <p><b>Commercial fishing activities</b> prohibited are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• groundfish bottom trawl</li> <li>• groundfish hook and line for halibut, inside rockfish, outside rockfish, lingcod, dogfish</li> <li>• sablefish by trap</li> <li>• salmon trolling</li> </ul>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	164 RCAs cover a total area of 4847.2km <sup>2</sup> . They range in size from 0.1km <sup>2</sup> to 493 km <sup>2</sup> .
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Each RCA has legally defined boundaries and GPS coordinates are available online and in printed materials aimed at commercial and recreational fishers. RCA boundaries are designed with minimal corners/sides to aid navigation and enforcement and are bound by shorelines to some extent. The location and coordinates for RCAs are published on the DFO website, in a booklet, and are also listed in Integrated Fisheries Management Plans (IFMPs) for commercial fisheries. Commercial groundfish fishers have onboard observers

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.davidsuzuki.org/publications/RockfishConservationAreas-OurCurrentStateofKnowledge-Mar2014.pdf>

	and VMS, and comply with the boundaries, but compliance by recreational fishers is poor (see below). <sup>6</sup>
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	RCAs are federally designated fisheries closures established by the federal fisheries agency, DFO.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	RCAs theoretically have the power to exclude activities harmful to rockfish. However, DFO has not had the capacity to enforce those exclusions, especially for recreational fishers. While there was an extensive outreach and consultation process surrounding the establishment of the RCAs, they remain a contentious issue for some user groups. The fisheries closures do not apply to First Nations constitutionally protected rights to fish for Food, Social or Ceremonial fisheries (FSC). DFO does not have the jurisdiction to grant or exercise subsurface rights.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	RCAs are established under the federal Fisheries Act. The areas and regulations are listed on the DFO website, in a booklet, and in the IFMPs for commercial fisheries and the Sport fishing Guide for recreational fishers, which are all publicly available from DFO.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	According to DFO, RCAs are intended to be long-term closures (and many have been in place for ten years). However, fishing closures are implemented through regulation, and can be overturned or changed by the Minister at any time.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year-round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	

<sup>6</sup> Lancaster, D., Dearden, P., Ban, N., 2015. Drivers of recreational fisher compliance in temperate marine conservation areas: A study of Rockfish Conservation Areas in British Columbia, Canada. *Global Ecology and Conservation* 4, 645-657.

What are the area's management objectives?	The management objective is the protection and conservation of specific inshore rockfish species.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Biodiversity is not specifically mentioned. Rather, RCAs are intended to protect rockfish, but may have the added benefit of protecting other species found in the same kind of habitat and subject to the same fishing methods.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	First Nations food, social and ceremonial fisheries (FSC) are permitted within RCAs. RCAs allow some kinds of fishing that may catch rockfish as bycatch (e.g., commercial prawn by trap, scallop trawl, groundfish mid-water trawl are allowed within RCAs).
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The closures only provide protection from fisheries mortality to rockfish and similar species.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Monitoring and enforcement of RCAs is generally poor, particularly for recreational fishers. A study in the southern Strait of Georgia found that the majority of recreational fishers either are not aware of the existence of RCAs (26%), or do not know where the boundaries are (60%), resulting in low compliance with RCAs by this sector. Other studies have found that, on average, recreational fishing occurrence did not change after RCA implementation, <sup>7</sup> and that 79% of RCAs in the southern Strait of Georgia had confirmed or suspected non-compliance. <sup>v</sup>
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	There is little information available to assess the effectiveness of RCAs. Baseline studies were not conducted prior to the implementation of the RCAs. While some surveys have since been conducted, it is difficult to determine whether there has been an effect on rockfish populations due to the RCAs. Some studies have shown some RCAs to be effective, while most have shown no difference. <sup>ii</sup> Furthermore these studies have only looked at

<sup>7</sup> Haggarty, D.R., Martell, S.J., Shurin, J., 2016. Lack of recreational fishing compliance may compromise effectiveness of Rockfish Conservation Areas in British Columbia. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences.

	<p>the effects of RCAs on rockfish numbers, not wider biodiversity within the RCA. Further studies are planned to determine effectiveness however the lack of baseline data and new data will limit the validity and reliability of these assessments.</p>
<p>How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet</p>	<p>RCAs theoretically have the power to exclude some activities harmful to rockfish. However, they only restrict/prevent fisheries mortality to rockfish and similar species. The mechanism used for RCAs, fishing closures, do not compel DFO to prohibit activities incompatible with conservation. The fishing closures only apply to a subset of fisheries that can occur within RCAs so there is still potential bycatch of rockfish in other fisheries, and the regulations do not protect habitat or consider trophic relationships. For example, a number of RCAs overlap glass sponge reefs which act as important refugia for rockfish, however some bottom contact fishing (although not groundfish bottom trawling) is still permitted within the RCA which is a major threat to the reefs.</p> <p>Furthermore it is not clear how effective RCAs currently are as a conservation measure. A lack of baseline data and lack of monitoring continues to hamper attempts to evaluate their effectiveness. DFO has not had the capacity to enforce exclusions, especially for recreational fishers. Studies have found that, on average, recreational fishing occurrence did not change after RCA implementation, and that 79% of RCAs in the southern Strait of Georgia had confirmed or suspected non-compliance.<sup>8</sup></p>

### 30 Coral Closure, off Newfoundland and Labrador (Canada) - Sigrid Kuehnemund

#### 1. Overview

<sup>8</sup> Lancaster, D., 2015. Conservation and compliance: a quantitative assessment of recreational fisher compliance in Rockfish Conservation Areas In School of Environmental Studies. University of Victoria, Victoria.

Name and location of the area	30 Coral Closure, off Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECS	<p>The 30 Coral Closure is a coral protection zone in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) convention area, which straddles both national and international waters. This area has the highest density of cold-water corals in the area, including brittle, slow-growing corals, and has been identified as a Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem (VME) by NAFO<sup>9</sup>, and a Sensitive Benthic Area (SBA) by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO).<sup>10</sup> Coral and sponge communities have high species richness and biodiversity, and provide an important ecological role in maintaining diverse and healthy aquatic ecosystems.<sup>11</sup> Almost 50% of this closure overlaps with the Southwest Shelf Edge and Slope Ecologically and Biologically Significant Area (EBSA) found in the Placentia Bay/Grand Banks Area.<sup>12,13</sup> In addition to corals and sponges, this area is important for groundfish, seabirds and leatherback turtles.</p> <p>Deep-sea corals are vulnerable to the impacts of bottom contact fishing gear, therefore any gear that has the potential to impact the bottom has been prohibited from use at this site.<sup>14</sup> The fisheries closure was initiated by Canada in 2007 - the first fishing closure created to protect deep-sea corals within the Newfoundland and Labrador region, and subsequently implemented by NAFO contracting parties in 2008.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	The area is 14,040 km <sup>2</sup> . Nearly 75% (10,396 km <sup>2</sup> ) of that is inside the

<sup>9</sup> NAFO (2017). Vulnerable marine ecosystems closures. Retrieved from [nafo.int/Fisheries/VME](http://nafo.int/Fisheries/VME)

<sup>10</sup> DFO (2009). Policy for Managing the Impacts of Fishing on Sensitive Benthic Areas. Retrieved from: <http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/reports-rapports/regs/sff-cpd/benthi-eng.htm#n1>

<sup>11</sup> DFO (2015). Coral and sponge conservation strategy for Eastern Canada 2015. Retrieved from: <http://waves-vagues.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/Library/363832.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> DFO (2007). Placentia Bay-Grand Banks large ocean management area ecologically and biologically significant areas. CSAS Research document 2007/052. Retrieved from: <http://waves-vagues.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/Library/331779.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> DFO (2016). Refinement of information relating to ecologically and biologically significant areas in identified in the Newfoundland and Labrador bioregion. CSAS Science Response 2016/032. Retrieved from: [http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/Publications/ScR-RS/2016/2016\\_032-eng.pdf](http://www.dfo-mpo.gc.ca/csas-sccs/Publications/ScR-RS/2016/2016_032-eng.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> NAFO (2017). NAFO Conservation and enforcement measures 2017. FC Doc. 17-01. Retrieved from: <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/mul163879.pdf>

	Canadian Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), with the rest in areas beyond national jurisdiction (ABNJ).
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	<p>The area and its boundaries have latitudes and longitudes defined by NAFO.<sup>15</sup></p> <p>That being said, this site is in essence vertically zoned, as the management tool only protects benthic species and habitats, and does not manage species in the remainder of the water column. Geographical space in the context of marine protected areas (and other marine conservation tools) is a “general presumption against the use of vertical zoning, due to the fact that there is increasing evidence of strong ecological benthic-pelagic coupling and the subsequent vertically tiered management is particularly difficult, if not impossible, to effectively police and enforce”.<sup>16</sup></p>
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area’s governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	The area’s governance is through government: under DFO in Canada’s EEZ, and under NAFO in ABNJ.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	UN Resolution A/RES 61/105 (2006) <sup>17</sup> called for identification of VMEs and an investigation into their protection. These commitments were re-affirmed in 2009 via A/RES 64/72. <sup>18</sup> NAFO’s regulatory powers are limited to the NAFO Regulatory Area, which is the ABNJ portion of the NAFO Convention Area, and can consequently identify and protect VMEs within their jurisdiction. Canada, as a Contracting Party to NAFO, has regulatory powers inside its EEZ,

<sup>15</sup> NAFO (2017). NAFO Conservation and enforcement measures 2017. FC Doc. 17-01. Article 1.7. Retrieved from: <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/mul163879.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> Day, J., Dudley, N., Hockings, M., Holmes, G., Laffoley, D. D. A., Stolton, S., & Wells, S. M. (2012). *Guidelines for applying the IUCN protected area management categories to marine protected areas*. IUCN. Retrieved from: [https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/import/downloads/iucn\\_categoriesamp\\_eng.pdf](https://www.iucn.org/sites/dev/files/import/downloads/iucn_categoriesamp_eng.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> United Nations General Assembly. (2006). UN Resolution A/RES 61/105. Retrieved from: [https://documents-dds-](https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/500/73/PDF/N0650073.pdf?OpenElement)

[ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/500/73/PDF/N0650073.pdf?OpenElement](https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N06/500/73/PDF/N0650073.pdf?OpenElement)

<sup>18</sup> United Nations General Assembly. (2009). UN Resolution A/RES 64/72. Retrieved from: <https://documents-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N09/466/15/PDF/N0946615.pdf?OpenElement>

	and can identify and protect SBAs using Fisheries Closures under the <i>Fisheries Act</i> . <sup>19</sup>
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	<p>The governance prevents the destruction of VMEs by prohibiting bottom contact fisheries. The prohibition is overseen by the governing bodies of NAFO and DFO.</p> <p>The governance arrangement, however, does not consider other activities beyond fisheries which may potentially impact the marine areas, species and ecosystems, including shipping and oil and gas development, and only protects a portion of the water column (in this case the benthic environment).</p>
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	As the measure covers both national and international waters, different legal tools are used to conserve the area. For the portion in ABNJ, NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures, Article 17 (2017) is used. <sup>20</sup> For the portion inside Canada's EEZ, a <i>Fisheries Act</i> variation order is used.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	<p>NAFO VME management is a "continuous process", meaning that closures are reviewed periodically and are subject to change. The 3O closure has been reviewed twice previously, at the ends of both 2012 and 2014, and is set to be reviewed again in 2020. The closure currently expires the 31<sup>st</sup> of December, 2020, though the closure can be renewed.</p> <p>The Canadian portion of the closure could be reversed by Ministerial order by the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard at any time, though this is thought to be unlikely for coral and sponge closures.</p>
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	The closure has been in force under NAFO since 2008, and will be reviewed again in 2020. It is interesting to note that the North East Atlantic Fisheries

<sup>19</sup> *Fisheries Act*, RSC 1985, c F-14. Retrieved from: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/PDF/F-14.pdf>

<sup>20</sup> NAFO (2017). NAFO Conservation and enforcement measures 2017. FC Doc. 17-01. Article 1.7. Retrieved from: <http://extwprlegs1.fao.org/docs/pdf/mul163879.pdf>



	Commission (NEAFC) has permanent VME closures, unlike NAFO that periodically reviews its VME closures.
Is the measure in place year-round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	The measure is in place year-round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The sole management objective is to protect coral VMEs by closing the area to all bottom-contact fishing activities.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	The protection of the coral VME is the sole and explicit management objective. As such, the sole objective is the conservation of benthic biodiversity.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	As the conservation of the of coral VME is the sole and explicit management objective, it can be argued that it would take primacy over other objectives in the case of conflict as there are no other objectives. However, the tools used to protect this site are only fisheries management tools, and are only being used to manage specific types of fisheries. Other impacts from oil and gas development and shipping, for example, are not being managed by the tool and developments in other sectors may take precedence to biodiversity conservation if future conflicts arise. Also, this tool is not conserving biodiversity as a whole, as it is only protecting benthic biodiversity.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The measure only protects the benthos and species associated with the bottom habitats in the area. While the coral VME and associated biota are being protected from their main threat (bottom contact fishing), non-bottom contact fishing is still open for some other species, and other activities, such as shipping, are not managed for the conservation of biodiversity. The tool cannot be said to protect biodiversity as a whole since the area is vertically zoned and the tool is not protecting the entire water column. There is a need to consider the biodiversity of the entire space and not just benthic habitats.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness for this site is measured in terms of if vessels are adhering to the prohibitions against bottom-contact fisheries. Management is measured using Vessel Monitoring Systems (VMS), which records vessel

	<p>presence, type of vessel, and activity (speed, course) within the closure.<sup>21</sup> A review of 2016 VMS data<sup>22</sup> shows that closed areas were respected by vessels, while 2015<sup>23</sup> showed two vessels which fished inside the closed area. By-catch in non-bottom contact fisheries is also reported to ensure that sensitive benthic habitats are not being damaged (i.e. that coral is not being caught). It could be argued that the effectiveness of the tool to conserve biodiversity isn't being measured, but that the adherence to rules is being measured. As such, it appears that the rules are being followed for the most part, meaning that the benthic environment is not being disturbed by the impacts of bottom contact fishing.</p>
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
<p>Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?</p>	<p>Effectiveness of the spatial coverage of the closure has been raised by NAFO, and given a moderate priority for review of boundaries.<sup>2425</sup> Advice has been given that the 400 m depth contour would be a more ecologically appropriate boundary for this closure rather than the current 800 m depth contour that is used to identify/delineate the site. Concentrations of small and large gorgonian corals, in addition to extensive sea pen fields, are not protected from the anthropogenic impacts of bottom contact fishing gear, as they exist at shallower depths than are currently protected. The area directly outside the closure, where these potentially vulnerable species are located, is also subject to high fishing pressure.</p>
<p>Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do</p>	<p>This closure is a sectoral measure limited to NAFO and DFO regulatory</p>

<sup>21</sup> FAO (2017). NAFO VME database summary. Retrieved from [fao.org/in-action/vulnerable-marine-ecosystems/background/vme-tools/en/](http://fao.org/in-action/vulnerable-marine-ecosystems/background/vme-tools/en/)

<sup>22</sup> NAFO (2016). Annual compliance review 2016 (compliance report for fishing year 2015). NAFO/FC Doc. 16/19. Retrieved from: <https://archive.nafo.int/open/fc/2016/fcdoc16-01.pdf>

<sup>23</sup> NAFO (2015). Report of the 8th Meeting of the NAFO Scientific Council Working Group on Ecosystem Science and Assessment. NAFO SCS Doc. 15/19. Retrieved from: <https://archive.nafo.int/open/sc/2015/scs15-19.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> NAFO (2013). Report of the 6th Meeting of the NAFO Scientific Council Working Group on Ecosystem Science and Assessment. NAFO SCS Doc. 13/024. Retrieved from: [https://gadcap.files.wordpress.com/2014/12/report\\_wgesa\\_2013.pdf](https://gadcap.files.wordpress.com/2014/12/report_wgesa_2013.pdf)

<sup>25</sup> NAFO (2014). Scientific Council reports 2014. Retrieved from; <https://www.nafo.int/Portals/0/PDFs/rb/2014/SC-parte-2014.pdf?ver=2016-02-19-111738-023>

<p>conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?</p>	<p>powers, and is only limited to managing the impacts of fishing. It would not necessarily take primacy in case of conflict with other activities. That said, currently the main human activity is fishing, and that activity is being managed in the area. As stated previously, there is only a single explicit conservation objective and therefore no conflict among management objectives. The conflict would come from activities outside the fisheries sector, such as shipping (which has limited benthic impact but could impact other species found in the area such as endangered leatherback turtles) or oil and gas (which isn't currently happening in the area, however licenses exist to the west of the site).</p>
<p>Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?</p>	<p>The current effectiveness of the area is due to governance and management; however other potentially damaging activities such as oil and gas could occur in the future which could impact the effectiveness of the measure, and which the current management has no authority to control.</p>
<p><b>7. Assessment</b></p>	
<p>In relation to the draft guidance (<b>Section 3</b>) and the draft screening tool (<b>Section 4</b>), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?</p>	<p>In its current form this area would NOT count as an OECM. It does, however, have the potential to be counted, but only if management is strengthened.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The tool needs to protect the entire water column. Vertical zonation goes against CBD guidance as mentioned previously. The entire water column needs to be protected to achieve the conservation of biodiversity as a whole.</li> <li>- Management needs to consider other sectoral activities outside of fishing, especially oil and gas. It is questionable whether conservation outcomes can be sustained if challenged by use of the area by another sector, as NAFO and DFO do not have the authority to manage other activities beyond fishing.</li> <li>- There are concerns with the permanence of this measure, as fisheries closures can be overturned in Canadian waters by a variation order from the Minister (although unlikely), and NAFO VME closures are periodically reviewed and can be overturned (as</li> </ul>

	<p>opposed to NEAFC VME closures which are permanent).</p> <p>It would be more appropriate to count this closure under Aichi Target 11 (with the caveats included above) rather than another Aichi Target (6 for example), because while most fisheries closures are put in place for stock management purposes, this closure was implemented to protect benthic biodiversity.</p>
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	<p>This tool could improve its effectiveness if it were to expand the area protected. It has been suggested that the 400 m depth contour would be a more ecologically appropriate boundary for the closure as numerous corals and sea pens are found outside of the 800 m depth contour.</p>

**Network of Areas of Particular Environmental Interest in the Clarion Clipperton Zone in the Pacific, in the International Seabed Area of the Eastern Central Pacific between Mexico and Hawaii (USA) - Kristina Gjerde**

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p><b>Nine so-called “Areas of Particular Environmental Interest”</b> were adopted on a provisional basis in June 2012 by the International Seabed Authority (ISA) as part of an environmental management plan (EMP) for the Clarion Clipperton Zone (ISBA/18/C/22). The primary conservation objective is to maintain regional biodiversity, ecosystem structure and ecosystem function across a poorly studied but richly biodiverse, fragile and slow-to-recover deep seabed in the face of future mineral mining;</p> <p>The plan is to be implemented over an initial three-year period. The details of the size, location and number of required areas of particular environmental interest are subject to being redefined based on improved scientific, technical, environmental baseline and resources assessment data. The primary conservation measure is that no application for contract of work for exploration or exploitation is to be granted for a period of five years or until</p>

	further review by the International Seabed Authority.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Each of the 9 sites is 400 km x 400 km, including a buffer zone of 100km <sup>2</sup> extending in each direction. Thus each site is approximately 160,000 km <sup>2</sup> in size. The total area of the CCZ nodule province is approximately 6000,000 km <sup>2</sup> . The nine APEIs cover 1440,000 km <sup>2</sup> , or approximately 25% of the management area. The CCZ is broadly comparable to the size of Europe, with each APEI being about the size of England.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The areas are located so as to include a wide range of the different habitat types present in the CCZ that are far enough and large enough to be relatively immune to the impacts of mining in the larger region. The areas are defined by geographic Coordinates listed in an Annex to the Council Decision.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	By an international organization consisting of UNCLOS member States --the International Seabed Authority.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes, the 9 APEIs are contained in an Environmental Management Plan for the Clarion Clipperton Zone adopted by the ISA Council in 2012 that applies to existing as well as potential future contractors.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	There is a legal instrument that approves the Environmental Management Plan and its arrangements: Decision of the Council relating to an environmental management plan for the Clarion-Clipperton Zone, ISBA/18/C/22. The actual plan is set out in ISBA/17/LTC/7.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Unclear. The EMP was adopted for an initial three year period, which included the designation, "on a provisional basis, of a network of APEIs. The APEIs are subject to further adjustment based on the results of workshops that have yet

	<p>to be convened, but are planned for either this year or next. The plan itself is subject to periodic review, every two to five years, and is intended to be updated.</p>
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	<p>Unclear, the Decision says they are in place for five years or until further review.</p> <p>The LTC is to keep the APEIs under review and determine their suitability or need for amendment. The Decision does envisage that any decision to amend the areas should be based on the outcomes of expert workshops and new data and information from the contractors, and taking into account the views of recognized experts.</p>
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<p>In order to protect the full range of habitats and biodiversity across the Zone, destructive seafloor activities must be excluded in particular areas distributed across those gradients.</p> <p>The goals of the present Environmental Management Plan include:</p> <p>(a) Facilitate exploitation of seabed mineral resources in an environmentally responsible manner, consistent with the legal framework and environmental guidelines of the International Seabed Authority for managing deep-sea nodule mining and protecting the deep-sea environment;</p> <p>(b) Contribute to the achievement of the management goals and targets set forth in the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, including: halting the loss of biodiversity; establishing ecosystem approaches to management; and developing marine protected areas, in accordance with international law and based on the best scientific information available, including representative networks by 2012;</p> <p>(c) Maintain regional biodiversity, ecosystem structure and ecosystem function across the Clarion-Clipperton Zone;</p>

	<p>(d) Manage the Clarion-Clipperton Zone consistent with the principles of integrated ecosystem-based management;</p> <p>(e) Enable the preservation of representative and unique marine ecosystems;</p> <p>...(j) Avoid overlap between the contractor areas, reserved areas and any areas of particular environmental interest</p>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	<b>An explicit management objective:</b> Maintain regional biodiversity, ecosystem structure and ecosystem function across the Clarion-Clipperton Zone;
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	<p><b>Yes, but only on a provisional basis.</b> The Council decision also specifically retains “flexibility” ie that “Any design of areas of particular environmental interest allows for the ability to modify the location and size of such areas, based on improved information about the location of mining activity, measurement of actual impacts from mining operations, and more biological data”, with an explicit reference to the need to apply the precautionary principle.</p> <p><b>In case of a potential conflict, individual APEIs may be moved under specific conditions:</b> “Any proposal to alter the location or nature of an area of particular environmental interest will require information on any suggested alternative to ensure that the strategic and operational objectives are maintained.”</p>
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	<p><b>No. It does not cover areas of ecological or biological significance (EBSAs)</b></p> <p>“Areas of special significance for their uniqueness, biological diversity or productivity, as well as areas of special importance to the life histories of non-fish species referred to in the criteria of the Convention on Biological Diversity have not been incorporated in the scientific design. The network design principles are based on areas representative of the full range of ecosystems, habitats, communities and species of different biogeographic regions; and having areas of sufficient size to protect and ensure the ecological viability and integrity of the features for which they were selected. <b>This was due to lack of knowledge at the time.</b></p> <p><b>The network does not cover biodiversity in the water column.</b> It is explicitly</p>

	<p>aimed at conservation of the seafloor. The buffer zone around each site is however intended to put the APEIs away from any potential impacts from sediment plumes raised during mining operations and hence will provide incidental protection to the water column.</p> <p><b>It only addresses a single activity:</b> seabed mining, and does not address other potentially harmful activities or impacts from eg fishing, shipping, ocean dumping.</p> <p><b>No.</b> The areas were designed to explicitly avoid overlap with the current distribution of claimant and reserve areas and hence scientific design principles for representative networks could not be fully applied, but needed to adjust to avoid existing claims.</p>
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Yes, the LTC has conducted a preliminary review of the status of the implementation of the Plan, based on an independent assessment. The recommendations were primarily focused on improving research and data availability and data management. Among the recommendations were a further scientific workshop in 2016, and it is unclear if it will take place.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Conservation effectiveness will be difficult to measure until mining begins. In the interim, the Authority, States Parties and contractors are encouraged to support and conduct marine scientific research in these areas to enhance knowledge and understanding of the ecosystem structures and functions. The LTC is encouraged to develop suitable mechanisms for monitoring the achievement of the conservation objectives for the area but it appears this has not been done.
How encompassing is the measure, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	The measure does not envisage active site management, but does encourage scientific research, the supply of available data, and regular reports on the implementation of the plan.

**Ha'ena Community-based Subsistence Fishing Area, Northwestern coast of Kaua'i, Hawaii (USA) - Mimi D'Iorio**



<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	Ha'ena Community-based Subsistence Fishing Area Northwestern coast of Kaua'i, Hawaii, USA
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	Area designated to sustainably support the consumptive needs of the Hā'ena ahupua'a through culturally-rooted community-based management, ensure the sustainability of nearshore ocean resources, particularly in order to preserve and protect this nursery habitat for juvenile reef fishes, and recognize and protect customary and traditional native Hawaiian fishing.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	9 km <sup>2</sup>
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Hā'ena Community-Based Subsistence Fishing Area includes that portion of the northwestern coast of Kaua'i consisting of all State waters and submerged lands bounded by a line drawn along the shoreline; a straight line that extends seaward from the shoreline at the boundary between Hā'ena State Park and Na Pali State Park, as drawn through the points 22°12'42.50"N, 159°35'44.50"W and 22°13'21.62"N, 159°36'22.27"W; a line that follows the contours of the shoreline at a distance of one mile seaward from the shoreline; and a straight line that extends seaward from the shoreline at the boundary between Hā'ena and Wainiha, as drawn through the points 22°13'28.00"N, 159°33'13.50"W and 22°14'19.91"N, 159°33'6.21"W;
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	State government (Hawaii Dept of Aquatic Resources) and community
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	COMMUNITY-BASED SUBSISTENCE FISHING AREA DESIGNATIONS represent an agency-recognized avenue for local community groups to take care of the cean by proposing management measures informed by

	traditional and customary fishing and management practices that were integral to sustaining the health and abundance of marine resources for generations in the Hawaiian Islands. In this way, CBSFA designation represents a collaborative co-management approach to fisheries management that is place-based, community driven, and culturally rooted.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	CBSFAs provide a mechanism for community groups to recommend regulations and carry out management activities to support the State's management of nearshore marine resources (i.e. monitoring, outreach), the DLNR must determine the balance of interests and actions necessary to manage marine resources and protect traditional and customary fishing practices, and is ultimately responsible for designating and adopting and enforcing rules for CBSFAs
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	HAR Chapter 13-60.8 and Site Management Plan <a href="https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/dar/files/2016/08/Haena_CBSFA_Mgmt_Plan_8.2016.pdf">https://dlnr.hawaii.gov/dar/files/2016/08/Haena_CBSFA_Mgmt_Plan_8.2016.pdf</a>
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Unknown
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Assumed long-term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustainably support the consumptive needs of the Hā'ena ahupua'a through culturally-rooted community-based management;</li> <li>• Ensure the sustainability of nearshore ocean resources in the area through effective management practices;</li> <li>• Preserve and protect nursery habitat for juvenile reef fishes;</li> <li>• Recognize and protect customary and traditional native Hawaiian fishing practices that are exercised for subsistence, cultural, and religious</li> </ul>

	<p>purposes in the area; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitate the substantive involvement of the community in resource management decisions for the area.</li> </ul> <p>To achieve these goals, the following management objectives will guide management activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish rules that reflect traditional fishing and management practices.</li> <li>Establish rules to address adverse impacts of tourism and ocean recreation activities on marine resources and associated subsistence practices.</li> <li>Increase the abundance of native fish species, limu kohu, he'e, urchins, lobsters, 'ōpihi and other shellfish.</li> <li>Increase percent coral cover by reducing human use impacts on coral reef resources.</li> </ul>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Explicit but through lenses of community-based subsistence
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Probably not over subsistence, but likely over everything else.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Most elements
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Newly established, so no results of yet. See monitoring measures below.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	To inform the adaptive management of marine resources within the Hā'ena CBSFA, The following indicators will be used to assess the status of marine resources within the Hā'ena CBSFA: 1. Abundance of fish populations by species inside and outside of the makua pu'u honua area. 2. Abundance of limu kohu, urchins, and lobsters. 3. 'Ōpihi abundance within the 'ōpihi restoration area. 4. Percent coral cover. DAR and others will seek funding and technical support to monitor the abundance of fish, shellfish, and coral cover in accordance with DAR

	supported monitoring protocols. Community-based monitoring methods may include: • 'Ōpihi monitoring using the ōpihi rapid assessment method. • Limu monitoring using the "Our Project in Hawaii's Intertidal" (OPIHI) method. • Logs of fish catch, spawning seasons, and lunar cycles. • Water quality monitoring.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Unknown, but... As appropriate, DLNR may provide an independent avenue for resolving conflicts between ocean resource users within CBSFAs to ensure volunteer and public safety, and promote the effective management of public trust resources. This may include holding meetings to foster communication among disputants, facilitate cooperative problem solving, and/or arbitrate solutions to intractable conflicts between ocean users. If needed, legal action may also be taken.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	Not yet known.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	After selecting this site, I realized it is within the Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary, so it would be disqualified under Step 1 of the Screening Tool, but there are other sites similar to this that do not lie within another protected area, so is still valid for discussion.  If this would not a protected area or an OECM, then maybe candidate for T18?
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	This has been a valuable exercise. Even after years of working with the IUCN definition and categories and reviewing sites from so many different management agencies, I still struggle with what should be considered an IUCN protected areas and now similarly an OECM definition.  And as such, even after selecting and reviewing my sample potential OECM site in detail, I am still unsure if this is a potential OECM. Or if it could be considered a protected area! Or neither!

**National Water Reserves Program (Mexico) – Ninel Escobar**

<b>Overview</b>	
<p>Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM</p>	<p>The National Water Reserves Program (NWRP) is an initiative launched by Mexico’s Water Commission (Comisión Nacional del Agua, CONAGUA), the National Commission of Natural Protected Areas (Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas, CONANP) and World Wildlife Fund-Mexico. It aims towards the establishment of a national system of water reserves for the environment, that entails a legal allocation of water for ecological protection under the National Water Law. Water volume is estimated based on ecological flow assessments, and when needed, additional volumes are allocated to protect water rights and downstream ecosystem services.</p> <p>The first stage of the NWRP targeted 189 basins that were selected based on their high biological richness and conservation values, and low water users’ demand. The main benefits of the program are the: i) improvement in the hydrological and ecological connectivity in priority state and federal conservation areas; ii) conservation of wetlands’ hydrological regime; iii) enhancement of resilience conditions against extreme weather events (droughts and floods). In a second stage of the program, Mexico’s Federal Government committed to decree water reserves in 356 river basins by September 2018; near half of the total number of basins in the country..</p> <p>The NWRP is a powerful environmental tool that will fill a big water management gap in Mexico’s conservation strategies. Therefore, it should be considered as OECM, because of its effectiveness, conservation objectives and scope.</p> <p><b>Effectiveness:</b> At the time a water reserve is established, riparian corridors are inevitably protected by securing ecological functions, the provision of</p>

	<p>ecosystem services and preventing impacts derived from human activities and/or irregular settlements. Migratory routes, connectivity with upland areas, energy transport and genetic resources are also safeguarded. In terms of water resources management, the NWRP is effective because it secures water for the environment by locking water allocations for any other use. The last in addition to the creation of synergies with natural protected areas.</p> <p>From the legal perspective, the NWRP is officially gazetted by Mexico's federal government through the National Water Program 2014-2018, the National Environmental Program 2013-2018, and the Special Climate Change Program (2012-2018).</p> <p><b>Area-Based:</b> Water reserves decrees protect the natural hydrological regime of a river. They protect a water volume running on river beds, a geographical area defined by law as a federal zone and that is managed by the federal government. Federal zones coincide with riparian corridors, floodplains, deltas, coastal lagoons, and other freshwater ecosystems, and provide natural connectivity along bioregions.</p> <p><b>Conservation:</b> The NWRP targets the conservation of freshwater ecosystems in selected basins with high biodiversity value. During the first stage (i.e. 189 river basins), the NWRP will strength the protection of existing 97 Natural Protected Areas and 55 Ramsar sites.</p> <p><b>Other:</b> In addition to biodiversity conservation, water reserves benefit indigenous communities because they safeguard water availability, securing the provision of cultural ecosystem services.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Based on estimations made by the NWRP, riparian corridors in potential water reserves cover around 2.6 million hectares.

How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Federal zones, are defined by the National Water Law as: “The inundated area that occurs with an ordinary maximum water level of a 5-year return period storm, plus 10 meters wide bands adjacent to both sides of river beds.” This is delimitation is considered as a baseline for the establishment of water reserves.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area’s governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	Water reserves are established through a presidential decree after following a participatory process. CONAGUA is responsible of: 1) estimate water volumes; 2) inform River Basins Councils in a public consultation process, and 3) ensure compliance of the program.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	River Basins Councils are integrated by water users’ representatives as well as national, regional and local government institutions, private sector, academics, NGOs and invited experts. Water reserves are recognized by river basins councils.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area’s governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Water reserves are included in the management plan of natural protected areas, to ensure their permanence and the establishment of direct links between land use and water management for conservation. . Area-based protection follows a tier approach, starting with the legal definition of the federal zone, followed by the protected runoff established by the NWRP and at the top, the option of including additional land protection in the form of a specific decree of federal zone with detail uses and coordinates. Federal zones can be licensed to local governments or legal organizations for specific purposes. In some cases, it could be needed to further develop a more detailed regulatory framework to specify water management rules. This for example, in the presence of activities such as hydropower operation).
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Presidential decrees can be removed only by the president. Federal Protected Areas in Mexico are also established by presidential decrees. A water reserve decree is the highest level of protection for a water volume.

Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	A water reserve decree comes into effect the day after it is released and it is effective for 50 years.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	It is a permanent measure while the decree is in effect (50 years)
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The Mexican Norm of Environmental Flows assigns an environmental objective to each water reserve including the federal zone (riparian corridors and flooded habitats). According to the norm, "Objective A" receives the highest level of protection whereas "Objective D" is the lowest one. These objectives designate a specific hydrological regime to protect biological values, such as riparian vegetation, fish and macroinvertebrate populations, migratory processes within others.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	It is explicitly because the technical justification of the water reserve, considers the presence of species of national and/or international relevance as well as habitat integrity.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The NWRP was designed to reinforce current national conservation strategies by making land and water management to coincide on a common environmental objective. Currently, there is a lack of overlapping between land and water management.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	It shows a strong coverage on freshwater ecosystems. It also supports ecological processes of related ecosystems such as forest, mangrove, or even coral reefs.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness is measured by the limitations on water usage and the presence of specific activities such as agricultural fields, hydraulic infrastructure projects, and industrial operations. Currently, due to a water reserve decree a hydropower dam authorization was rejected.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	As a part of the program, a monitoring system has been developed based on ecological justification of the water reserves in terms of species and habitat.



	Currently, the NWPR is on an early stage to show results.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	Water reserves is quite encompassing since it limits all economic activities in a river basin.

### Areas Voluntarily Destined for Conservation (Mexico) – Andrew Rhodes

Overview	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	Certification is a tool that helps owners to the establishment, administration and management of their private protected natural areas. It is a unilateral process by the applicant, CONANP participates as a notary of the will to preserve their land and policies, criteria and actions that the applicant intends to make to achieve their ends. This process is ideal for society in the conservation of forests, jungles, swamps, deserts and the wildlife that inhabits them.
2. Boundaries & Geographical Space	
What size is the area?	By 2016 there is total of 404,238.46 ha in AVDCs
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Depends on the scope of environmental services, and the preservation of representative natural environments of different geographical regions and ecological and most fragile ecosystems. Nowadays, there are 370 AVDC in 20 states.
3. Governance Type	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	These properties are considered as productive areas dedicated to a public interest function, but there are several categories: Public, Private, Public-Centralized, Public-Parastatal, and Social-Communal land.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes. Ca. 78,675 people participate in the ecosystems restoration, including indigenous and local communities.
4. Permanence	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other	<b>General Law of Ecological Balance and Environmental Protection</b> ( <a href="http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/148_130516.pdf">http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/148_130516.pdf</a> )

factors (below)	
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Non easy due to the several regulations that are related to the agreement.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve representative natural environments.</li> <li>• Safeguard the genetic diversity of wild species.</li> <li>• Ensure the preservation and sustainable use of ecosystems.</li> <li>• Provide an enabling environment for scientific research field.</li> <li>• Generate, rescue and disseminate knowledge, practices and technologies, traditional or new.</li> <li>• Protect villages, roads, industrial facilities and agricultural exploitations.</li> <li>• Protect natural environment areas, monuments and archaeological, historical remains and artistic and tourist areas</li> </ul>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Yes
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Yes, the National Council of Protected Areas is an organization of consultation and support of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and the National Commission for Protected Areas in the <b>formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public policy for the establishment, management and monitoring federal Protected Natural Areas (PNA).</b>
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation	Yes. Each AVDC works within a framework or management plan which guides

effectiveness measured?	the actions and assessments focused on biodiversity conservation.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	Not available.

### Fishing Refuge Areas: Akumal, Quintana Roo (Mexico) – Andrew Rhodes

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	In 2015 an agreement establishing a fishing refuge area in marine waters under federal jurisdiction was issued for the conservation of several species. Fishing Refuge: Defined areas in waters under federal jurisdiction, with the primary purpose of conserving and contribute, naturally or artificially, to the development of fisheries resources on the occasion of reproduction, growth or recruitment, and to preserve and protect the surrounding environment.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Could extend to more than 9.88 km <sup>2</sup>
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Along the coast of the Riviera Maya, in the municipality of Tulum in the state of Quintana Roo, it is located Akumal, which comprises the Akumal Bay South, Akumal Bay North, Jade Bay and Caracoles Bay, with depths less than 5 meters that constitute reef lagoons, since they are lined with barrier reefs and seagrass beds.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	National Fisheries Commission (CONAPESCA, by its acronym in Spanish) and the National Fisheries Institute (INAPESCA, by its acronym in Spanish).
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Agreement establishing a fishing refuge area in marine waters under federal jurisdiction, located in the area of Akumal in Quintana (2015) ( <a href="http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5388585&amp;fecha=13/04/2015">http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5388585&amp;fecha=13/04/2015</a> )

How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Non easy due to the several regulations that are related to the agreement.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	<b>Long-term:</b> It has been considered a period of <b>six years</b> as the minimum time to be able to assess the growth of fish stocks and other resources that inhabit the areas established.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	<b>Temporary partial fishing refuge:</b> It can only be carried out sports and recreational activities, as well as commercial fishing or domestic consumption of one or more species of aquatic flora and fauna, for a defined period of time and only by using highly selective specific fishing methods.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The recovery of biomass levels of commercial exploitation species regulated by the General Law on Sustainable Fisheries and Aquaculture
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Yes, natural resources that constitute the flora and fauna whose total, partial or temporary life is water. Exceptions: Commercial fishing and domestic consumption of <i>Pterois volitans</i> is allowed.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Yes. To date, there is no information available of results.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Not available
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	Not available

### Forest Management (Mexico) – Andrew Rhodes

Overview	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons	Consists on the sustainable use of resources of forests, jungles and arid

for considering the area as an OECM	vegetation, providing financial support to forest owners to hire the necessary technical assistance to develop studies that allow them to obtain authorizations for use of timber and non-timber resources
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	1,708,000 ha
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	It is important to incorporate new forest producers to low planned, legal and sustainable management.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>National Strategy for Sustainable Forest Management for Increasing Production and Productivity 2013-2018:</b> Aims to meet the goals of increased timber production established in the National Development Program, and the number of jobs in the sector, access to credit, the number of hectares under management planned and the number of hectares with some sort of certification.</li> </ul>
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Non easy due to the several regulations that are related.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	Economic resources are granted to people performing harvesting (timber, non-timber and wildlife) to carry out practices that allow the establishment of natural regeneration and recovery of the populations in those areas subject to use and also to improve road infrastructure and modernize equipment used in the process of obtaining raw materials.

Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Covers forest elements of the area.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Yes.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Yes, based on the assessment of the implementation of the National Strategy for Sustainable Forest Management.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	Information not available.

### Program of Payment for Environmental Services (Mexico) – Andrew Rhodes

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	The Payment for Environmental Services was designed to provide economic incentives to forest land owners (communities and small owners) to support conservation practices and avoid use change (deforestation) of forests. It aims to build capacity to develop markets for environmental services in Mexico.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	More than 2 million ha
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Defined by properties that maintain forest cover in good condition, including those with a legally authorized forest management and use.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	In the country, the National Forestry Commission (CONAFOR, by its acronym in Spanish) is the responsible for the operation and forest policy, as well for the productive activities, conservation and restoration of forests, jungles and

	vegetation in arid and semi-arid regions.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes. It has benefited 4,893 communities.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>National Forestry Program:</b> aims to improve the quality of life of owners and owners of forest land, and contribute to the conservation of ecosystems. (<a href="file:///D:/Downloads/Reglas%20de%20Operaci%C3%B3n%20PRONA%202015%20(1).pdf">file:///D:/Downloads/Reglas%20de%20Operaci%C3%B3n%20PRONA%202015%20(1).pdf</a>)</li> <li>• <b>Biodiversity Endowment Fund:</b> Instrument for financing <b>long-term</b> conservation of forest ecosystems whose biodiversity is considered of global importance, through payment schemes for environmental services.</li> <li>• <b>Concurrent Fund Scheme:</b> Promote the concurrence of funds for the expansion of the program "Payment for Environmental Services".</li> </ul>
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Non easy due to the several regulations that are related to the Program.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	Increase and preserve biodiversity, and protect forest ecosystems and globally significant mountains, through improved targeting current programs, and the establishment of an Endowment Fund to provide long-term financing for the payment of environmental services.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Yes

Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Yes. Some of Opportunities are: There are areas of land with agro-ecological conditions suitable for the development of highly productive Commercial Forest Plantations; The program is part of a comprehensive forestry development policy with clear and achievable objectives, and with a continuous assessment which translates into greater efficiency in their business processes.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Yes, the actions have allowed the permanence of 98.8% of the forest area of the country within five years (2005-2010). Several assessments have been made in joint work between the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, the National Forestry Commission and the National Council of Policy Development Assessment.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	CONAFOR is currently carrying out the work needed to measure the forest area of Mexico by 2015, so that 99% of permanence of the country's forest area is estimated. Also, the 1.37% of the susceptible forest area restoration supported by actions of conservation and restoration of soil and/or reforestation representing a compliance rate of 86.7% compared to the annual target set and a stay of 98.3% of registered surface supported by PES for the period 2009-2012 with a fulfillment of 99.3% compared to the target.

**Units for the Conservation, Management and Sustainable Use of Wildlife (Mexico) – Andrew Rhodes**

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<b>The Units for the Conservation, Management and Sustainable Use of Wildlife</b> aim to promote spaces compatible with the conservation of wildlife alternative production schemes, and are integrated into a National System.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Information not available



How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Conduct activities of conservation and sustainable use of specimens of wildlife developed under natural conditions without imposing restrictions on their movements, or conditions of captivity or confinement.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regulation to the General Law of Ecological Balance and Environmental Protection</b></li> <li>• <b>Management Plan:</b> They describe and program management activities.</li> </ul>
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Non easy due to the several regulations that are related.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	Promote alternative production schemes compatible with care for the environment through rational use, orderly and planned use of natural resources, renewable content in them, and slow or reverse environmental degradation processes.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Yes

Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Yes, through Assessments Projects. Some of the assessments concluded that there is a need for consistent Management Plans; the need for more biological monitoring; management focused on a few species and essentially based on economic incentives.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Yes. Through the Assessments of Management Plans.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	Information not available.

#### **Private Protected Areas Certification (Mexico), WCPA Private Protected Areas Specialist Group**

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	Certification is a tool that helps owners to the establishment, administration and management of their private protected natural areas. It is a unilateral process by the applicant, CONANP participates as a notary of the will to preserve their land and policies, criteria and actions that the applicant intends to make to achieve their ends. This process is ideal for society in the conservation of forests, jungles, swamps, deserts and the wildlife that inhabits them.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	By 2016 there is total of 404,238.46 ha in AVDCs
How are the area and its boundaries defined?	THE AREA AND ITS BOUNDARIES ARE DEFINED IN A PRECISE MANNER IN THE CERTIFICATE Depends on the scope of environmental services, and the preservation of representative natural environments of different geographical regions and ecological and most fragile ecosystems. Nowadays, there are 370 AVDC in 20 states.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	

Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	These properties are considered as productive areas dedicated to a public interest function, but there are several categories: Public, Private, Public-Centralized, Public-Parastatal, and Social-Communal land. ADVCS BECOME PRIVATELY MANAGED FEDERAL PROTECTED AREAS WHEN CERTIFIED
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes. Ca. 78,675 people participate in the ecosystems restoration, including indigenous and local communities.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	<b>General Law of Ecological Balance and Environmental Protection</b> ( <a href="http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/148_130516.pdf">http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/148_130516.pdf</a> )
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Non easy due to the several regulations that are related to the agreement. THE CERTIFICATION INSTRUMENT CAN BE OVERTURNED UNILATERALLY BY THE OWNWER AT ANY TIME SINCE IT IS 100% VOLUNTARY.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term. ADVCS CAN BE CERTIFIED FOR A MINIMUM OF 15 YEARS, TO A MAXIMUM OF 99 YEARS, ALTHOUGH SOME OF THEM WERE CERTIFIED FOR PERPETUITY AT THE EARLY STAGES OF THE PROGRAM. THIS CREATES A PROBLEM WITH WHAT IS STATED IN THE FUTURE OF PPAs, WHERE 25 YEARS IS INTERPRETED AS PERMANENT, WHICH MAY RESULT IN THAT THOSE BELOW 25 YEAR LIMIT BECOME OECS AND THOSE ABOVE THAT LIMIT PPAs AND ICCAs, NEVERTHELESS SINCE ADVCS AUTOMATICALLY BECOME FEDERAL PROTECTED AREAS WHEN CERTIFIED, THEY ARE REPORTED TO THE WCMC AS SUCH.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Preserve representative natural environments.</li> <li>· Safeguard the genetic diversity of wild species.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Ensure the preservation and sustainable use of ecosystems.</li> <li>· Provide an enabling environment for scientific research field.</li> <li>· Generate, rescue and disseminate knowledge, practices and technologies, traditional or new.</li> <li>· Protect villages, roads, industrial facilities and agricultural exploitations.</li> <li>· Protect natural environment areas, monuments and archaeological, historical remains and artistic and tourist areas</li> </ul>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Yes
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	<p>NOT REALLY DUE TO CAPACITY PROBLEMS</p> <p>Yes, the National Council of Protected Areas is an organization of consultation and support of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and the National Commission for Protected Areas in the <b>formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of public policy for the establishment, management and monitoring federal Protected Natural Areas (PNA).</b></p>
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Yes. Each AVDC works within a framework or management plan which guides the actions and assessments focused on biodiversity conservation.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	Not available.

**Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization Vulnerable Marine Ecosystem, Northwest Atlantic, NAFO Regulatory Area (outside 200 mile limit) - Kristina Gjerde**

**Overview**

Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	NAFO has closed 20 areas to bottom fishing over the past 12 years, with a particular focus on corals, sponges and sea pen concentrations identified following the UNGA Resolution 61/105. While initially “closed” to fishing in 2004, seamount areas were fully closed to all bottom fishing in 2015. Closures are all for vulnerable marine ecosystem elements or indicator species and are only closed to bottom fishing and not to any other activity.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	(NAFO to confirm total area) VME areas ~ 25,000 km <sup>2</sup> , need km <sup>2</sup> for seamounts)
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	See map included below. Areas are defined in two ways – VME closures and seamount closures and included in the NAFO Conservation and Enforcement Measures with specific coordinates as well as a defined map.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area’s governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	NAFO is the governance body for straddling stock fisheries and all bottom fishing activities are restricted within the closed areas, however the most significant impact on closed areas remains ongoing scientific trawl surveys that continue within the closed areas, despite calls for a review of the impact of these surveys and evidence that significant catches of VMEs occur on an annual basis within the closed areas. The area also overlaps with the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT), as well as Canada’s extended continental shelf where governance of oil and gas resources is by the Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board (CNOBP), International Maritime Organization governs shipping activity and shipping lanes in the area and there are no restrictions within the closed areas.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Currently, there is no mechanism to ensure that the closures are protected from other human impacts, except for bottom fishing under NAFO’s jurisdiction. This is problematic, as there is exploration, seismic testing and drilling for oil and gas within at least one closed area as of 2016. ICCAT does not restrict fisheries for highly migratory species within the closed areas.

<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	UNGA 61/105 Sustainable Fisheries Resolution, non-binding soft law triggered the closure decisions, NAFO's Conservation and Enforcement Measures include the closures as part of NAFO's fisheries regulation.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Closures could be opened with the agreement of 2/3rds of NAFO's Contracting Parties.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Generally, the closures are viewed as long term however there are some Contracting Parties who refused to agree to new closures and do not consider the closures necessarily permanent.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	NAFO manages straddling stocks, however under UNGA 61/105 para 83 they are required to avoid impacts of bottom trawling on VMEs.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Implicit in VME indicators and elements as identified.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	VME protection
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Only benthic VME species. Closures are specific to corals, sponges and seapens and seamount species, however these areas likely benefit demersal fish species as well.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Incursions and fishing vessel traffic within the closed areas is monitored via VMS and reported upon via annual compliance reports. To date, there has been little evidence of fishing within the VMEs closed areas, with the exception of one seamount area where midwater trawling continues for alphonsino.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	The VME closures provide considerable protection for some VME species (corals, sponges, seapens) and associated benthic fauna as well as associated

	<p>demersal marine fish species. Effectiveness is measured through the Annual NAFO Compliance Review where fishing vessel activity is monitored via VMS. Tracks through the closed areas are assessed for vessel speed to determine if fishing activity might be taking place.</p>
<p>How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet</p>	<p>The measure only restricts bottom activities, current effectiveness is due to agreement by Contracting Parties that their flagged vessels abide by NAFOs' CEM. The areas used to be open to fishing activity and are now closed. There are no restrictions on other activities and oil and gas activity is occurring nearby and within some VME areas. Non-bottom fishing is allowed. There is no mechanism to close these areas to oil and gas drilling or exploration within NAFO and no governance mechanism to engage with the Canada-Newfoundland Offshore Petroleum Board on shared protections.</p>

2.

# SOUTH AMERICA



## Forest Code (Brazil) - Allison Pritchard

1. Overview	
Name and location of the area	Areas of Permanent Protection and Legal Reserve on private land under the Forest Code in Brazil.
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p><b>AREA OF PERMANENT PROTECTION (APP)</b>            APPs are Brazil's primary mechanism for achieving REDD+ objectives. They are areas that are physically and ecologically fragile, covered by native vegetation or not, with the environmental function to preserve water resources, landscapes, geological stability and biodiversity, facilitate genetic flows of fauna and flora, protect the soil, and ensure human wellbeing. Examples of APPs are as riparian areas, springs, hilltops, mountain slopes, and mangroves.</p> <p><b>LEGAL RESERVE (LR)</b>            LR is the portion of land that must be set aside in native vegetation, depending on property size and location. Legal Reserve can help to ensure sustainable economic use of natural resources, support conservation and provision of ecological processes, and promote conservation of native fauna and flora. The size of a Legal Reserve depends on where the property is located.</p>
2. Boundaries & Geographical Space	
What size is the area?	Dependent on property size (see below).
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	<p><b>AREA OF PERMANENT PROTECTION:</b>            Watercourses            Riparian strips alongside any perennial and seasonal watercourse must maintain the following minimum widths from the edge of the channel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 meters for watercourses that are less than 10 meters wide</li> <li>• 50 meters for watercourses that are 10 to 50 meters wide</li> <li>• 100 meters for watercourses that are 50 to 200 meters wide</li> <li>• 200 meters for watercourses that are 200 to 600 meters wide</li> <li>• 500 meters for watercourses that are greater than 600 meters wide</li> </ul> <p>Reservoirs</p>

	<p>Areas surrounding lakes and natural reservoirs must maintain a strip of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 meters, except for water bodies with less than 20 hectares of surface area, which must maintain a strip of 50 meters</li> <li>• 30 meters in urban areas where there are manmade lakes or reservoirs</li> </ul> <p>Areas in the vicinity of perennial springs, regardless of topographical situation, must maintain a strip of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum radius of 50 meters</li> </ul> <p>Plateaus, hilltops, mountains, ridges, mangroves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Areas with a slope of at least 45 degrees or higher must maintain native habitat</li> <li>• Areas with salt marshes, dunes, or mangroves must maintain native habitat</li> <li>• Areas up to the edge of plateaus must be maintained at not less than 100 meters from a horizontal projection</li> <li>• Areas on hilltops, mountains, and ridges with a minimum height of 100 meters and an average slope greater than 25 degrees must maintain native habitat</li> <li>• All areas with an altitude exceeding 1,800 meters must maintain native habitat</li> <li>• Areas along swamps and wetlands measured horizontally from the edge of the flooded area must maintain a minimum width of 50 meters</li> </ul> <p><b>LEGAL RESERVE</b></p> <p>The size of a Legal Reserve requirement depends on where the property is located.</p> <p>Percent of land cover the must be set aside in the Legal Amazon by land use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forest: Legal Reserve 80% and Productive Use 20%</li> <li>• Cerrado: Legal Reserve 35% and Productive Use 65%</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grasslands: Legal Reserve 20% and Productive Use 80%</li> </ul> <p>For the rest of Brazil (i.e. outside the Legal Amazon): Legal Reserve 20% and Productive Use 80%</p> <p>It should be noted that nothing in the legislation specifies a location or boundary – landowners are only required to meet the proportional area requirement. This also means that land owners can “move” that area over time. In cases where this happens, these areas will not meet the OECM guidance.</p> <p>All land in APPs and LRs are registered in The Rural Environmental Registry (CAR, the acronym in Portuguese) which will provide provides high resolution satellite images of all APPs and LRs.</p>
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area’s governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Governments set out overarching rules and regulations. Private land owners contribute to governance within their private property.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	While the Forest Code is federal legislation, its implementation depends on the states’ legislation, which may vary significantly. States have flexibility to address their priorities and address regional differences as they create their own rules and mechanisms.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	<p><b>AREA OF PERMANENT PROTECTION</b></p> <p>Owners of APPs that have been converted may not use compensation to become compliant and, instead, must restore the APP. Reforestation must be completed within 20 years, with at least 10% of the total area rehabilitated every two years.</p> <p><b>LEGAL RESERVE</b></p> <p>When deciding the location of Legal Reserve in rural properties, the following criteria must be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Connectivity and the creation of ecological corridors with other Legal Reserves, APPs, Conservation Units, or any other legally protected</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>areas;</li> <li>• The areas of greatest importance for biodiversity conservation;</li> <li>• The areas of greatest environmental fragility;</li> <li>• The watershed plan; and</li> <li>• Ecological-Economic Zoning (ZEE)</li> </ul> <p>It is unknown what mechanisms are in place to ensure that the above criteria are met and considered.</p> <p>Medium and large landowners and who deforested more than what was allowed before July 22, 2008, are obligated to take action. They must either restore their Legal Reserves on the property itself or via an “offset” through a compensation process in areas of equivalent size in the same biome. Compensation options include: a) the Environmental Reserve Quota; b) a direct lease from another property owner; or c) a land purchase for or donation to the state or federal government of a private area within a Conservation Unit.</p> <p>The new Forest Code establishes that compensation of Legal Reserves outside the state in which the property is located should be in priority areas identified by the federal or state governments. The new Forest Code provides the following definition for selection of priority areas for Legal Reserve compensation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Recovery of watershed basins which have been excessively degraded;</li> <li>b. Creation of ecological corridors;</li> <li>c. Conservation of large protected areas; and</li> <li>d. Conservation or recovery of threatened ecosystems or species.</li> </ul> <p>It should be noted that, in reality, it is largely state dependent whether or not compensation areas are located in priority areas – some states mandate that compensation areas must be in priority areas whereas this is not true for other states. Private initiatives have sprung up to support compliance in the form of</p>
--	---

	international certification standards, commodity roundtables, and boycotts of products produced on newly deforested land.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Private property rights apply to the area's governance.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Not easily as APPs and LRs are legally binding protection instruments for conservation on private lands. If land owners do not comply with the laws set out by the Forest Code they will incur fines and penalties. When unauthorized removal of vegetation has occurred on APPs, the landowner will be fined and obligated to restore it
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<b>Areas of Permanent Protection</b> The objective of APPs are to preserve areas that are physically and ecologically fragile.  <b>Legal Reserves</b> The of objective of LRs are to ensure sustainable economic use of natural resources, support conservation and provision of ecological processes, and promote conservation of native fauna and flora.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Biodiversity is an explicit management objective; however, other than selecting the location of LR, management actions do not have explicit biodiversity goals (for example, there is no way to ensure that poaching does not take place).
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Unclear. The framework largely covers vegetation cover, but does not address other conservation issues such as human-wildlife conflicts. There is no

	legislation preventing the land owner from prioritizing non-conservation objectives that don't interfere with vegetation cover.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The measure covers habitat; however, there are no regulations on how to manage the set aside areas for biodiversity.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	<p>The Rural Environmental Registry (CAR, the acronym in Portuguese) is a mandatory national public environmental registry for the integration of environmental information of all rural properties. Registration in the CAR are done through the Rural Environmental Registry System (SICAR) which is part of the National Environmental Information System (SINIMA), managed by the Ministry of Environment.</p> <p>The CAR is used to control, monitor and combat the destruction of forests and other forms of native vegetation in the country and to facilitate environmental and economic planning for rural properties. Data provided by the CAR will help to identify deficits with respect to the areas legally required to be conserved, monitor areas under restoration and, in general, contribute to the environmental management capacity of the country.</p> <p>The goal of the CAR is to provide an integrated database with information about each property and their environmental situation that allows municipalities, states, and the federal government to control, monitor and identify environmental deficits, conduct environmental and economic planning, and combat deforestation. The CAR will help landowners and possessors to protect natural resources and improve the planning of their production.</p> <p>The CAR system is a national electronic system operated by the Ministry of Environment that provides high resolution satellite images that landowners can use to locate and register their property.</p>

	The CAR system only monitors forest cover to ensure that areas are being set aside, but does not give detailed insight into the state of biodiversity.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	Yes the area is conserving biodiversity even though the main concern is forest cover. There is no on the ground monitoring of conservation effectiveness or biodiversity.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	<p>Yes – in legal reserves land collection of timber and non-timber forest products is still permitted as long as it does not jeopardize the conservation. Sustainable management of the vegetation in Legal Reserve areas may be implemented in one of two ways:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sustainable management for non-commercial purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Must be for consumption within the property itself;</li> <li>• May be implemented independently of authorization by responsible agencies;</li> <li>• Must be declared to the environmental agency prior to activity and state the reason and the volumes to be extracted, up to 20 cubic meters of timber per year.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Sustainable management for commercial purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires a sustainable forestry management plan and authorization from responsible agencies;</li> <li>• Should guarantee conservation of a diversity of species;</li> <li>• Should not disfigure the plant cover or harm conservation of native vegetation in the area; and</li> <li>• May involve the introduction of exotic species when the Legal Reserves are under restoration, if plantings are interspersed with native species and do not exceed 50% of the area.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	The effectiveness is due to the area's governance and management.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	

<p>In relation to the draft guidance (<b>Section 3</b>) and the draft screening tool (<b>Section 4</b>), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?</p>	<p>These areas could qualify as OECMs; however, not all land owners are compliant, so not all APPs and LRs will qualify as an OECM – a method of determining good management of APPs and LRs to classify them as OECMs is needed. Overall, APPs are more likely to be OECMs than LRs.</p>
<p>Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.</p>	<p>For more information on the Forest Code can be accessed from:  <a href="https://c402277.ssl.cf1.rackcdn.com/publications/859/files/original/wwf_brazils_new_forest_code_guide.pdf?1455912714">https://c402277.ssl.cf1.rackcdn.com/publications/859/files/original/wwf_brazils_new_forest_code_guide.pdf?1455912714</a>   <a href="https://climatepolicyinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Policy-Brief-Part-I-How-to-Navigate-the-Complexity.pdf">https://climatepolicyinitiative.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Policy-Brief-Part-I-How-to-Navigate-the-Complexity.pdf</a></p>

**Bitá, Protected River, Colombian Orinoco Basin (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute**

Overview	
<p>Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM</p>	<p>The Bitá river belongs to the Colombian portion of the Orinoco Basin and has a total length of 500km. Without hydrological connection with the Andean region, it is a black water river, rich in hydro biological resources but highly sensitive to changes to water conditions. Sparsely inhabited and isolated from the rest of the country, the region remains in a good general conservation condition. Main features of the basin are tropical savannas, grasslands, temporary wetlands and riparian forests, result of the extreme seasonal climatic regime and river pulse. Species present in the region include Botos or Orinoco River Dolphins (<i>Inia geoffrensis humboldtiana</i>), Giant Otters (<i>Pteronoura brasiliensis</i>) West Indian Manatee (<i>Trichechus manatus</i>), Capybara (<i>Hydrochaeris hydrochaeris</i>), Tapir (<i>Tapirus terrestris</i>) and Jaguar (<i>Panthera onca</i>). Fish: Brycon (<i>Brycon melanopterus</i>), bocachico (<i>Prochilodus mariae</i>), piranha (<i>Serrasalmus manuelei</i>), Black arowana (<i>Osteoglossum bicirrhosum</i>) and Black Spot piranha (<i>Pigocentrus cariba</i>). Reptiles: Orinoco Crocodile (<i>Crocodylus intermedius</i>), Spectacled Caiman (<i>Caiman crocodilus</i>), Cuvier's Dwarf Caiman and Smooth-fronted Caiman (<i>Paleosuchus palpebrosus</i>)</p>



	<p><i>and Paleosuchus trigonatus</i>), Arrau River Turtle (<i>Podocnemis expansa</i>) and Yellow-spotted Amazon River Turtle (<i>Podocnemis unifilis</i>) while it boasts almost 200 species of plants belonging to 114 genera and 41 families. The region, originally inhabited by indigenous peoples (mainly sikuani, amorúa, Piaroa and piapoco) was destination for immigration waves from the countries' inland during the XIX and XX centuries, main economic activities included cattle ranching, farming and fisheries (including ornamental). Nevertheless, during the last 10 to 15 years, the region has been scenario of a fast transformation process, driven mainly by the development of large scale forestry and agribusiness projects, accompanied land acquisition processes. This transformation, even if an opportunity in terms of economic development, poses a risk to biodiversity, hydrological cycles and the socio cultural tissue. In this setting, the proposed management strategy, Protected River; based in the Ecological Integrity approach, aims to preserve the continuity of the riverine system as a whole and focuses in the maintenance of the ecological flow, from an initial observed state or benchmark.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Around 8500 sq km.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The boundaries have been defined exclusively after hydrological aspects, including only the watershed area, after the National Geographic Service. Nevertheless, it can be reviewed as a result of the assessment of biotic and socio economic connections and dynamics.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	There are not yet any specific official or unofficial governance arrangements on place, one of the main weaknesses and threats of an area facing a rapid transformation process
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	There is not an agreement about this issue yet, perceptions are fragmented.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's	Need to be developed. One of the main outcomes of the current stage is to

governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	promote the development of the necessary institutional framework.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	As there is not yet a formal instrument, but it is process in construction, there is not yet any decision to overturn. As a management strategy largely based on voluntary agreements, those are as strong as the will of each member. We are still in a vulnerable stage as the social tissue has not been fully developed, but this strengthening is also one of the main goals of the proposal.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	the Protected River initiative seeks to establish bases for a process of integrated management of the basin based on socioeconomic knowledge of the landscape, information management, and the creation of scenarios for participation, learning, communication and governance.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Biodiversity conservation is an explicit management objective
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	No. It aims to allow a prudent and agreed-on transformation process within boundaries identified as "safe".
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	A set of Ecological Integrity indicators has been identified, including biodiversity and landscape metrics, as a proxy to measure and monitor Ecological Integrity
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	The process is still in an initial phase (baseline, indicator setting, development of the firsts conservation agreements, and communication strategy) and there is not yet enough data available to measure effectiveness.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Biodiversity is less still in good condition in the area, mainly as a result of a stating transformation process; less than 10 % of the basin, but the goal is to avoid degradation before it reaches an irreversible threshold. Currently it is measured through the number of stakeholders (organizations or individuals)

	willing to join the initiative
How encompassing this measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	It is a straightforward measure easily collected, but it does not yet include all the actors, and damaging activities have not been completely targeted.

### Special Management Area of Afro Colombian Communities of the upstream of the Amurrupe River, Risaralda (Colombia) – Humboldt Institute

Overview	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p>This is a special management area located on a collective territory of afro Colombian communities, at the north west of the Risaralda department, which is part of the Choco Biogeographic Region. Approximately 80% of the area is cover by native tropical rainforest, 10% is cover with secondary forest and the remaining area is used for crops. The territory is inhabited mainly by indigenous people from the Embera Chami ethnic group and afro Colombians.</p> <p>The Choco Biogeographic region is recognized as one of the most biologically and culturally diverse, in part because is in between the Andean and the Amazon regions. It has more than 11.000 vascular plants and 900 species of birds. In the area of the Amurrupe River, there are 80 species of bryophytes, 1.900 species of vascular plants, from which 330 species are orchids. The communities recognize at least 43 plants with medical uses. Regarding the fauna some studies suggest that in the area could inhabit about 500 species of birds and 83 mammals. For other groups information is still missing.</p> <p>The area is manly use to establish agroforestral systems and timber extraction that is the main economic activity of the communities. At least 19 tree species are used for timber.</p> <p>The area could be consider as an OECM, because it has a legal background, a community that supports it maintenance, it has clear conservation objectives,</p>

	has a clearly defined limits and a management plan. The area is not consider a protected area, but is recognized as a special managed area.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	10.823 hectares
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The area include the upstream of the Amurrapá River, its limit are established in a map contained in an agreement of the regional environmental authority.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	The area is managed by a community council supported by the regional environmental authority.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	The community proposed the creation of the area to the environmental authority, so they recognized the protected status, and agree with the conservation objectives.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	There is an agreement of the regional environmental authority that creates the area.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	The decision cannot easily be overturned. There will be necessary to sign a new agreement with the communities and other stakeholders of the region.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	The agreement that creates this areas was sign in 1999, so the expected time frame is for a long term.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	The measure is in place year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve and recover the biological diversity, habitats and ecosystems present in the area.</li> <li>• Promote the participation of the afro Colombian community on the management of the area.</li> <li>• Preserve the traditional knowledge of the community that inhabit the area.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support a sustainable economic growth of the community.</li> </ul>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Biodiversity is an explicit objective.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The agreement does not give more importance to any of the objectives.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	It cover all the biodiversity, but with an emphasis on species used for timber.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	The area has a management plan, which progress is measure sporadically, in particular the regional authority has identify the principal difficulties to it implementation. The main problems are how to really work in cooperation with the community and taking into account all their necessities.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	The tropical rain forest of the area is well conserved, but there are not periodical measures of the state of the forest and the management plan do not set effectiveness indicators.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	To answer this question more research has to be done, the regional authority and the community council believes that the area is effective, but there are other aspects that may influence the state of, such as the difficulty for access and presence of armed groups. Nowadays the whole Choco biogeographic region phases threats caused by illegal deforestation and mining.

**Jaba Tañiwashkaka de la Linea Negra, Sierra Nevada of Santa Marta (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area - Nombre y ubicación del área	Sacred site – Jaba Tañiwashkaka de la Linea Negra, Sierra Nevada of Santa Marta. Department of La Guajira; municipality of Dibulla, Puntica region, located by the Jerez river mouth across the Caribbean beaches.
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons	Linea Negra sacred site cultural value; this site contains working materials such

for considering the area as an OECEM - Breve descripción, incluidos los valores naturales, culturales y sociales, y razones para considerar el área como un OECEM	as shells and seeds. It connects the lagoon that serves as the Jerez River source, it has coastal lagoons that have a spiritual connection with the Sierra Nevada, it has marshlands in process of recovery; oxbow lakes used as nesting place by alligators, turtles, and fish; mangrove areas and dry forests, it is a migratory bird site.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area? - ¿De qué tamaño es el área?	230 ha
How is the area and its boundaries defined? - ¿Cómo se define el área y sus límites? (Límites definidos)	It is the first seashore sacred site recovered for the indigenous people of the Sierra Nevada - Pto Brisa; a total of four properties were acquired. Part of the Jerez river mouth is connected to private properties and is located next to a mile and a half long beach; it is currently fenced; before being acquired in 2012, this territory was a garbage dump, it was frequented by hunters, and slash and burn was a common practice; the community work carried out in this place has contributed to its transformation.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities? - ¿Cuál es el tipo de gobernabilidad de la zona, de acuerdo con la orientación de la UICN: es decir, el gobierno, los pueblos compartidos, privados o los pueblos indígenas / comunidades locales?	This territory is in the process of being incorporated into the Kogui Malayo Arhuaco reservation. Although the ownership of this place belongs to four different communities, the Kogui people are in charge of its management; the territorial management is supported by different organizations such as the Amazon Conservation Team (ACT).
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail - Por favor describa el arreglo de gobierno más detalladamente	The Kogui people are in charge of its management and the indigenous organization Gonawindùà Tayrona has specific ancestral structuring functions, , it a is a <i>pagamento</i> (traditional retribution rite) site that requires the presence of a Site Guardian – <i>mamo</i> allocated by the other <i>mamos</i> – to be in constant contact with other sacred sites and report to the elder authorities who live uphill; the lower area is ruled by the governing council that represent the organization; the decisions in relation to the management of the area are collectively taken during an assembly. Internal agreements are established, follow up activities are made; the what-to-do and how-to-do decisions are conditioned by their own world-view

	<p>principles; since there are partnership decisions that also need to be taken, the reservation signed an agreement with ACT to support biological and cultural conservation; the material world is strengthened by spiritual agreements; as this process is still new (four years), there are many needs that need to be covered. Constructions have been developed along with crops, water sources, education for the youth, a five-member family lives in the area, there are meetings that have been attended by 50 or even 100 people, shells for the <i>poporo</i> are collected, biodiversity is used, the <i>mamos</i> are consulted; different type of infrastructure is being constructed such as <i>casas marías</i>, along with community, meeting, and accommodation facilities.</p>
<p>How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes? - ¿Cómo el gobierno de la zona promueve los resultados de la conservación?</p>	<p>The management of the site has two principles: governmental and territorial. Everything revolves around maintaining a balance with nature, keeping in mind conservation and recovering nature; the government orientation has the same guidelines; the impact of the actions still need to be measured; however, they are clearly visible, there are photographs, drones, water measurements that show the evolution and the ecosystem services recovery. The fauna is returning, there have been sightings of capybaras, the cows have been removed. Observation has been the traditional method used by the indigenous people to measure the world around them, this has allowed them to realize that the natural order is being restored.</p> <p>The state government/authority is not involved, Corpoguajira has shown the interest in turning it into a Protected Area; however, the indigenous government and its communities are not interested in being a Protected Area, only a reservation. That is why the indigenous organization has proposed to establish the Protected Area on the upper part of the mountain, by the water streams that feed the river.</p>
<p><b>4. Permanence</b></p>	
<p>Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other</p>	<p>The land is in the process of being allocated to the Kogui Malayo Arhuaco reservation; in 2012 the Ministry of Culture declared this territory a National</p>

factors (below) - ¿Existe un instrumento o decisión legal o de otro tipo que establezca los arreglos de gobernabilidad y conservación de la zona, así como otros factores (a continuación)	Cultural Asset due to the historical, aesthetic, and symbolic value of this natural and traditional area, resolution 2873 of 2012.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned? - ¿Con qué facilidad puede volcarse el instrumento / decisión?	They are in the process of being implemented so that these instruments encourage the protection of the sacred territory; since the indigenous communities own them, they are protected by the natural law; other lands are also considered to be included in order to establish a management/protection plan of the area of influence.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term - ¿Cuál es el marco de tiempo en el que se encuentra la medida: largo / medio / corto plazo	It is set over the long-term period; however, it is expected to become permanent after it is declared an indigenous reservation.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect? - ¿Está la medida en vigor todo el año o sólo parte del año? Si esta última, ¿qué prácticas de gestión se aplican cuando la medida no está en vigor?	All year long
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives? - ¿Cuáles son los objetivos de gestión del área?	Maintain the spiritual, material and, protection objectives of the site; instill the understanding of the cultural and natural importance among the population so that the strategy of protection of the Linea Negra sacred sites at the Sierra Nevada of Santa Marta can be extended.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management? - ¿Es la conservación de la biodiversidad un objetivo de gestión explícito o implícito? ¿O hay otra manera de describir la forma en que se plantea esta cuestión en la gestión del área?	The goal is also explicit. Tourism, garbage, logging, and crops represent serious threads; there is a very striking contrast but this area is considered very important within the conservation efforts. This strategy has contributed to the acquisition of knowledge on how to recover sacred indigenous seashore sites, soil recovery efforts, and crops located in degraded land, relearn the previously lost management of the downhill area and difficult environmental conditions; this initiative aims to



	provide learning and reconnection.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict? - Si hay un objetivo explícito / implícito de conservación de la biodiversidad, ¿toma primacía sobre otros objetivos en caso de conflicto?	Conservation takes primacy. The placenta of the mother earth is in the mangrove. Every element of biodiversity has its own meaning and must be managed in accordance with the law of origin of the indigenous peoples of the Sierra Nevada, so that the balance in the cycles of nature and the welfare of the territory is ensured.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species? - ¿La medida cubre todos o la mayoría de los elementos de la biodiversidad en el área o sólo de ciertas especies?	All the elements of biodiversity are taken into consideration, as they provide the resources to maintain the connections with other sacred sites.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results? - ¿Se mide la efectividad de la gestión? Si es así, ¿cómo y cuáles son los resultados?	They are measured in a quantitative way, through the confrontation of before/after photographs, sampling taking to analyze the quality of water, direct observation, record books to keep track of any change in nature dynamics; growing observation of animal tracks, development of cover maps to establish a comparison point of reference, establishment of connections between mangrove patches; six young indigenous people were trained to manage the sacred site; the <i>Mamos</i> visit the community on a more frequent basis to conduct traditional tasks and to keep track of the connections that have been reestablished with the uphill sites, strengthening meetings are being held with the indigenous unit and the support team; an increasing number of indigenous people is participating in the activities and the visits.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored? - ¿Está el área conservando efectivamente la biodiversidad y cómo se mide y monitorea la efectividad de la conservación?	Although effectiveness is not being measured, there are inputs that show effectiveness in terms of conservation, it is not meticulous monitoring, but one that is based on the perception gathered during the community processes and are in agreement with the needs and the interest of those established by the conservation strategy.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives,	The conservation objectives take primacy. This primacy is based on the creation and management of the sacred sites.

management approaches or activities? - Independientemente de si el área tiene o no objetivos de conservación, ¿los resultados de la conservación tienen primacía en los casos de conflicto entre objetivos, enfoques de manejo o actividades?	
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place? - ¿La efectividad actual se debe a la gobernabilidad y gestión del área, o debido al hecho de que aún no se han producido actividades perjudiciales?	Yes, it responds to the ruling of this area by the indigenous communities. A different decision in relation to the recovery would have resulted in a disastrous situation, as the connection and the natural value of the sacred site would have been lost.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target? - En relación con el proyecto de guía (Sección 3) y el proyecto de herramienta de selección (Sección 4), ¿cree usted que el área es un OECM? Si no es así, ¿es un área protegida o una medida que contribuye a otro objetivo de Aichi?	It is an OECM as it stays compliant with the criteria; for the community, it represent its life objective, its mission and repossession of the ancestral territory, the recovery of the management and connection with nature and the sacredness of life, they are not independent.
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks. - Por favor, agregue más comentarios aquí. Muchas gracias.	Both OECM and the guidelines have very interesting points of view in relation to the biodiversity conservation management, an issue that must continue being analyzed with the communities and the local government. There are several interesting issues such as monitoring, effectiveness and participatory follow-up, especially in experience-sharing scenarios and knowledge exchange.

**Robles conservation corridor reaches four municipalities: Duitama (Boyacá), Encino, Charalá and Coromoro (Santander) (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area - Nombre y ubicación del área	The coverage of the conservation/production agreements at the Robles conservation corridor reaches four municipalities: Duitama (Boyacá), Encino, Charalá and Coromoro (Santander); this corridor is formed of national and regional protected areas, and private lands. Andean forest, High-Andean forest and moorland ecosystems.

Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM - Breve descripción, incluidos los valores naturales, culturales y sociales, y razones para considerar el área como un OECM	This is a comprehensive conservation strategy that gathers social, productive and environmental aspects along with conservation concepts and landscaping tools aimed at creating connectivity, such is the case of the design of living fences, pastureland division, performance maximization, grassland improvement; it takes into consideration renewable/clean technologies which entails managing a piece of land formed of natural and productive areas that brings along a benefit to the local communities, and the protection of the Ecosystem Services.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area? - ¿De qué tamaño es el área?	Dimension range: Between 1.5 ha and 40 ha (small-scale producers); between 200 ha and 300 ha (productive area); and 1 hectare (forest).
How is the area and its boundaries defined? - ¿Cómo se define el área y sus límites? (Límites definidos)	Private property, land tenure and limits; the documentation provided confirms and validates the private nature of these lands (entitlement, possession, or tenure).
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities? - ¿Cuál es el tipo de gobernabilidad de la zona, de acuerdo con la orientación de la UICN: es decir, el gobierno, los pueblos compartidos, privados o los pueblos indígenas / comunidades locales?	The governance is exerted by individuals and private organizations (usually the owners). Producers in conjunction with civil society organizations.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail - Por favor describa el arreglo de gobierno más detalladamente	A civil contract (legal) tool allows reaching an agreement which provides that, in exchange for the conservation of natural ecosystems areas, or the generation of the restoration and/or reconversion landscaping tool, the producers receive land planning supplies and technical support aimed at the development of landscape conservation, preservation of the Ecosystem Services, reduction of the pressure exerted over the forest, and encouragement of the sustainability of the productive activities to improve the quality of life of the families. These contracts apply community-related governance and conflict resolution concepts.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes? -	These agreements generate the conditions for the intervention of the

<p>¿Cómo el gobierno de la zona promueve los resultados de la conservación?</p>	<p>forests and the water sources of each property; by conserving the forests, the private owners also protect the water springs that supply the municipal aqueducts; this type of effort not only reduces the costs of the actions that the owner would have to pay for, but generates a social interest on conservation topics, encouraging the permanence of these actions and the creation of environmental and social solutions.</p>
<p><b>4. Permanence</b></p>	
<p>Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below) -          ¿Existe un instrumento o decisión legal o de otro tipo que establezca los arreglos de gobernabilidad y conservación de la zona, así como otros factores (a continuación)</p>	<p>There are no concepts on this matter, the only approach is carried out by action boards and local-based organizations with a scope that only reaches one segment of the community; as the conservation decision is individual and based on the comprehension of the producer's necessities, the compliance with the commitments that have been agreed upon are guaranteed. The instrumental tool is the regulation of the project contained in some articles of the agreement, which stipulate the return of the supplies or its economic value in case of non-compliance, as well as compliance process of the agreements established between the parties, the importance of the social/collective awareness and concern towards the neighbors, the decision to give to the communities the resources that have been returned due to non-compliance, the oversight and reporting process exerted by the producers over the improvement of the productive system, and the installation of relevant and necessary technologies aimed at the communities that would be affected in case of non-compliance.</p>
<p>How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned? - ¿Con qué facilidad puede volcarse el instrumento / decisión?</p>	<p>The agreements depend on the expectations of the owners on issues related the way these actions give value to the farms, as well as the confidence on the productive system, the principle of trust between the parties, land tenure and heir-related issues.</p>
<p>Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term -          ¿Cuál es el marco de tiempo en el que se encuentra la medida: largo / medio / corto plazo</p>	<p>It is set over the long-term period; the everyday language and scheme of temporality agreed upon with the producers is based on the ecological functionality contemplated. For REDD+ it is 30 years. But most of the agreements are set on a 10 year-long term that by year 5 must have showed</p>

	progress on restoration and reconversion issues.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect? - ¿Está la medida en vigor todo el año o sólo parte del año? Si esta última, ¿qué prácticas de gestión se aplican cuando la medida no está en vigor?	All year long.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives? - ¿Cuáles son los objetivos de gestión del área?	According to the agreement: conservation and protection, sustainable use of the resources based on combined landscape strategies.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management? - ¿Es la conservación de la biodiversidad un objetivo de gestión explícito o implícito? ¿O hay otra manera de describir la forma en que se plantea esta cuestión en la gestión del área?	It is explicit; the base institutions, organizations and individuals are aware that the agreements are signed with an environmental organization and with a conservation and productive objective. The management objectives are a series of forest relicts, creeks, water springs and ecosystem soil and water services.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict? - Si hay un objetivo explícito / implícito de conservación de la biodiversidad, ¿toma primacía sobre otros objetivos en caso de conflicto?	The challenge lies in giving equal prevalence to the conservation and productive activities; however, the encouragement of the latter brings along the risk of overgrowing it in order to make it more profitable; such situation has not occurred in the agreements signed in relation to the corridor; an additional challenge is the one associated with the difficulty to find workers in the area, they do not live in the countryside or wander from one place to the other depending on the demand of work, this favors conservation; another challenge for the organization is that of the balance between production and environment, the language established with the producer is productive and serves the purpose of establishing the most appropriate processes to achieve a better management without generating environmental impact; different schemes are created.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species? - ¿La medida cubre todos o la mayoría de los elementos de la biodiversidad en el área o sólo de ciertas especies?	It The property covers everything, along with the existing components.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results? - ¿Se mide la efectividad de la gestión? Si es así, ¿cómo y cuáles son	Not in the long term, the implementation is based on indicators along with empirical impact observation; however, the measuring of effectiveness

los resultados?	never exceeds the five year-long limit; there is a lack of on-going support.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored? - ¿Está el área conservando efectivamente la biodiversidad y cómo se mide y monitorea la efectividad de la conservación?	According to the opinions expressed by the people, they have perceived major changes and processes in their properties which have had an influence in the process of recovery of areas at a landscape scale; there have been sightings of a larger number of animals, there are species that have started to return to the area, there is a number of useful forest species that were totally or partially inexistent; on the other hand, while there are reports of animal species that generate a negative impact on the productive systems, there are also methods of wildlife displacement.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities? - Independientemente de si el área tiene o no objetivos de conservación, ¿los resultados de la conservación tienen primacía en los casos de conflicto entre objetivos, enfoques de manejo o actividades?	Despite having a priority, there is a multiscale sustainability productive language; the productive problem is reduced in favor of the protection of the biodiversity. In the absence of alternatives to the local economy, the productive system prevails. Implementation of functional corridors and financially sustainable productive systems; any effort exerted over the productive system provides a balance to achieving conservation/production.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place? - ¿La efectividad actual se debe a la gobernabilidad y gestión del área, o debido al hecho de que aún no se han producido actividades perjudiciales?	There is governance, and the agreements are responsible for generating the actions of conservation, they are an additional effort.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target? - En relación con el proyecto de guía (Sección 3) y el proyecto de herramienta de selección (Sección 4), ¿cree usted que el área es un OECM? Si no es así, ¿es un área protegida o una medida que contribuye a otro objetivo de Aichi?	It is an OMEC, it stays compliant with the rural development strategies; the livelihood activities do generate an impact; the impact is lower in the presence of different and sustainable rules. The implementation of ongoing support, land management and the use of an easy-to-understand language guarantees the reciprocity of the benefits; it is fundamental to have environmental benefits and farm productive activities aimed at the welfare of the families.
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks. - Por favor, agregue más comentarios aquí. Muchas gracias.	The producers are much more than just a group of beneficiaries, their contribution is usually the most important of all; opportunity costs; the

	conservation/production agreements are activators of effective conservation actions in the territories.
--	---

### Civil Society Natural Reserve “El Oasis” (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute

1. Overview	
Name and location of the area	<p><b>Civil Society Natural Reserve El Oasis</b></p> <p>It is located southeast side of Armenia (capital of Quindio department). Between 1.550 and 1.890 meters high, the natural reserve is situated one hour and a half by car from Armenia.</p>
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECD	<p>This natural reserve is part of a peasant family owners interested on biodiversity conservation of Andean forest, in an area that has been strongly destroyed and fragmented in the last decades, due to single crops and extensive cattle ranching. In the natural reserve, there is also coffee production and farming, under good environmental practices.</p> <p>Cultural values are related to traditions of a peasant family, its way of living and farming under friendly environmental practices, the associative and community network with neighbors and, in particular, with peasant women that produce coffee.</p> <p>There is also archeological remains in the natural reserve and its surroundings.</p>
2. Boundaries & Geographical Space	
What size is the area?	53.7 ha (Andean forest, agroforestry systems and pasture area)
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The area is defined through public deed, that includes only one property.
3. Governance Type	
What is the area’s governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	<p>C. Private governance. civil society natural reserve</p> <p>The natural reserve has its own management plan update in 2012, with the</p>

	support of the regional authority and the NGO called Orquidea). Its main objectives are conservation of Andean forest and sustainable coffee production.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	The owners are a family group members that live in the reserve. They have been interested in the last 100 years to conserve biological diversity and ecosystem services of the area. The activities in the reserve are well planned and implemented by the owners, according to the management plan.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	The natural reserve owners encourage conservation of biodiversity at the landscape level as well as agroecological production. In conjunction with the local NGO Orquidea, they promote other conservation processes from the civil society in the surroundings of the natural reserve, through community work with coffee producers that use environmental sustainability criteria. They are also raising awareness through an environmental education program focused on visitors that stay in the natural reserve. Since 2004, the natural reserve is an associate of the Colombian Network of Civil Society Natural Reserves (Resnatur), an association formerly recognized by the National Natural Park of Colombia as an articulation organization of private natural reserves at the national level.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	The land where the natural reserve is located is under the figure of private land. It has been a property of the same family for the last 100 years. Since then, they have kept an area for Andean forest conservation for volunteer and consciousness decision. They have also decided to plant coffee under environmental friendly practices.  The management plan includes a clear zonation where productivity activities are defined in space, as well as the conservation areas. Forest areas are never destructed for production use.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	The land has been inherited for several generations under the same principles of conservation biodiversity and friendly productivity practices



	with the environment. The family is not interested in selling the property. Contrary, they are getting prepared for the next generational replacement.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	The measure is in place over a long term <i>in situ</i> conservation.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	It is a measure in place year-round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The main objectives of the area are: - to conserve the natural ecosystems of the natural reserve through preservation and restoration actions. - To strengthen the agroecological management in the natural reserve, diversifying farming production and renovating crops. - To continue the community network through strengthen different local actors with impact in conservation issues.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Biodiversity conservation is an explicit management objective.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The biodiversity conservation objective is the main goal defined for the natural reserve management. There are no conflicts identified within the natural reserve.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The measures cover most elements of biodiversity with several conservation objectives defined for the civil society natural reserve: ecosystems services related to water production, its regulation and conservation, a bird ( <i>Dendroica caerulea</i> ), three trees ( <i>Pouteria lúcumá</i> , <i>Juglans neotropica</i> , <i>Billia rosea</i> ), ethnic and arqueological history of the reserve and its surroundings, local and natural medical knowledge.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness has not been measured, but multitemporal analyses has been run to detect changes in vegetal cover, showing that natural vegetation has expanded over the area.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	

Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	Conservation biodiversity in the natural reserve has been assessed through a multitemporal analysis of vegetation cover change in the area. Inventories of bird species have detected changes in bird composition, and identified the increase of flora and fauna species in the natural reserve area.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	There is no conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities, because the management plan has a clear zonation that defined the land uses and because all activities are direct to biodiversity conservation.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	The current effectiveness is due to the area's governance and management. There is clear work focused in achieving conservation objectives. Environmental education on conservation issues has allowed engaging local people from the surrounding area in civil society conservation processes, in order to reduce threats.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	This natural reserve applies to steps 1 to 3. Nonetheless effectiveness has not been directly measured. The area is not recorded over the environmental authority (in this case National Natural Parks of Colombia). Mining could be a potential threat, because Colombian legislation is unclear: development activities have priority over conservation efforts, in many cases.
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	The civil society natural reserve works together with local and regional governmental conservation projects. It is part of the local group Eje Cafetero from Resnatur.

**Civil Society Natural Reserve “El Silencio” (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	Civil Society Natural Reserve “El Silencio”. It is located at the east side of Bogota (capital of Colombia - department of Cundinamarca), in a geographical area known as “the escarpment”. The natural reserve is situated at one hour and a half by car from Bogota, and

	between 2.700 and 3.000 meters high.
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	This natural reserve is part of a group of land owners interested in biodiversity conservation of Andean forest, as well as milk production under good environmental practices. It is located in the most important corridor of Andean forest remnant, that enhance the biological connectivity from north to south of the east side of Cundinamarca department. It is the last viable refuge on the long term for the conservation of many fauna and flora species.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	118 ha.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The area is defined through public deed, that includes only one property.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	C. Private governance. Civil Society Natural reserve
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	The owners of the reserve are a family group members interested in the last 50 years to conserve biological diversity and ecosystem services of the area. They are surrounding by other five natural reserves that conserve the Andean forest in conjunction with milk production.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	The owners of the natural reserve have set up activities such as isolation of native forest, ecological restoration in strategic zone of the land (like water springs, rivers and creeks), life fences installation and recovery of degraded zones. All these activities are carried out in parallel with production practices that applied criteria of sustainable and environmental responsibility.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	The land where the natural reserve is located is under the figure of private land. It is part of the Colombian Network of Civil Society Natural Reserves (Resnatur), an association formerly recognized by the National Natural Park of Colombia, as an articulation organization of private civil society natural reserves at the national level.

How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	The land has been managed for three generations under the same principles of conservation biodiversity and friendly productivity practices with the environment. The current young generation (under 18 years old) is already with a high level of consciousness in conservation issues and have a sense a land belonging.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	The measure is in place over a long term <i>in situ</i> conservation.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	It is a measure in place year-round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The main objectives of the area are: - to conserve the natural ecosystem of high Andean forests. - to protect oak forest of the Andes of the threatened species <i>Quercus humboldtii</i> . - to produce milk with friendly environment standards (this reserve is currently recognized by the cattle group of friendly milk production).
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Biodiversity conservation is an explicit management objective.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The natural reserve has a clear zonation areas where productivity activities are defined in space, as well as the conservation areas. Forest areas are never destructed for production use and they expand in more than 60% of the land.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The measures cover most elements of biodiversity including ecosystems services related to water production, its regulation and conservation.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness has not been measured. Nevertheless, the restoration area has increased in the last 10 years in 10 new hectares that are include now in the conservation area of the reserve.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	Conservation biodiversity is clearly assessed by the fact the more than 500 plant species have been recorded in the area as well as 100 bird species.

	Some of these species are only found in healthy forest. The fact that water is always available even during drier seasons, make clear that the water cycling and forest processes are under good conditions.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict with milk production, which has never been the case. In Colombia, civil society natural reserves have a double focus: biodiversity conservation and sustainable production.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	The current effectiveness is due to the area's governance and management. There is clear interested of the reserve owners to protect high Andean forest. This is observed in the fact that more than 60% of the reserve area is under conservation status.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	This natural reserve applies to steps 1 to 3. The area is not recorded over the environmental authority (in this case National Natural Parks of Colombia), because the owners do not feel comfortable with this registration system that may imply limitations and the not truly recognition of their volunteer conservation efforts. Mining could be a potential threat, because Colombian legislation is unclear: development activities have priority over conservation efforts, in many cases.
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	The volunteer and consciousness efforts through natural reserves from the civil society are required to be recognized as OMEC to make visible their contribution to conservation biodiversity and regional planning, as well as contribute to national conservation objectives.

**Civil Society Natural Reserve "Agua Clara and Valle Lindo" (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	<b>Civil Society Natural Reserve "Agua Clara and Valle Lindo"</b>

	<p>This natural reserve is located south of Armenia (capital of Quindío department), inside a protected area called "Regional District of Integrated Management -DRMI Paramos and High Andean Forest of Genova".</p> <p>Between 2.850 and 3.900 meters high, the natural reserve is situated two hours and a half by car from Armenia followed by three hours walking.</p>
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p>The owner of the natural reserve is an NGO called Ecological Foundation Las Mellizas. Apart from being located inside a DRMI, the natural reserve has been recognized as an Important Bird and Biodiversity Area (IBAs).</p> <p>In Colombia, paramo ecosystems are considered strategic ecosystems for water provision and have specific law regulation for delimitation. The Natural Reserve Agua Clara and Valle Lindo is within the protected and delimited paramo of <i>Chilí-Barragán</i> that has an area of 80.708 ha. This whole area, including the natural reserve, functions as an important ecosystem and socio-cultural connector that enhances the biological connectivity of two national natural parks: Las Hermosas y Los Nevados. Cultural values are found in the natural reserve buffer area, associated to coffee plantations.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	395,4 ha.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The area and the boundaries are defined through public deed which includes three properties. Each has its own public deed: Valle Lindo with 246,6 ha, Aguas Claras with 70,5 ha and Buena Vista with 78,3 ha.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	<p>C. Private governance. civil society natural reserve</p> <p>The natural reserve is inside the regional protected area (DRMI), that has a management plan not yet implemented because the environmental authority (<i>Corporación Autónoma Regional del Quindío</i>) executive</p>

	committee has not yet approved it. In contrast, the Natural Reserve Agua Clara and Valle Lindo has its own management plan formulated in 2012. Its main objective is the preservation of natural ecosystems: paramo and high Andean forest.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	The Ecological Foundation Las Mellizas is an environmental NGO, focused on promoting the conservation of natural areas, especially high mountain ecosystems located in the Quindio department. The NGO bought the properties in 2000.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	<p>The natural reserve is an associate of the Colombian Network of Civil Society Natural Reserves (Resnatur), an association formerly recognized by the National Natural Park of Colombia as an articulation organization of private natural reserves at the national level.</p> <p>The NGO Ecological Foundation Las Mellizas contributed to the declaration of the regional protected area, the DRMI Paramos and High Andean Forest of Genova. The area encompasses 8.300 ha. Due to the management of the NGO and in collaboration with other organization such as Resnatur, the creation and establishment of new civil society natural reserves have been promoted in Genova and throughout the coffee area known as Eje Cafetero.</p> <p>The Ecological Foundation Las Mellizas has also influenced the creation and strengthened the local and regional systems of protected areas, in conjunction with different public and private organizations.</p>
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	The land where the natural reserve is located is under the figure of private land. It includes three properties that have been formally bought.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	In the statutes of creation of the Ecological Foundation Las Mellizas are defined that if the NGO is liquidated, the natural reserve will be passed to an NGO with similar conservation objectives. It may not be sold to change the

	conservation land use.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	The measure is in place over a long term <i>in situ</i> conservation.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	It is a measure in place year-round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The main objectives of the area are: - to conserve the natural ecosystem of high Andean forests and paramo. - To increase the biotic and abiotic, as well as the socio-cultural information of the natural reserve. - To create an environmental space to enjoy nature.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Biodiversity conservation is an explicit management objective.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The biodiversity conservation objective is the main goal defined for the natural reserve management.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The measures cover most elements of biodiversity. Five conservation objectives have been defined for the civil society natural reserve: a palm ( <i>Ceroxylon parvifrons</i> ), two bird species ( <i>Hapalopsitaca fuertesii</i> , and <i>Grallaricula lineifrons</i> ), and two natural ecosystems, high Andean forest and paramo. Each one of the five conservation objectives has its own strategies and goals defined.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness has not been measured, but multitemporal analyses has been run to detect changes in vegetal cover, showing that natural vegetation has expanded over the area.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	Conservation biodiversity in the natural reserve has been assessed through a multitemporal analysis of vegetation cover change in the area. Inventories of bird species between 2012 and 2014 have detected changes in bird composition, and identified the increase of flora and fauna species in the natural reserve area.



<p>Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?</p>	<p>There is no conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities, because the area of the natural reserve is exclusively devoted to conservation.</p>
<p>Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?</p>	<p>The current effectiveness is due to the area's governance and management. There is clear interest of the NGO to protect high Andean forest and paramo ecosystems. Environmental education on conservation issues has allowed engaging local people from the buffer area in civil society conservation processes.</p>
<p><b>7. Assessment</b></p>	
<p>In relation to the draft guidance (<b>Section 3</b>) and the draft screening tool (<b>Section 4</b>), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?</p>	<p>This natural reserve does not apply to sept 1, because it is located inside the DRMI High Andean Forests and Paramos of Genova, a declared regional protected area. Nevertheless, the civil society natural reserve was already managed as a conservation area 13 years ago, while the DRMI was declared only four years ago. The DRMI has a weak governance, since management has not formally applied and financial resources have not yet been allocated.</p> <p>The natural reserve applies to steps 2 and 3. Nonetheless effectiveness has not been directly measured.</p> <p>The area is not recorded by the environmental authority (in this case National Natural Parks of Colombia).</p> <p>Mining could be a potential threat, because Colombian legislation is unclear: in many cases development activities have priority over conservation efforts.</p>
<p>Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.</p>	<p>Despite Agua Clara and Valle Lindo Natural Reserve being inside a declared regional protected area, it is considered that the volunteer and consciousness raising efforts of the NGO should be recognized as OMEC to make their contribution to conservation biodiversity and regional planning visible, as an example of effective private governance.</p>

**Water Reciprocal Agreements, a Case of Payments for Ecosystem Services (Colombia) – Humboldt Institute**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	<p><b>Water Reciprocal Agreements – WRA: a case of payments for ecosystem services – PES</b></p> <p>The project’s area of influence is located between the urban center of San Vicente de Chucurí municipality, in Santander Province and Quebrada Las Cruces watershed, Northeastern Colombia. With an estimated extension of 5,737 hectares, the WRA strategy has been championed by Fundación Natura Colombia since 2009 in order to find solutions and alternatives for the water quality and regulation problems in this small watershed. Quebrada Las Cruces originates in the northern sector of the National Natural Park Serranía de los Yariguíes (PNN SEYA) and is completely within the municipality limits of San Vicente de Chucurí.</p> <p>This watershed supplies water for 14,000 inhabitants in the urban center and many small rural aqueducts as well.</p>
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p>The Water Reciprocal Agreements are contracts which landowners sign with the Water Administration Company (in this case Aguas para Chucurí - APC); there are currently 61 signed Agreements which cover a total area of 1,194 ha, with 490,5 ha of forests and gallery forests under a conservation and restoration management strategy and 703,5 ha of cacao, coffee and pasture systems where Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) are applied. Fundación Natura is a third party in these Agreements acting as an overseer. Aimed to protect the watershed which maintains the water regulation benefit, these agreements involve landowners on the watershed who compromise themselves with the urban inhabitants, the main water resource users.</p>

	<p>These Agreements are a Complementary Strategy for PES mechanisms.</p> <p>The WRA are signed in regions within the buffer zone of the Serranía de Los Yariguíes National Natural Park, the natural distribution zone of the quail <i>Odontophorus strophium</i> (Perdiz santandereana), the region's most representative species, and many other threatened species (Donegan y Huertas, 2005). In 2005, Serranía de los Yariguíes was proposed as an Important Bird Area (IBA) (Boyla &amp; Estrada, 2005) and a site for the Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) (Ricketts et al., 2005).</p> <p>The cultural and production practices, the cultural views about the territory, the watershed, the forest, fauna and flora resources, as well as the water resource were identified as conservation objectives.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	These Agreements involve properties between 1 ha and 90 ha, with an average extension between 2 to 7 ha.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Boundaries are defined according to the legal delimitation of the properties involved, and each of them has well defined conservation and production zones.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	The area has private governance because the decision is taken by the landowner. However, it's important to remember that APC is a party in the Agreements and it has its rights and duties therein.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	<p>The Agreement contract is signed by the landowner of the property in question and an organization which is responsible for managing the quality and distribution of water resources called APC. The Agreement involves other organizations representing common interests in urban spaces such as the city hall, municipal council, an Overseeing Committee and Fundación Natura.</p> <p>The Overseeing Committee includes representatives from the Colombian</p>

	<p>National Natural Parks Service, Ecoagrotours, Nuestra Señora de la Paz School and Asogalaxia (tours and marketing tasks).</p> <p>APC directs participative monitoring activities and involves young people mainly from rural areas.</p>
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	By meeting objectives regarding conservation, financial sustainability, monitoring and follow-up, social overseeing, behavioral changes and inter-institutional articulation.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Yes, the WR Agreement plus a framework agreement between APC, the City Hall and Fundación Natura. There is also an Environmental Services Contract represented in the water bill which people, inhabiting the urban area, pay. Also, there are specific agreements for funds and internal regulations for the Agreement operation. All of the above mentioned are legal support instruments.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	<p>It's not that simple but it has been achieved because the Framework Agreement prevents that policy and staff changes, with changing interests, disrupt the Agreements' continuity, which derives in a greater sustainability and stability for the terms of the Agreement. This is the most important achievement in this regard.</p> <p>Specific Agreements allow for private and public funding and the internal regulation defined the rules for the Agreements.</p> <p>The Environmental Services Contract legalizes the donor's grant.</p>
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Medium term: 5 years
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Permanent
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	

What are the area's management objectives?	To preserve water regulating forests, to restore areas set for land use change, Good Agricultural Practices have agroforestry systems with rich biodiversity and will not widen the agricultural frontier. Specific conservation objectives such as the <i>Odontophorus strophium</i> (Gorgeted wood-quail) are also added.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Yes, water regulation and wild life and ecosystem and agricultural systems.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes. In the Agreements' terms is clear that widening the agricultural frontier is prohibited and the zoning must be respected, which are appendices of the Agreements.  If there is forest use, the landowner must report it.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Yes, it is wide and it's more focused on the ecological function of water regulation (quality) and with an ecosystem focus instead of a species focus.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Yes, because effectiveness in the fulfillment of the terms of the Agreement is measured, as well as governance (both associated parties as well as other spaces such as Overseeing Committee and external evaluations) and two economic indicators are used: one measuring whether the economy of the family has improved and other measuring whether the Agreement has impacted the production systems and has induced behavioral changes four times in seven years of the Agreement operation. Ecosystem monitoring, water quality indicators, sedimentation and microorganism presence, superficial discharge, water volume entering the plant, forest ecosystem connectivity.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	Yes, it is being performed and is measured by the monitoring described in the previous segment. It's being performed in 12 points of the watershed, natural regeneration processes and restoration in the property and monitoring plots of land.

	The forest quail is being monitored and its forest use is being observed as an indicator for the ecosystem quality.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	No, there are behavioral changes in the people and direct benefits and there is fear of losing due to the risk of changing behavior. It's the way they see their territory: the water resource and its protection is paramount.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	Yes, effectiveness has been achieved thanks to the activities taken place on the territory and on the implementation of the Agreement.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OEMC? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	Yes, it is a OEMC. It isn't officially included in RUNAP. Its impact has been measured. It has a type of governance tailored to the local conditions and involves a wide range of institutions.
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	

**“El Morron” Rural property of the Municipality of La Celia, Risaralda Department (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	“El Morron” Rural property of the Municipality of La Celia, Risaralda Department (Colombia)
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OEMC	It is a real estate bought for the conservation of the water resource in order to comply with a national law (Ley 99 de 1993). It is prohibited to perform any productive activity in the area and that is a permanent status. Most of its extension is covered by an Andean submontane forest and the rest is covered by other agricultural activities.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	30 ha
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The mapped limits are defined with the Municipal Land-use Outline (Spanish: <i>Esquema de Ordenamiento Territorial</i> ) of La Celia and according to its Municipal Protected Area System.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e.	Governance depends on the city hall within the framework of the Municipal

government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Protected Area System supported by the local environmental organizations. It is a government type governance.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	The city hall buys the real estate for the conservation of water supplying watersheds for rural aqueducts, as a result of the implementation of a law of 1993 that mandate municipalities to invest 1% of their annual budget on land acquisition for watershed conservation. The estate is managed by the city hall which identifies activities to be performed, that are mainly represented in establishing fences for protection against encroaching. The property is not always supervised. Sometimes environmental organizations perform activities in this area; however, there are no formal conservation or administration agreements on such estates.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	Conservation results are not measured.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	There is a legal binding document in the City Council, which creates the Municipal Protected Area System and identifies the zone where the estate as "protection soil" (a legal conservation status given to a zone within the municipal territory).
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	The instrument cannot be overturned because it is supported by a law.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long term. The real state cannot be sell by the municipality.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	This measure is permanent, all year round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	To conserve the water springs which supply human consumption.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Biodiversity conservation is an explicit management objective
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The estate must remain in time as a conservation space and shall not be used for any productive activity.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or	All elements of biodiversity.

only certain species?	
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness is not measured.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	No biodiversity monitoring activities are performed. There is no supervision of conservation activities either.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Yes, conservation is the main activity, but not focus on biodiversity but on ecosystem services.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	The effectiveness is due to the legal status of the area, but also depend on the management made by the municipality and the resources invested to do so.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	The area is an OMEC
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	

**Dos Quebradas, Napoles Site Natural Municipal Park, Local Protected Area (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	<b>Dos Quebradas, Napoles Site Natural Municipal Park – Local Protected Area, Palmira Municipality, Valle del Cauca</b>
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	It is described by the municipality as an area representing the municipal ecosystems, expressed in landscapes, biomes, ecosystems with special scientific, esthetic, educational and recreational value, whose existence must be sustained or whose natural conditions must be restored by a dedicated regime of declaration and management. The area in particular



	contains moist forest and it is property of the municipality.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	72,43 ha
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Boundaries are defined and mapped according to the Palmira Land Use Plan and the Municipal Protected Area System
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Governance is exercised by the Palmira city hall according to the Municipal Protected Area System. Governance by the government.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	The local administration allocates the resources and raises other funds with the department's environmental authority (CVC) and with the rest of stakeholders from the Department's Protected Area System (Spanish: <i>SIDAP Valle del Cauca</i> ).
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	The municipality owns the land, so it is protected from threats that could include encroachment and deforestation.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	There is a legally binding document issued by the Municipal Council which creates the Municipal Protected Area System, within which this area is declared as a local protected area.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	It cannot be easily overturned because the area is public property of the municipality, bought for the conservation of water supply watersheds for aqueducts (according to Law 99 of 1993) and later declared as a municipal protected area.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	The measure is permanent all year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	To maintain the needed land covers for water supply regulation as well as to prevent and control erosion and massive sedimentation.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or	Biodiversity conservation is an explicit management objective

is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The property must keep its status as a conservation space and cannot be used for any productive purpose.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	All elements or biodiversity
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness is not measured
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	No biodiversity monitoring activities are performed. There is no supervision of conservation activities either.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Yes, conservation is a priority because the city hall is legally bound.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	It is due to the area's legal status.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	The area is an OECM
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	

**Traditional Fishing Exclusive Zone. Chocó coast, Chocó Department (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	ZEPA: Traditional Fishing Exclusive Zone. Chocó coast, Chocó Department.
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	ZEPA originated as a proposal both from a group of local fishermen from the northern part of Chocó's Pacific Coast and from Consejo Delfines (Council). The proposal was also supported by regional fishermen organizations. Since 2008, this initiative has been aimed at avoiding conflict with industrial

	<p>fisheries whose ships were fishing too close to the coast which was causing negative impacts in the zone in terms of a reduced fishing output. Founded in 1998, the Fishermen's council brings together several organizations in three levels. It is a decision making facility in the territory, which is a fisheries decision co-responsibility and coordination space.</p> <p>Values: Species and ecosystem conservation, improvement of the traditional fishermen living conditions, Cabo Marzo rocky shore ecosystems, village beaches and mangrove zones, seabeds (e.g. ichthyoplankton's importance, etc.) and cetaceans' migration zones.</p> <p>ZEPA was created in 2005 with an area of 2.5 nautical miles where tourism, spearfishing and traditional fishing take place, which are activities improving the quality of life if responsible fishing criteria are applied.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Delimitation is precise: from the Panama border in Punta Ardita (northern limit) until the northern limit of the Utría National Natural Park (NNP) and 2.5 nautical miles off the coastline. This sums a total of 250.000 ha.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The ZEPA's boundaries are clearly defined. ZEPA is part of a mosaic of several other conservation areas, such as a Fishing Management Exclusive Zone, Utría NNP and the Tribuga y Cabo Corrientes Regional Integrated Management District (a legally recognized regional protected area category).
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Is a mixed type governance.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	The mixed governance of ZEPA depends on the <i>AUNAP</i> (National Aquaculture and Fishing Authority) which is the fishing governing body in Colombia. There is also a coordinating committee chaired by the fishermen's council, which represents all sectors, especially traditional fisheries. ZEPA includes a plan for a joint management agreement with shared activities.

	<p>Other organizations involved are: Fedepesca (representing the Chocóan fishing sector including the industrial fisheries).</p> <p>Meetings are regularly scheduled where several topics are addressed: e.g. proposals for surveillance and control, monitoring, etc.</p>
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	<p>The institutional jurisdictions contribute to the governance. For instance, AUNAP is partially responsible for surveillance and control, Codechocó: partially responsible for surveillance and control and it is in charge of the environmental component of the zone, fishermen monitor fishing resources and there is social oversight regarding big opportunistic fisheries, which are using prohibited nets.</p>
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	<p>Yes, it is recognized by a Resolution issued by AUNAP</p> <p>It is supported by: the area's management plan, the fishing planning scheme and the GIC PA Assembly.</p>
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	<p>It has been sustained and benefits have been measured. However, there are still surveillance and control problems, due mainly to the institutional weakness of AUNAP and Codechocó.</p>
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	<p>Long-term and for the entire region.</p>
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	<p>It is all year round and is stricter than the Regional Integrated Management District (Spanish <i>DRMI</i>) because it is focused on traditional fishing. This situation makes it more vulnerable because fishermen exert significant pressures to access the fishing resource.</p>
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<p>To replace high-impact fishing gears for the restoration of fish population species, such as the Yellowfin tuna (<i>Thunnus albacares</i>), the Green jack (<i>Cranax caballus</i>), the Bigeye trevally (<i>Caranx sexfasciatus</i>), the Yellow snapper (<i>Lutjanus argentiventris</i>), the Pacific dog snapper (<i>Lutjanus novemfasciatus</i>), the Bluestriped chub (<i>Sectator ocyurus</i>), the Almaco jack</p>

	<p>(<i>Seriola rivoliana</i>), the Spottail grunt (<i>Haemulon maculicauda</i>), the Rock hind (<i>Epinephelus sp.</i>) and Pacific bearded bortula (<i>Brotula clarkae</i>).</p> <p>To improve the traditional fishermen living conditions.</p>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Yes, it is explicit because the extinction threat for local species was clear. Nowadays, its positive effect has been measured in the fish populations.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes, it is a priority over other conflicts and opportunities.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Measures show a recovery in fish populations. There are no measures regarding ecosystem recovery but it is part of the objective.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	<p>Yes, there are measures focused mainly on fish sizes and presence/absence of groupers species.</p> <p>Social and economic indicators have improved in the zone. There is visible improvement on the quality of the fishing output and on the quality of life of the people. However, there are problems with the distribution of benefits among fishermen because not all of them are part of the guild nor participate on the established productive chain, which manages quality and price control issues.</p>
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	There in fishing and fishing arts monitoring. It is performed directly by the fishermen and by accompanying non-governmental organizations.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Yes, the coordinating committee represents the interests from the fishermen communities and the conservation objective has prevailed over occupation attempts from industrial fishing vessels. There is constant pressure but the management measures are maintained, such as the lower impact fishing gears (handline and types of hooks).
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	The governance model is in the process of being settled. Significant threats to the management and governance model have been overcome, such as

	<p>complex processes like the pressure exerted by industrial shrimping and fisheries.</p> <p>Within the Chocoan marine conservation portfolio, ZEPA serves a protection function and it has met its intended objectives. Nothing else has been declared in this place and there are expectations for the ZEPA to continue strengthening.</p>
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	<p>It is an OECM. ZEPA is a pioneer initiative because is totally community based and has originated from many years of community work, where AUNAP and Codechoco are involved in a social initiative.</p> <p>This is a OECM with stronger use restrictions than other surrounding protected areas, which makes it very special as well.</p>
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	<p>AUNAP needs more resources for surveillance and control activities. The shrimping industries should contribute an installment for the management of these zones. The fishing techniques should be expanded to more pelagic species in the Fishing Exclusive Zone. The financial sustainability should also be considered.</p>

**Cerro Sancancio, City of Manizales, Caldas Department (Colombia) - Humboldt Institute**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	<b>Cerro Sancancio (City of Manizales, Caldas Department)</b>
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p>Cerro Sancancio is a hill with an altitude between 1,910 and 2,220 MAMSL, located within premontane wet forest and lower montane wet forest life zones. It was declared as a green area of public interest by Municipal Agreement No. 107 of 1995. Later, it was also declared by the regional environmental authority (Corpocaldas) as a “municipal zone for cultural and ecological preservation” by Resolution 471 of 2009. The zone includes several forests and their fauna and flora species have been identified. Cerro</p>

	Sancancio is one of Manizales' landmark hills and is at risk for landslides due to deforestation and grazing.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	74,22 ha
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Boundaries are defined and mapped according to the Manizales Land Use Plan
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Governance is exercised and shared by Manizales Environment Department and the Cerro Sancancio's landowners in accordance to the Municipal Protected Area System (Spanish "SIMAP Manizales").
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	There is an environmental management plan defined by the Manizales Environment Department and activities are coordinated with landowners. In addition, there is an agreement of the Municipal Council by which landowners are exempted of property taxes. There are also land use agreements with the landowners to conserve steeply sloped areas where forestry is the main land use.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	Through conservation agreements with the private landowners
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	There is a legally binding document from the regional environmental authority (Corpocaldas) which defines the area as part of the Manizales Municipal Main Ecological Structure (Spanish EEP) and it is declared as an area for the preservation and defense of the ecological heritage.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	It can be easily overturned because it depends on the regional political will.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Medium
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	The measure is permanent all year round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The area is part of the Manizales Municipal Main Ecological Structure (Spanish EEP) and it is declared as an area for the preservation and defense of the ecological heritage.

Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Biodiversity conservation is an explicit management objective
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Although biodiversity conservation is the main objective of the area, there are pressure factors generating conflicts with this objective such as deforestation, livestock farming and urbanization.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The area cover all elements of biodiversity.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness is not measured
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	No biodiversity monitoring activities are performed. There is no supervision of conservation activities either.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Conservation is indeed a priority thanks to the strong commitment of the city hall and the regional environmental authority Corpocaldas
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	It is due to the governance and management of the zone.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	The area is an OMEC
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	

### Complejo de Humedales del Abanico del Río Pastaza (Peru) - Marina Rosales

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	Complejo de Humedales del Abanico del río Pastaza
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	Complejo de humedales del Abanico del río Pastaza. 05/06/02; Loreto; 3,827,329 ha; 04°00'S 075°25'W. An enormous alluvial fan composed of



	<p>volcanic sediments brought down from the Andes of Ecuador and deposited along the river Pastaza and associated streams and secondary rivers leading to the river Marañón. The site contains an extraordinary diversity of both permanent and seasonal wetland types, with abundant lakes and remnant islands. Some 9 species of fauna from CITES Appendix I are supported, as well as 70 from Appendix II, and 17 species found in IUCN's Red List are present. Parts of the site near the river Urituyacu are particularly important for the palms <i>Phytelephas tenuicaulis</i> and <i>Aphandra natalia</i>, and the Pastaza supports a large population of the palm <i>Elaeis oleifera</i>, seen only a few places elsewhere in Peru. Nearly 300 species of fish have been recorded. Human occupation, largely restricted to the banks of the principal rivers, is a low-density mix of indigenous and settler communities who cultivate banana, cassava, and maize. Studies of the area by WWF Perú and the Centro de Datos para la Conservación of the Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina facilitated the preparation of the site's designation. Ramsar site no. 1174.</p> <p>The Abanico del Pastaza in Loreto is the largest Ramsar site (wetland of international importance) in the Peruvian Amazon. It is home to about 300 fish species and food source for dozens of Achuar, Kandozi, Quechua, Cocama Cocamilla and Urarina indigenous communities. Over 300 indigenous communities were living there.</p> <p>Reasons for considering the area as an OECM:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a geographically defined space, not recognized as a protected area. It was determined that the biological uniqueness of the area did not justify a natural protected area at the national level. However, it has also been recognized by the Peruvian government as a priority site for biodiversity conservation.</li> </ul>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Its is governed and managed over the long-term in ways that deliver the effective and enduring in-situ conservation of biodiversity, with associated ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values since it is a Ramsar Site.</li> </ul>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	The Pastaza River Wetland Complex (also known as Abanico del Pastaza) is located in Loreto and covers over 3.8 million hectares of flooded forests, rivers and lakes at 100-200 meters above sea level.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	In 2002, the Abanico del Pastaza was declared by the Ramsar Convention as a Wetland of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat, due to the variety and importance of local wetlands for the conservation of various species. Defined by geographical rivers boundaries.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Governed, indigenous peoples and NGO – WWF.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	WWF has worked closely with the local population as a whole, especially with the Achuar, Quechua and Kandozi peoples, promoting the proper management of their resources in close collaboration with various civil society organizations, and local, regional and national authorities.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	<p>The Abanico del Pastaza was declared by the Ramsar Convention as a Wetland of International Importance.</p> <p>WWF worked on local capacity building. The communities are regularly monitoring the water quality of the Corrientes River themselves and thereby asserting their rights to a healthy and productive environment. It is developed the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of the Abanico del Pastaza wetland complex through the designation of a conservation mechanism, and the promotion of an integrated management of the basin with key stakeholders' involvement.</li> <li>• Community management of natural resources, in a</li> </ul>

	<p>sustainable and participatory way, with emphasis on fisheries and river turtles management, for the benefit of indigenous communities and, at the same time, to ensure the conservation of critical habitats for important species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy for best practices in oil extraction activities, by generating technical information about the effects of pollution and the measures in place to reduce its impacts, favoring the organizational strengthening of the Achuar (Corrientes) and Quechua (Pastaza) peoples, promoting mechanisms of dialogue and negotiation among all stakeholders, and implementing community environmental monitoring systems.</li> <li>• Organizational strengthening to address health issues, with emphasis on the problem of hepatitis that affects the people and their relationship with natural resources.</li> </ul>
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
<p>Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)</p>	<p>The Abanico del Pastaza was declared by the Ramsar Convention as a Wetland of International Importance.</p> <p>To drive a better land management, WWF fostered the creation and strengthening of spaces for both consultation and coordination. These spaces facilitated communication among key stakeholders throughout the basin, both in Peru and Ecuador, with support from Fundación Natura and Fundación Pachamama, and prompted the creation of the Pastaza River Basin Committee in Peru, in 2005. The committee was led by CORPI SL and consisted of indigenous federations from the Kandozi, Quechua and Achuar peoples in the Pastaza-Tigre area and their communities. The committee's main purpose was to control and monitor the various activities taking place in the area, in order to detect early on those that could jeopardize the natural resources in the Ramsar site. In this context, the committee contributed to the debate for the proposition of a new Water Law and the</p>

	regional ordinance regarding hydrocarbon activities in indigenous territories.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	WWF, together with the Peruvian Amazon Research Institute (IIAP), the Conservation Data Center of the Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina (CDC-UNALM) and the Natural History Museum of the National University of San Marcos (MHN-UNMSM), focused its efforts on developing the technical assessments that showed the high biological and socio-cultural value of the Abanico del Pastaza. In this way, the original mechanism proposed to guarantee the conservation of the area was the establishment of a natural protected area. However, after consulting with local communities, it opted for a figure that would not limit the territorial aspirations of the people and that would somehow confer protection to the place. Therefore, the whole Abanico del Pastaza wetland complex, covering an area of 3.8 million hectares, was declared a Ramsar site on June 5, 2002.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long - term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	<p>Protection of the Abanico del Pastaza wetland complex through the designation of a conservation mechanism, and the promotion of an integrated management of the basin with key stakeholders' involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community management of natural resources, in a sustainable and participatory way, with emphasis on fisheries and river turtles management, for the benefit of indigenous communities and, at the same time, to ensure the conservation of critical habitats for important species.</li> <li>• Advocacy for best practices in oil extraction activities, by generating technical information about the effects of pollution and the measures in place to reduce its impacts, favoring the organizational strengthening of the Achuar (Corrientes) and Quechua (Pastaza) peoples, promoting mechanisms of dialogue and negotiation among all stakeholders, and implementing community environmental monitoring systems.</li> <li>• Organizational strengthening to address health issues, with emphasis on the problem of hepatitis that affects the people and their relationship with natural resources.</li> </ul>

### 5. Management Objectives

<p>What are the area's management objectives?</p>	<p>Abanico del Pastaza wetland complex, covering an area of 3.8 million hectares, was declared a Ramsar site on June 5, 2002. It thus became the only one in Peru that does not correspond to a natural protected area, which highlights the importance of this designation, since it implied that the Peruvian government had committed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure the maintenance of its ecological characteristics</li> <li>• Promote a rational use</li> <li>• Conduct environmental impact assessments before making changes in the area</li> <li>• Promote training for the research, management and rational use of wetlands</li> </ul> <p>Conserve the following ecosystems (7 of the 20 wetland types described by the Ramsar Convention):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Permanent freshwater marshes/pools</li> <li>2. Freshwater, tree-dominated wetlands</li> <li>3. Shrub-dominated wetlands</li> <li>4. Seasonal/intermittent freshwater marshes/pools on inorganic soils</li> <li>5. Permanent rivers/streams/creeks</li> <li>6. Seasonal/intermittent freshwater lakes</li> <li>7. Permanent freshwater lakes</li> </ol> <p>Large communities of valuable timber species such as cedar and ceiba trees, 45 palm tree species, and over 800 tree and shrub species. Additionally, the wide variety of freshwater ecosystems is habitat for species such as the pink river dolphin (<i>Inia geoffrensis</i>) and the Amazonian manatee (<i>Trichechus inunguis</i>).</p>
<p>Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's</p>	<p>It is explicit management objective</p>

management?	
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes, it takes primacy over other objectives in case of conflict.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Yes, it does.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	<p>ACHIEVEMENT: Wetland Protection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation and designation of the Abanico del Pastaza wetland complex as the largest RAMSAR site in the Peruvian Amazon</li> <li>• Establishment of the Pastaza River Basin Committee, comprising representatives of the Kandozi, Quechua and Achuar peoples</li> <li>• Local environmental agenda and participation of indigenous organizations in the corresponding decision making process</li> <li>• Start of Ecological-Economic Zoning (EEZ) in the Pastaza basin and the Datem province, with participatory and intercultural approach</li> </ul> <p>ACHIEVEMENT: Wetland Restoration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fisheries management</li> <li>• Decades of mistrust between indigenous communities and fisheries authorities reversed as a result of better cultural understanding</li> <li>• Nearly 200 artisanal fishermen formalized and recognized</li> <li>• Implementation of 2 fisheries management plans, 2007-2011 and 2011-2015</li> <li>• 2 fisheries surveillance groups recognized by the government and empowered to represent them in fisheries control and surveillance</li> <li>• Reduction in fish spawn commercialization (illegal fishing indicator) from 7544 kg in 2005 to less than 1895 kg in 2011</li> <li>• Stable capture sizes for 5 of the 8 species of commercial importance</li> <li>• Conservation policy measures in line with the local reality and based on science: 1) Identification and establishment of potential spawning areas; 2)</li> </ul>

	<p>fishing ban during reproductive season; and 3) capture size definition for the boquichico (<i>Prochilodus nigricans</i>)</p> <p>ACHIEVEMENT: Management of the taricaya</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over 40,000 turtles released into their natural habitat between 2004 and 2011</li> <li>• First taricaya management plan approved outside a natural protected area</li> <li>• Income increase by up to four times from the sale of managed turtles</li> <li>• Increased hatching success under management practices, from 42% in 2004 to 82% in 2011</li> <li>• Increases in abundance indices: from 8 taricaya females/km in 2010 to 18 females/km in 2011</li> <li>• Replication of management experience by Quechua and Achuar communities in the Pastaza basin</li> </ul> <p>ACHIEVEMENT: Social and environmental commitments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of heavy metals in the water and in the blood of local residents of the Corrientes River basin was proven for the first time.</li> <li>• A community environmental monitoring system with FEDIQUEP and FECONACO, which identifies liabilities and oil spills, was implemented.</li> <li>• Indigenous federations in the area presented their case to the Congress of the Republic of Peru for the first time.</li> <li>• The company involved admitted the impacts of oil activities and committed to reinject 100% of its wastewater into underground formations.</li> </ul>
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
<p>Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?</p>	<p>Protection of the Abanico del Pastaza wetland complex through the designation of a conservation mechanism, and the promotion of an integrated management of the basin with key stakeholders' involvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community management of natural resources, in a sustainable and participatory way, with emphasis on fisheries and river turtles management,</li> </ul>

	<p>for the benefit of indigenous communities and, at the same time, to ensure the conservation of critical habitats for important species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advocacy for best practices in oil extraction activities, by generating technical information about the effects of pollution and the measures in place to reduce its impacts, favoring the organizational strengthening of the Achuar (Corrientes) and Quechua (Pastaza) peoples, promoting mechanisms of dialogue and negotiation among all stakeholders, and implementing community environmental monitoring systems.</li> <li>• Organizational strengthening to address health issues, with emphasis on the problem of hepatitis that affects the people and their relationship with natural resources.</li> </ul>
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Conservation objectives take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	The current effectiveness is due to the area's governance and management. It is important recognize the strong work developed by WWF. This NGO has been leading conservation and sustainable management activities there.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	It is an OECM.
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	<p>Source: Germaná, C., Lozano, L., Montoya, M., Nielsen, K., Soto, A., Tumi, A., Valqui, M., Moya, L. and H. Flores. 2013. 10 + years in the Amanico del Pastaza. Nature, cultures and challenges in the north Peruvian Amazon. WWF. Lima. Peru. Luglio, Ch, Nielsen, K and Pérez, D. (Eds). Retrieved from <a href="http://awsassets.panda.org/downloads/pastaza_en_1.pdf">http://awsassets.panda.org/downloads/pastaza_en_1.pdf</a></p> <p>Ramsar. 2002. Ficha informativa de los Humedales de Ramsar. Complejo de Humedales del Abanico del Pastaza. Retrieved from <a href="https://es.scribd.com/document/65961770/RAMSAR-Complejo-de-humedales-del-Abanico-del-rio-Pastaza">https://es.scribd.com/document/65961770/RAMSAR-Complejo-de-humedales-del-Abanico-del-rio-Pastaza</a></p>



**“El Breo” Conservation Concession (Peru) - Jeff Pradel**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	Conservation concession “El Breo”, located in Region San Martin, Peru.
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p>This concession covers the Yungas Ecoregion, also known as Selva Alta, located between 800 and 3800 masl. It is characterized by its humid or subhumid steep slopes forests, with dense to semi-dense vegetation, trees whose average height varies between 9 and 25 m.</p> <p>This concession has been included into one of the priority hotspots for the Tropical Andes. It is part of the conservation corridor of Abiseo-Cóndor-Kutukú, and is located within one of the 9 conservation priority areas of the Peruvian Yungas.</p> <p>A feature that stands out is the presence of endemic mammals, amphibians and birds of the montane forest.</p> <p>It is part of an important sector considered of high priority for conservation, in the territorial planning proposals of San Martín department.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	113 thousand hectares.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The area is a forest and its boundaries haven been clearly stated in the settlement resolution. The criteria applied in this delimitation were the very limits of the Huayabamba river basin and its main tributaries.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area’s governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Private governance.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	The government grants the concession to a person, company or NGO, for a period of 40 years.

How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	The concessionaire is responsible for implementing biodiversity conservation projects, in accordance with the concession scope.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Resolution issued by the administrative authority (Directorial Resolution No. 034-2010-DRASAM-DRNYAAA) and the signing of a concession agreement.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	For contract-breaching behavior, or expiration of the concession (40 years).
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	40 years, renewable.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The primary objective is the conservation of 'biological diversity'.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	It is an explicit primary objective.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	All biodiversity elements in the area.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Yes, it is under evaluation by the Forest Monitoring Agency in Peru, which has not issued any reports on significant deforestation.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	It has not been reported any significant deforestation in the area.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Yes.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management,	The current effectiveness is due to the area's governance and management.

or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	I believe that, with the exception of the criterion of "long term", which should be set higher (40 years), it does meet all the criteria of the Guide.
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	No further comments.

# 3. EUROPE

## Scapa Flow (UK) - Dan Laffoley

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	Scapa Flow has a long history as a safe harbour in the North of Scotland with easy access to both the North Sea and the Atlantic Ocean. It has been the base for the allied North Atlantic Fleet in two World Wars. It is also an important commercial harbour to this day with an oil terminal on Flotta one of the islands in Scapa Flow. It is also an important fishing area especially for crabs and lobsters used by local inshore fishermen. Perhaps its most recent claim to fame is as an important scuba dive location for those who wish to explore the wrecks of the First World War German fleet that was captured and held in Scapa Flow before they were all scuttled by their crews. This has provided local fishermen with additional income and helped them diversify into providing diving trips. At the same time these wrecks and other historical wrecks such as the Royal Oak the flag ship of the North Atlantic Fleet which was sunk by a German submarine and is now a war grave provide protection from mobile gear and as such enhance the natural benthic biodiversity.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Scapa Flow covers an area of 324.5 sq. km and contains in the order of 1 billion cubic metres of water
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Scapa flow is a natural harbour with an entrance on the west between the islands on Mainland Orkney and Hoy and in the south-east Hoxa Sound, that lies between the islands of South Ronaldsay and Hoy. There were up until 1943 four other narrow entrances into Scapa Flow on its eastern boundary but these were blocked with the building of the Churchill Barriers that were designed to prevent further U-boat attacks. These barriers remain.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	The area is under the jurisdiction of the Orkney Islands Harbour Authority.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize	The importance of the protection of the natural and historical heritage of

and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Scapa Flow is recognized by OIHA and there are various measures in place to enhance its protection and good management such as a non-tives monitoring programme, an annual monitoring programme of selected sites, good practice guidelines to manage the diving tourism industry, etc.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Orkney Islands Council Harbour Authority is the statutory body who oversee the operations in Scapa Flow and there are various directions and byelaws in place to manage the various activities. E.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">The Orkney Pilotage Direction</a> (2.6Mb)</li> <li>• <a href="#">General ByeLaws</a> (160k)</li> <li>• <a href="#">Orkney Harbour Areas (Vehicles) Byelaws</a> (134k)</li> <li>• <a href="#">The Orkney Harbours [Petroleum] Byelaws</a> (157k)</li> <li>• <a href="#">The Orkney Harbours [Liquefied Gases] Byelaws</a> (251k)</li> </ul>
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	These are statutory measures that cannot be easily overturned.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year-round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The main objectives are the safe management of the harbour area whilst at the same time conserving the natural and cultural heritage
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	It is implicit.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Areas of Scapa Flow and the surrounding land are designated for the natural and cultural heritage, e.g. historic wreck sites, Special areas of Conservation and Special protection Areas as well as adjacent local and national nature reserves on land
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The different designations cover a range of different species.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	The quality of the natural environment and issues such as introduction of non-native species from ballast and ship hull fouling are monitored on a regular basis through various monitoring schemes that are undertaken at

	regular intervals. There is also monitoring for toxic algal blooms to inform the shellfish fishery with the powers in place to close such fisheries if toxic blooms occur.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	With the areas around the various historic wrecks effectively closed to all types of mobile gear there has by default been a high degree of protection afforded to parts of the benthic ecosystem within Scapa Flow and there is evidence in these areas of thriving maerl beds, flame shell beds, horse mussel reefs and even fan shells which are very rare elsewhere in Scotland
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	The situation and the condition of the sea bed habitat is entirely due to the fact that the designation that are in place have provided the necessary protection for around the last 100 years.

**Part of Hope Quarry, Peak District National Park, Derbyshire (England) - Nigel Dudley**

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	The limestone quarry and cement works exist within the Peak District National park and was established before the PA was set up. Around half the area is a quarry and works, and clearly not of conservation value (although peregrines nest happily very close to where stone is still being blasted). Around half the quarry is no longer worked and is managed as a nature reserve, with high cliffs, important calcicole plant species and returning woodland. Extensive restoration has taken place.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	The reserve covers a few hectares
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The whole site is owned by Lafarge Company, now merged with Holcim, purchased from the original UK owner.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous	Privately managed within the national park

etc.	
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	The cement works occupies an ambiguous position – an important employer but also a source of noise, dust and heavy lorries. The national park authorities almost certainly wish it was not within the PA borders. The nature conservation aspect is known and respected.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	The area is managed by the company. Lafarge has expressed formal commitment to restoration and conservation within its sites, has a monitoring system and has invested time and money into conservation. The manager is, in private life, an active raptor conservation volunteer.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	The company can change its policies whenever it likes, although would suffer negative publicity. The area set aside as a reserve is not in any particular danger; it is worked out and effectively waste land, unlikely to be used for other purposes but with significant conservation value.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Medium term; the reserve has been managed for conservation already for many years.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	To maintain cliff habitat and calcicole plant communities
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	It is a small area, important for birds, plants and some insect species.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Not formally; it is probably subject to bird monitoring by volunteer groups
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	It is effectively conserving biodiversity within the limits outlined above



<p>How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet</p>	<p>The current effectiveness is due to the company's decision to restore the area and manage as a nature reserve. Several other former quarry sites within the national park are owned and managed by The Derbyshire Wildlife Trust</p>
---	---

# 4. AFRICA

### Hunting Zones in North Cameroon (Cameroon) - Paul Scholte

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	Hunting zones in North Region Cameroon  Note that in South-East Cameroon, hunting zones overlap with production forests, reason we do not include them here.
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	26 Hunting zones (2.384.714 ha) 7 Community hunting zones (283.723 ha) This totals 5.6% of the national territory
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Boundaries are mapped and generally follow natural limits
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Government
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	Government has leased the area to private enterprises (hunting zones) or to communities (represented by local government) (community hunting zones), many of which have been leased to private enterprises.
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	Each private enterprise should produce an annual report of its activities following the outline of its management plan (to be updated every 5 years). One should note however that this is not always enforced
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Yes hunting zones are pa In Cameroon both national parks and hunting zones are parts of the 'permanent forest estate', highlighting the permanent land use character of wildlife. Whereas national parks are relatively clearly defined, hunting zones are not unequivocally defined with respect to land use such as pastoralism and permanent settlements. One may assume, however that land uses are limited to the ones that do jeopardize the permanent character of the

	'wildlife estate'.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Very difficult, needs decision at prime minister level
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year-round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	Hunting is regulated through
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	I would say implicit, although one can also reason that there is a clear (hunting) interest in having biodiversity conservation (limited to the large mammals)
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Targeting the main (hunted) mammals. One should add however that several of these (elephant, hippo, lion) are also key species that
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Formally it is, as there should (every 5 years) a wildlife inventory, that is however conducted in only a number of hunting zones
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	Most hunting zones (under active management) are (see publications below) A wildlife inventory is mandatory every 5 years
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Strictly speaking, hunting objectives will prevail (but mostly concur with conservation objectives)
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	Due to governance and management, although the remoteness of most hunting zones also contributes to their effectiveness
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	Yes I do,  Results of this study highlight the importance of year-round presence of conservation agents for the survival of hippopotamus and likely other large mammals as well. Increasing numbers of park guards, and deploying them

	<p>effectively in the field should therefore be a priority. The effectiveness of park guards is intrinsically linked to the state of road infrastructures.</p> <p>It will be essential to keep the hunting zones 2 and 3 operational and to re-establish sport hunting in zone 9, to reinforce patrolling. This is in contradiction with the current declining importance of sport hunting (UICN, 2009), showing the need to develop new perspectives for sustainable use of the hunting zones.</p>
<p>Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.</p>	<p>References and abstracts / conclusions:</p> <p>Lescuyer,G., J. N.Poufoun, L. Defo, D. Bastin and P.Scholte 2016. Does trophy hunting remain a profitable business model for conserving biodiversity in Cameroon? Int.Forestry Review 18 (S1): 108-118  <a href="http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/articles/ALescuyer1602.pdf">http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/articles/ALescuyer1602.pdf</a></p> <p>SUMMARY: In Central Africa, trophy hunting constitutes an incentive-based approach for sustainable wildlife management. We collected data from the wildlife administration, safari hunting enterprises and local wildlife management committees, to provide an order of magnitude of the financial performance of this sector in Cameroon. In 2012, trophy hunting was likely to generate an annual turnover of € 7.5 million and its added value could amount to only 0.0001% of GDP although these hunting zones cover 12% of the national territory. The profit margin for professional guides had become negative, with a net annual profit around € –0.5 million. The severe crisis in the trophy hunting sector is mainly due to an increase in the management costs of the hunting zones and the diminishing price of hunting safaris. The State plays a crucial role in enhancing the financial attractiveness of trophy hunting by the restoration of security in the Northern region and by technical measures to (1) clarify the allocation process for hunting areas, (2) simplify regulations and (3) establish an incentives system for law</p>

enforcement at national and local levels.

Hiol Hiol, F, A. Larzilliere, F. Palla et P. Scholte 2015. République du Cameroun. Pp. 41-66 In : Doumenge C., Palla F., Scholte P., Hiol Hiol F. & Larzilliere A. (Eds.), 2015. Aires protégées d'Afrique centrale – Etat 2015. OFAC, Kinshasa, RDC et Yaoundé, Cameroun: 256 p.  
<http://www.observatoire-comifac.net/edAP2015.php>

Scholte, P. and E. Iyah 2016. Declining population of the Vulnerable common hippopotamus *Hippopotamus amphibius* in Bénoué National Park, Cameroon (1976–2013): the importance of conservation presence. *Oryx* 50: 506 – 513.

Scholte, P., F. Nguimkeng and E. Iyah 2017. Good News from North-Central Africa: Largest Population of Vulnerable Common Hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius*) is stable. *Oryx* 51: 218-221.

North-Central Africa, i.e. Cameroon, CAR, Chad, used to hold important populations of large mammals, including hippopotamus. Their status and trends remain poorly known, leading to suspension of hippopotamus trophy exports from Cameroon. Using the same methodology as in 2000 and 2008, we counted hippopotamus in Faro National Park and bordering hunting zones in 2014. We counted 685 individuals over 97 km of river, compared to 647 and 525 in 2000 and 2008 respectively. The stability contrasts the declines in large mammal populations across North-Central Africa. We attribute this conservation success to private (safari hunting) efforts complementing declined state protection. An influx of transhumant cattle and gold diggers highlights the fragility of the present situation however. We recommend increasing public-private conservation efforts, including incentives for the safari hunting industry presently under pressure as well.

### Yélisoubé, Loos Islands, Conakry (Guinea) - Alkaly Doumbouya

Overview	
<p>Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM</p>	<p>Located Nearly 2km from Tamara Island Yélisoubvé (Île Corail) belongs to a group of 3 inhabited Islands (with Île Blanche (8.75ha), Îlot Cabri (0.65ha)) and many others Islets (Îlot de la Bouteille, Île Poulet, Île Fousset), in a Fauna Sanctuaries of Loos Islands (Marine Turtles conservation and bird nesting), at least 1 hour from Conakry.</p> <p>The site is chosen for its cultural value. Ritual ceremonies are organized by indigenous peoples of Yélisoubé (coral island) .is made of granite rocks in its peripheral area. There is a cave in the middle part, while its central area is occupied by a dense shrubland whose undergrowth consists mainly of intertwined vines and thorny</p> <p>The island Yélisoubé has a rich and varied flora</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An upper stratum is a settlement dominated by <i>Ficus ovata</i> with fewer structures as <i>Terminalia superba</i>, <i>Albizia zygia</i>, <i>Anisophillia laurina</i>, <i>Bombax costatum</i>, <i>Cola nitida</i>, <i>Dialium guineensis</i>, <i>Ficus exasperatas</i>, <i>Parkia biglobosa</i>, <i>Avicennia africana</i>, <i>Elaeis guineensis</i></li> </ul> <p>There is also a underground consisting of <i>Vitex</i>, <i>Tricalcia</i>, <i>Pavetta</i>, <i>ficus capensis</i> and grasses mainly composed of <i>Ficus vogeli</i> and some halophytes grasslands (salt flats).</p> <p>On the island, we find three types of wildlife for the three environments offered by the area .It there's first aquatic fauna composed of demersal fish, pelagic fish, sharks, cephalopods, crustaceans, reptiles (turtles). <i>Sousa dolphin</i> and whales are also seen in the area.</p> <p>The Wildlife consists of reptiles and avifauna. The most present reptile is <i>Varanus niloticus</i> and some unidentified snakes</p> <p>The traditional practices of local management of natural resources include local rules for better heritage conservation (prohibit use and consumption of certain species of plants and animals, limiting access to certain areas of sacred forests, ponds and caves, use of certain plants and animal species for</p>

	traditional medicine needs
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Yélisoubé or Corail Islands = 3.75 ha
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Only Yélisoubé or Corail Islands is considered as sacred site by the indigenous Baga and Mandényi and they have established boundaries by themselves
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	Despite of the weak presence of a representatives of the Ministry of Environment (3 persons staff), Yélisoubé is managed by an Elder Council, a college of insider headed by the Older Ousmane Kobélé YATTARA
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Access to this site is regulated. Visitors must first have the authorization of the island of managers and a guide is always available for visits and offerings. For the offerings, the site manager before departure made incantations imploring for the success of the trip, once the gift items (chicken, white bread, colas, goat, ram and oxen sometimes ....) are handed to the priest before the central cavern imploring the grace of the Gods of the island to grant the wishes of the donor. Slaughtered animals are consumed locally on the site and those released are living on the island under the protection of Gods of the site.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Until now, there is no formal instrument for governance and conservation management. But the site is since long undefined time under the
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	On the Fauna Sanctuary of Loos Islands, the process has started to implement an MPA with management plan. But the sacred Yélisoubé Site is maintaining its indigenous based management methods and regulated access.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long time
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	The measures are in place year round in Yélisoubé
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	



What are the area's management objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Share understanding of natural phenomena and limit access to resources (sacred, forbidden, reserved spaces)</li> <li>• Propose and enforce usage rules (limits, relationships, forms, total prohibitions in respect of certain species, etc.) by earlier local sanctions.</li> <li>• Preserving the site of any degradation or any cultivation</li> <li>• Mutual all forces and volunteers within and among communities</li> <li>• rely on the community for collective solutions to decisions</li> <li>• build on solidarity and reciprocity within the group</li> <li>• encouraged to specialize in different domains</li> <li>• perpetuate local religious and spiritual beliefs and values</li> </ul>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Biodiversity conservation is an implicit management objective
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The biodiversity conservation objective does not take primacy over other objectives. It is the cultural values of these animists communities witch are most important.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Yélisoubé considered as a sacred site, all biodiversity elements were also covered. It is forbidden to take any species there, if not only the offerings accepted by the indigenous site manager.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	There is no evaluation of the management effectiveness, which is known only by formal created Protected Areas.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Through the sacred ceremonies on Yélisoubé site, biodiversity is well conserve there. The site is really preserved as pictures can show.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	

**Mabaso Community Stewardship Project, KZN Province (South Africa) – Onkemetse Nteta**

**Overview**

Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM

The Mgundeni Community property, owned by the Mgundeni Community Trust, was identified in 2006 as a pilot site within the KZN Biodiversity Stewardship Programme. Following a detailed biodiversity assessment on the property an area was identified as qualifying for a Nature Reserve. However, due to the landowners' desire to continue with commercial livestock grazing, it was agreed to pursue a Biodiversity Agreement for a portion of the property.

Wakkerstroom Montane Grassland covers most of the property (this grassland type is classified as "Near Threatened"). These grasslands are generally in good condition, and support a high diversity of birds for this habitat type. The grassland provides habitat for five Red Data Book bird species, being potential breeding habitat for Wattled Crane (Critically Endangered), and Rudd's Lark (Critically Endangered) as well as potential forage habitat for Yellow-breasted Pipit (Vulnerable), Grey Crowned Crane (Vulnerable), the Southern Bald Ibis (Vulnerable) and the Secretarybird (Near threatened). Also, the land has significant cultural and heritage value to the Mgundeni community.

The site is essential for achieving the KwaZulu-Natal provincial biodiversity targets and qualified as a Biodiversity Agreement Area. Ownership and use of this land by the Mgundeni community was made possible through the Land Reform programme of the South African government. This community is one many in South Africa that were dispossessed and forcefully removed from their land by the previous colonial/apartheid governments. Conservation agencies have to take this situation into consideration when engaging communities in biodiversity stewardship and protected areas expansion. The focus is mostly on ensuring sustainable land management through providing technical and financial support, with voluntary

	agreements between the community and conservation agencies. The stewardship status recognizes the conservation value of an area, without placing restrictions such as those in formally declared protected areas.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	1472 ha (3637 acres)
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Area surveyed by professional Land Surveyor, and a Survey diagram produced. Size of the area also recorded in title deed.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	Mgundeni community got their land back in 1994 and the community is currently under the leadership of iNkosi Z.G Mabaso. When they got their land they formed the Mgundeni Trust, as a formal structure to govern the land.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes, There was a lengthy community engagement and negotiation process to explain the concept of biodiversity stewardship and options suitable for this land. The Biodiversity Agreement option provides access to incentives and technical support, and does not restrict community land use.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Memorandum of Agreement signed between the community, KZN Ezemvelo Wildlife (conservation agency) and WWF-SA. A management plan was developed and a Community Advisory Forum was also established.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	The community can opt out when contract lapses
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Minimum duration of 5 years for BA option
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Yes, there is an Annual Plan of Operation developed to guide day-to-day management activities
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	The Mabaso Community Biodiversity Agreement has the following purposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to conserve the indigenous biodiversity on the property, maintaining the ecological integrity and natural character of the area;</li> <li>• to promote the sustainable utilization of the grazing resources, based on best management practice principles;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to promote management activities to improve the biodiversity value on the property; and</li> <li>• to develop a strategy that will support the existence of appropriate business opportunities on the land.</li> </ul>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit objective. The mission of the BA agreement: To conserve the indigenous biodiversity of the property, and demonstrate an example of a viable conservation land-use in an agricultural landscape in Northern KZN.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The future development plans are discussed at the initial phases of the negotiation. Portions of the Land can be used for other developments. However, developments can not infringe on the terms set in the contract.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	It covers most elements of biodiversity. The biodiversity assessment conducted prior to assigning the stewardship status is used to inform the development and operationalization of the management plan.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Yes. Performance is measured against the objectives set in the management plan.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Yes. The conservation agencies conduct annual assessments/audits to ensure compliance and to provide advice on management operations.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	Overall, the land was in a good state prior to the stewardship agreement. However, the agreement adds a layer of security by raising awareness of the biodiversity on the land, establishing an advisory forum, assessing the biodiversity and developing a management plan. This plan includes the clearing of alien plants and rehabilitation of degraded land. The goal is to maintain and sustain biodiversity on the land.

# 5. ASIA

## Hutan Harapan, Sumatera (Indonesia) - Agus B. Utomo

Overview	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p>Hutan Harapan or the Rainforest of Hope is formerly commercially logged lowland tropical forest in central-south Sumatra, Indonesia. Despite past intensive logging activity, Hutan Harapan is still rich in biodiversity and is an important habitat for over 1,350 different species; 133 of which are globally threatened. This includes several endangered species such as the Sumatran tiger and Sumatran elephant. Hutan Harapan represents more than 20% of this particular forest type - a forest “island” surrounded by plantations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 307 bird species, representing 49% of Sumatran bird species or 72% of lowland bird species in Sumatra.</li><li>• 64 species of mammals, including Sumatran tiger (<i>Panthera tigris sumatrae</i>), Sumatran elephant (<i>Elephas maximus</i>), Malay tapir (<i>Tapirus indicus</i>), and Sun bear (<i>Helarctus malayanus</i>).</li><li>• 55 species of amphibians, including 8 categorized as globally threatened species.</li><li>• 71 species of reptiles, including 5 categorized as globally threatened species</li><li>• 123 species of fresh water fishes representing 20% all fresh water fishes in Sumatra, including 4 categorized as globally threatened species.</li><li>• 728 plant species representing 89% of known plant species in Sumatra.</li></ul> <p>Hutan Harapan’s global significance is recognized internationally: the area forms part of Sundaland biodiversity hotspot (one of only 34 global Biodiversity Hotspots) as well as being part of BirdLife International’s global</p>

	<p>network of Endemic Bird Areas (EBAs) and Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs)<sup>26</sup>. Hutan Harapan consist of 2 IBAs.</p> <p>Hutan Harapan is also home to 132 families of traditional Batin Sembilan people whose live depend on forest resources.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Hutan Harapan is 98,000 ha situated in the southern part of Sumatra. The northern area is in Jambi Province and the southern area is in South Sumatra Province.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	<p>Hutan Harapan is an Ecosystem Restoration Concession (ERC) which is a new category of forestry concession in Indonesia. License for ERC is granted by Minister of Environment and Forestry to manage production forest areas for restoration purposes instead of logging. Each of the ERC licenses is granted to a specific forest area to be managed by a specific business entity. Therefore the area is defined legally under a licensing procedure based on proposal submitted by the business entity to the ministry. Once the license is granted, the boundaries on the ground will be defined according to the area approved in the license.</p> <p>Business entity may submit application to obtain EREC license for specific areas within production forests that are allocated or ERC development.</p>
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	As a forestry concession (ERC) and as required by law, Hutan Harapan is managed by a private company. Therefore, the company is legally responsible in managing the ERC. The forest area under which the license is issued, however, is categorized under state forest land. To manage the concession, a land-use plan has been developed consisting of 3 main zones: protection, production, and infrastructure. Within the production zone,

<sup>26</sup> BirdLife International. 2012. BirdLife International Indonesia Program. UK

	collaboration and livelihood zones have also been designated to work with communities living inside the concession. Therefore in these zones, the management of the area is based on agreements established with the communities.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	By granting ERC license to specific forest areas, the government (Ministry of Environment and Forestry) recognizes the need to maintain the remaining natural forests, to restore the ecosystem functions, as well as improving the forest productivity. Although the ERC license is not granted for conservation, it is also not a license to extract timbers. Hence the purpose of the license is not to manage the designated areas for logging, but for restoration purposes. Local communities such as Batin Sembilan people are supportive given their dependency to forest resources. Local governments support the establishment of Hutan Harapan which is the first ERC in Indonesia. Recommendations from District as well as Provincial Government were part of the requirement to secure ERC license for Hutan Harapan.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	The licensing policy under which ERC is defined is part of government regulation approved by the national parliament. Each of the ERC license granted is legally binding. For Hutan Harapan, 2 ministerial decrees were issued and associated with the management license.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	ERC license, as it is also the case for other type of forestry concession licenses in Indonesia, can only be revoked by government if the concession holder failed to comply with the obligation and or considered perform poorly based on periodical assessment. Other possibility that the management over the area come to an end is if the concession holder returned the license back to the government before the end of license period.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	The ERC license to manage the southern part of Hutan Harapan is for 100 years, starting in 2008. The second license to manage the northern part is



	for 60 years starting 2017. Other ERCs in Indonesia have the duration of their license for 60 years which can be extended for another 35 years.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Conservation measures in protection zone can be as long as the duration of the license (100 or 60 years) and even so during the restoration period.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	Hutan Harapan management has multiple-objectives recognizing the legal status as production forest as well as the importance of the ecosystem contained. The management is aimed at improving the forest resource productivity, protecting/conserving the remaining lowland rainforest, sustaining livelihood of the communities that depend on Hutan Harapan forest resources, developing innovative methods for rehabilitating degraded lands and secondary forests as well as restoring the ecosystem functions.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Implicit objective
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	According to the zonation, biodiversity conservation is being addressed in each of the zone. In the protection zone, biodiversity conservation takes a higher priority whereas in production zone, the primary objective is on forest productivity and livelihood development. Nevertheless, as the management paradigm being put in place is an ecosystem based approach, the zonation is not meant to be strictly applied.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	<p>Establishing Hutan Harapan as an ERC is considered as a conservation measure. Without such a measure, a significant portion of the areas might have been converted into monoculture plantation. The measure has been benefiting the species, habitat, and the people that depend on the ecosystem services provided.</p> <p>In terms of its management, Hutan Harapan has selected key species of multiple-taxa to monitor progress of forest restoration. At the same time, management interventions also targeting habitat restoration as part of forest restoration strategies. Further, by establishing a specific zone for the protection of the remaining natural forests allows Hutan Harapan to take</p>

	measures benefiting most elements of biodiversity contained.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	<p>Framework to measure the management effectiveness of ERCs is not yet available. ERCs in Indonesia is a major shift of forest management paradigm moving away from timber (commodity) based toward ecosystem based. Practical implementation of the approach remain a challenge and need to be supported with knowledge and learning as well as strong regulatory support which should be away from commodity based focused.</p> <p>Regulatory on management plans of ERCs are being improved to allow ERC holders to implement their management objectives as well as deal to with socio, economic and physical conditions on the ground.</p>
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	<p>ERCs open possibility for biodiversity conservation in Indonesia's production forest areas in a long run. If the areas are of important biodiversity areas (for example Hutan Harapan), ERCs can support species as well as habitat conservation. The de facto logging moratorium applied in ERCs provides opportunity for long term biodiversity conservation. Establishment of ERCs in important biodiversity areas such as Hutan Harapan is a conservation measure as otherwise the degraded forests within it would have been gone due to conversion for other uses.</p> <p>ERCs can also support connectivity conservation is well-placed in the landscape. It can provide connectivity to formal protected areas. Hence, the conservation effectiveness of ERCs can be measured at species, site, habitat, and landscape levels. Available tools might be used or further developed to measure the effectiveness at the different levels.</p>
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	As noted above, by establishing Hutan Harapan as an ERC, the remaining lowland rainforests in Sumatra can be maintained or otherwise would have been used or converted into monoculture. This measure encompasses the duration of the license (60 or 100 years). The de facto logging moratorium in Hutan Harapan ERC is taking place which means degradation and/or

	<p>deforestation can be reduced.</p> <p>There is still un-known, however, what would happen once the licenses (for ERC management) are expired. It will depend on the future policy on ERCs in Indonesia.</p>
--	---

### Community-based MPA: Ay and Rhun Island, Maluku (Indonesia) – Hesti Widodo

Overview	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p>Ay and Rhun Island are two islands located in Eastern Indonesia. In the past, Rhun or Run Island according to the Treaty of Westminster should be returned to England (1652-1654) but it failed. After the second Anglo-Dutch War of 1665-1667 with the Treaty of Breda England and the United Provinces of Netherland agreed on the status quo to formally let the Dutch to take Rhun as source of the value of the nutmeg (<i>Mystica fragrant</i>) and England to take Manhattan Island.</p> <p>Marine Rapid Assessment conducted in 2012 showed that Ay, Rhun, and Hatta Islands has high marine biodiversity and home to Napoleon wrasse. There were 238 coral species identified and 683 fish species found in Banda Sea.</p> <p>Sasi, traditional wisdom for seasonal closure, is common in the area to harvest seacucumber and Trochus - coneshell. Currently there is an effort to revitalize Sasi to sustain fisheries.</p> <p>The establishment of community-based MPA in Ay and Rhun Island if succeed in the process will be the first to make use national (government) law and Adat law post issuance of Law No. 23/2014 on Local Government. The zoning system of the MPA integrated SASI area as local wisdom.</p>
2. Boundaries & Geographical Space	
What size is the area?	47968.74 ha
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Declared by community with village regulation and traditional law through participatory process.

<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	Current: traditional law (adat) and village regulation The village is managed under national government authority but in Ay and Rhun Island community has traditional rights based on Adat law to manage marine areas.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes, but clear legal aspect for establishment is not solely based on traditional. It still need to combine between traditional law and existing district/city/provincial government decree
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Yes. Ay and Rhun Island community-based MPA are established under Adat rules that is written in the form of village regulation (Peraturan Negeri).
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Adat Law is not a written rules; it needs government rules/regulation to officiate. Adat law is strong to set every part of the community to follow, Adat law is not easy to be overturned in Ay and Rhun Island that any change will require approval from all members of ORANG LIMA (sea protector, forest protector, religious leader, women leader, youth leader). Orang Lima is structure of Adat in Ay Island. In making such decision related to Adat rules, the Orang Lima will need to discuss internally within them, then they have to discuss with village government (pemerintah negeri), then socialize to community. If community is not supportive then Orang Lima should try to resolute.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Medium term; any change in the decision will require long process of communications and consensus with community.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	In absence of Adat law, national regulation takes place.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To sustain fisheries</li> <li>2. To develop the area as marine tourism destination</li> <li>3. To sustain traditional wisdom</li> </ol>

Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Yes. The area will protect coral reefs, Napoleon wrasse, hammerhead shark. Bomb fishing, cyanide-poison fishing are prohibited in the area. Sand, stone, woods for government development activities are prohibited to exploit resources from the island. Those resources are only to fulfill the need of internal community (building house).
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	It is explicitly stated all endangered-protected-threatened species <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Turtle</li> <li>- Hammerhead shark</li> <li>- Napoleon wrasse</li> <li>- Giant clam (Tridacna)</li> <li>- Cetacean</li> </ul> Adat law is stronger in the case of conflict
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Most elements of biodiversity covered in the regulation such as coral reefs protection, turtle and hammerhead shark conservation.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	It is not yet measured using Indonesia MPA Management Effectiveness Evaluation tool (EKPP3K) but it will soon use this tool. The plan is to evaluate management effectiveness once in two year.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	The area is just recently declared in December 2015 as community-based MPA with Adat rules applied. As it still needs to get formal acknowledgement under Indonesia formal law, there is an effort to ensure the initiative and conservation effort and legalize under Provincial government decree; as part of Provincial Zoning Plan and Marine Spatial Management. To measure effectiveness in term of biodiversity aspect, there is initial effort to train local communities to conduct participatory reef monitoring.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	If Indonesia MPA Management Effectiveness Evaluation tool come to use, evaluation is more on filling in score cards on data collections and activities implemented to target biophysics, socioeconomic, and governance aspects

	of the area.
--	--------------

**Tana' Ulen Lapan River (Indonesia) - Cristina Eghenter**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	<i>Tana' Ulen</i> Lapan River, a branch of the Berini River, tributary of the Bahau River, District of Malinau, North Kalimantan, Indonesia.
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p><i>Tana' ulen</i>, is <i>tana'</i>, or land, which is <i>m/ulen</i> or restricted, prohibited, a forest area with restricted access. In the past, <i>tana' ulen</i> functioned mostly as primary forest reserves managed by the aristocratic families on behalf of the entire community. The forest was considered a public good for which the aristocratic leaders were entrusted as managers and keepers. Criteria for choosing a <i>tana' ulen</i> location included: a good hunting ground with abundance of wildlife, a stream or river where easy to catch fish, valuable timber (for construction), and rich in NTFP with high economic value for local people. In general, <i>tana' ulen</i> area is strategically located near the village so that management and control are easier.</p> <p><i>Tana' ulen</i> Lapan River (Long Berini village) is one of nine <i>tana' ulen</i> forest areas mapped and documented in the <i>wilayah adat</i> of Hulu Bahau in the interior of Kalimantan. The area has been traditionally under the customary governance of Dayak Kenyah of various sub-ethnic groups (Lepo Ke' Lepo Maut, Nybun, Lepo Ndang). These areas are also in the process of being registered as ICCAs in Indonesia with BRWA, the voluntary Agency for the registration of Indigenous Territories and Areas (see MAP).</p> <p><i>Tana' ulen</i> represents an excellent example of traditional conservation practices by Indigenous communities that are well integrated in the governance and sustainable use of the larger customary territory. The conservation value of the area is clear (primary forest in pristine conditions,</p>

	abundance of wildlife). Moreover, the main purpose of the establishment of a <i>tana' ulen</i> is indeed to limit access to natural resources and strictly regulate natural resource use by the community (outsiders have no access).
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	The <i>tana' ulen</i> area of Lapan River in Long Berini is about 8,821 hectares and covers the headwaters of several streams that flow into the Lapan and then Berini rivers.
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The boundary is the natural boundary of the watershed that stretches to the estuary of that stream or tributary. The <i>tana' ulen</i> boundaries tend to follow natural boundaries (ridges, mountains, and rivers) which are the traditional way to mark and recognize territories among the Dayak people in Borneo. Accordingly, size varies depending on the stream/tributary and surrounding forest chosen as the <i>tana' ulen</i> area of a village.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	<i>Tana' ulen</i> fits the Indigenous community governance type of protected area. Since this is a long-standing tradition among Dayak Kenyah, it is a kind of governance that was created, developed and shaped by local people over time, based on knowledge of local circumstances and ecology of the forest.
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	In the past, <i>tana' ulen</i> areas were managed by the customary chief of the community on behalf of the community. This was a common practice among the Dayak Kenyah (and Kayan) people that used to have very closed social systems based on equivalent of caste. It was the decision of the customary chief to 'open' access to the <i>tana' ulen</i> area for a specific period of time for use (hunting, fishing) or harvesting of NTFP (e.g., rattan). This was a limited period and justified by either economic measures (proceeds of collecting rattan, for example, divided among all, including special allocation to poorest families and widows), or social events like collective ceremonies and rituals.  More recently, with the process of democratization and widespread

	<p>schooling, the traditional governance model has seen a shift to broader accountability and more involvement of the customary council taking on the authority of managing the <i>tana' ulen</i> areas by continuing to apply regulations that limit use and exploitation to specific times and/or events, and prohibition for any more destructive uses of the forest like shifting cultivation. In 1998, the community mapping exercise helped document and profile <i>tana' ulen</i> areas.</p> <p>As a general rule, no forest may be cleared in <i>tana' ulen</i> to open rice fields, and this is true until today. Hunting and fishing may be done collectively and only upon permission of the customary chief and council, and for special occasions only.</p> <p>Collection of specific NTFP products is restricted with regard to length of time of collection, tools and methods employed.</p> <p>Rules are very strict when it comes unsustainable uses of uses by outsiders. In at least two cases (hunting monkeys for bezoar stones by poisoning the salt leak where they drink and harvesting <i>gaharu</i> with no permission by outsiders), the perpetrators were asked to leave the community and their possessions confiscated.</p>
<p>How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?</p>	<p>Why are <i>tana' ulen</i> areas so important in traditional Kenyah communities? In the past, religious beliefs required the organization of celebrations throughout the year to mark the agricultural cycle and other social occasions like the safe return of war parties and migrants/traders. The customary chief acted as prime host. He gave hospitality to travellers and delegations from other communities that visited the area. He also had to prepare the meals for the people of the community working in his fields. All these responsibilities implied that he and his family needed to ensure there was enough food, especially fish and game for the guests. In addition to food, construction timber for longhouses was also an important resource in <i>tana'</i></p>



	<p><i>ulen</i>. The protection of a primary and rich forest near the village was a way to address economic and social needs of the community. They refer to <i>tana ulen</i> as the equivalent of a protected area. It is impressive to see the high level of biodiversity and good status of the forest although located near the village, a clear indication of the strength of the tradition and its conservation outcome. This is all the more remarkable when we visit communities in the lowlands where <i>tan'a ulen</i> forest areas are the only remaining standing forests surrounded by oil palm plantations and other commercial uses.</p>
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	<p>The <i>tana' ulen</i> of Lapan River is under the protection and management of the customary council of Long Berini, and the authority vested with the Customary chief of Long Berini and the Head of the village. Recently, the people of Long Berini drafted in writing the regulations for <i>tana' ulen</i>. <i>They also drafted and endorsed a village regulation to protect tana ulen areas. This signals the strong commitment of the community to stand by the tradition of tana' ulen and formally recognize it in village regulations as an additional legal protection.</i></p> <p>It must be noted that villages in Indonesia nowadays are important administrative units recognized by a national law, with new powers regarding the social, economic and cultural development of the area.</p>
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	<p><i>Tana' ulen</i> is still a strong tradition among Dayak Kenyah communities, and based on strong values of the importance of forest for Dayak Kenyah communities. Moreover, several initiatives by the communities to secure additional protection in written traditional regulations and village regulations clearly indicate the continued commitment. This provides an additional assurance that the practice/traditional governance type will not easily disappear or be overturned.</p>
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	<p>Long term. <i>Tana' ulen</i> is a long-standing tradition, embedded in the social and cultural</p>

	<p>context of the Dayak Kenyah communities, and in many ways defining also their identity as an ethnic group. Long Berini and the other villages in Hulu Bahau are very proud of their <i>tana' ulen</i> tradition. It was over the last few years that they started to put regulations in writing (before it was an oral tradition) to share information, support advocacy and protect the forest areas from encroaching development (road construction). The younger generation is as strong as the older generation in defending this tradition against new threats.</p>
<p>Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?</p>	<p>Year-round, and multi-year-round.</p>
<p><b>5. Management Objectives</b></p>	
<p>What are the area's management objectives?</p>	<p><i>Tana' ulen</i> areas are an integral part of the larger indigenous territory within which they are embedded and provide specific social, economic, and environmental services. The Indigenous territory referred to as <i>wilayah adat</i>, is usually managed based on a zonation system that comprises: agricultura areas (rice fields), forest used daily, grasslands or other special habitats, forest only occasionally accessed; protected forest of <i>tana' ulen</i>, critical watersheds (for drinking water and irrigation); areas especially rich in important NTFP, etc. In the context, <i>tana' ulen</i> represents the protected area of the indigenous territory.</p>
<p>Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?</p>	<p>The 'conservation target' of <i>tana' ulen</i> is really at the level of ecosystem, or the area that comprises the stream/tributary and surrounding forest from the highest ridges or watershed to the estuary. This is the best strategy to ensure that valuable species therein including those most valuable to the community can continue to thrive. The conservation objectives of 'sustainable use' and 'inter-generational' are explicit. Moreover, the fact that permission to enter and hunt or fish or harvest NTFP is given occasionally and for limited duration of helps the plentiful availability of game and fish when needed for some village ceremony. Some species are also banned from hunting based on customary regulations.</p>

If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes, as this is protected by the traditional law and the prime objective of establishing and maintaining the <i>tana' ulen</i> forest area.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	It is an area-based measure. Some rare species are also protected if necessary. Sustainability is guaranteed by the application of the regulations.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	There is no formal system or tool used for measuring effectiveness, but the management effectiveness can be evidenced by the good status of the forest and its biodiversity, and the lack of threats and compliance to the regulations by local people. Moreover, as indirect measure of its effectiveness, the successful and plentiful hunting or fishing when there are special occasions (plenty of wildlife caught in short time) is evidence that the area is undisturbed and the ecosystem is healthy,
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	See previous answer
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	<p>Biodiversity has also high importance for local communities: subsistence, trade, and food security. Hence the importance of biodiversity conservation is very much part of the survival of the community that endeavors to ensure that products like timber, wildlife, other forest products like rattan, food sources, fish, etc continue to be available for future generations.</p> <p>Conservation is really in terms of sustainable and inter-generational use but in the <i>tana' ulen</i> sustainable use is also more restricted than in other areas of the territory, hence forest cannot be cleared, and some methods and tools regarded as more exploitative or damaging are banned in <i>tana' ulen</i>. These are areas conserved and managed as primary forest.</p>
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	The conservation objective is clear and explicit but also very integrated in the socio-cultural and ecological context. In the world view of this forest community, conservation is really part of livelihood strategy and life plan. Moreover, the initiatives and steps recently taken by communities to secure stronger legal status for their <i>tana' ulen</i> is evidence of the strong resilience in

	face of incoming threats like road construction, oil palm expansion.
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	Yes, TANA ULEN is an OECM, IUCN governance type IV, and traditional model of conservation governance of Indigenous Dayak communities in Borneo.
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	This and other <i>tana' ulen</i> areas are being registered as ICCAs in the national registry and communities are seeking legal recognition by the Indonesian state as 'customary forests with protection function and value.'

### Mount Candalaga Dumut ICCA (the Philippines) – Terence Dacles

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	The ICCA was designated by the Mansaka people within their Ancestral Domain. No natural resource use is permitted. It is within a Key Biodiversity Area, which is home to threatened and restricted-range species, including the Philippine Eagle. The community has multiple objectives, including biodiversity conservation, but cultural/traditional preservation; supporting traditional livelihoods; and maintaining and enhancing natural resources are primary.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	168km2
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	Area is defined by the community as a "Strict Protection Forest" within their Ancestral Domain. It is described in their Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan (ADSDPP).
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	Indigenous peoples
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	Yes
<b>4. Permanence</b>	

Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	The Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development and Protection Plan has the support of the government, but the area is not recognized in law as a protected area. The area is governed through written and oral communication. Leaders of the governance council are chosen by the community through consensus.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Unknown. An ADSDPP is a "long term comprehensive spatial and development plan".
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	Cultural/traditional preservation; Spiritual/sacred sites protection; Supporting traditional livelihoods; Maintaining and enhancing natural resources; Biodiversity/species conservation; Territorial security (control of access to land and resources); Increasing rights for self-rule and empowerment; Land ownership security
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	No
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	All
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Unknown
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Unknown. The area had been sustainably managed by the community for generations, however with population changes it became increasingly threatened by overexploitation. As a result, the community designated it as an area where no natural resource use is permitted.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted	Unknown. Previous damaging activities have been eliminated.

there yet	
-----------	--

**Danjugan Island (the Philippines) - Terence Dacles**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	Danjugan Island, Barangay Bulata, Cauayan Negros Occidental Philippines
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p>Together with Sipalay City and the Municipality of Hinobaan, it forms the southern border of the province and is situated in the Sulu Sea, an important eco-region for marine biodiversity. The island’s surrounding reef is under the Danjugan Island Marine Reserve and Sanctuaries with three Special Management Areas or No Take Zones established in 2000 through Cauayan Municipal Ordinance 99-52.</p> <p>Seen both for its potential as a biodiversity conservation site and its vulnerability to exploitation, Danjugan Island was purchased in 1994 through the efforts of the PRRCFI and the World Land Trust.</p> <p>It holds an incredible biodiversity given its small size. At least 72 bird species have been recorded on the island, including a nesting pair of White breasted Sea Eagles <i>Heliastur leucogaster</i> that have been breeding atop Typhoon Beach Camp since 1974 and Tabon scrub fowls <i>Megapodius cumingi</i> which are common around the island.</p> <p>At least 10 bat species and 22 butterfly species (with <i>Pachliopta phlegon</i> recorded for the first time in Negros Occidental) have also been documented.</p> <p>At least 17 species of mangroves, 572 fish species belonging to 139 genera, 244 species of hard corals, 8 species of seagrasses and 74 species of macroalgae have been recorded.</p> <p>Commercially important marine invertebrates such as the giant clams (<i>Tridacna crocea</i>, <i>T. squamosa</i> and <i>Hippopus hippopus</i>) are observed in the reefs. A restocking program for the endangered <i>Tridacna gigas</i> is being implemented in collaboration with UP-MSI. Other commercially important</p>

	<p>invertebrates observed are Abalone <i>Haliotis asinine</i> and Spiny lobster <i>Panulirus</i> spp. The endangered coconut crab <i>Birgus latro</i> still occur in the coastal and mangrove forests of the island. The western beaches of Danjugan Island are known nesting sites of the Hawksbill <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> and Green Sea <i>Chelonia mydas</i> turtles. There was one sighting of a Dugong in the past while sightings of dolphins are common within the municipal waters of Cauayan which is a migration path of some larger marine mammal species.</p> <p>Danjungan island is being protected and managed by a local NGO, Philippine Reef and Rainforest Conservation Foundation, Inc. It is located 3 kilometers Southwest off the coast of Negros Occidental, Danjugan is a lush, 43-hectare island rich in marine and terrestrial biodiversity. This island, about 1.5 kilometers long and 0.5 kilometers at its widest point, has 5 lagoons and is covered with limestone forests providing asylum to many wildlife species that struggle to exist in the mainland.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	43 hectares of limestone forests, with 200 hectares of coral reefs, seagrass beds and lagoons that are protected under a local ordinance
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The entire island is protected and managed by PRRCFI, aside from the Marine Protected Areas (under the LGU of Cauayan, Local Government Unit) marked by floating buoys
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Private protection by the PRRCFI, while the surrounding waters is a joint patrol with the LGU of Cauayan
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	Private land by the PRRCFI (Philippine Reef and Rainforest Conservation Foundation Inc.) set for conservation, while the MPAs are governed by a Local Ordinance and agreement with stakeholders
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	Strict protection and regulation of human activities, e.g. fishing
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's	Private ownership of natural resources (titled land)

governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	At least 25 years
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	1992
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	Protection of existing limestone forests including flora and fauna, see description, lagoons and cave systems
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Yes
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	Yes strict protection of all resources (e.g. hunting, fishing and timber collection)
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	All ecosystems, including special focus on island species e.g. Coconut Crab, Avifauna, reptiles e.g. turtles and bats
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Resource monitoring every 3-4 years depending on the budget by the PRRCFI
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	YES, resource monitoring e.g. bird counts, UW coral reef assessment
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	YES
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	Governance and strict protection
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool	YES as an OECM but different form-private initiative e.g. private land



(Section 4), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	

**Mount Apo KBA (the Philippines) - Nicole Bendsen and Günter Mühlbauer**

<b>1. Overview</b>	
Name and location of the area	Unprotected (Non-NIPAS) Regions of the Mount Apo KBA (municipalities of Arakan, Magpet, Davao City (Barangays Tamayong, Carmen)) NIPAS: National Integrated Protected Area System
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	Mountains adjacent to the Mount Apo Natural Park (MANP) and within the Mount Apo KBA, which are mainly covered by different pristine and secondary rainforest biotopes (sequences of dipterocarp forests, lower and upper montane and lower and upper mossy rainforests) with a high biodiversity (more than 150 plant species of 58 families, out of them more than 100 tree species, more than 70 bird species, more than 25 mammal species and more than 20 species of frogs and reptiles), and are habitats of endangered species (like up to 7 pairs of Philippine Eagle, Brahminy kite, warty pig, Philippine deer, Rufous and Tarictic hornbills ). The area is covered by Ancestral Domains (CADTs of 3 Manobo tribes; Certificate of Ancestral Domain Title); the tribes regard those mountains as their sacred places and maintain them according to their customary laws/IKSP (Indigenous Knowledge Systems and Practices)/Pusaka (indigenous practice of sanctifying items, animals, and lands). Further on, the area provides watersheds, airsheds and forest ecosystems services (timber and non-timber products). Culturally and socially important species for the tribes include Philippine Eagle, the deer, wild pig, palm civet, monkey, hornbills, wild dogs, brahminy kite, wild dove, tarictic hornbill, and woodpecker.

	The area can be considered as an OECM because it has a high biodiversity, it is not or only extensively used and will it be for the future and it functions as a corridor (Biotopverbund, Trittsteinbiotop) especially for species with a large habitat demand (e.g. Philippine Eagle) between the adjacent MANP and the central Mindanao Mountain Range.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	More than 30,000 ha
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	The boundaries of the area are defined by the vegetation type of rainforest and the boundaries of MANP, Ancestral Domains and LGUs
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Indigenous peoples/local communities with the LGUs, DENR (Department of Environment and Natural Resources)
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	Provisions of IPRA law (Indigenous Peoples Rights Act), customary laws, IKSP and Pusaka (see above)
How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?	Land use restrictions due to Ancestral Domains and DENR protection forests, extensive resource use/conservation due to sacred places and low population pressure due to remote location
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	IPRA law, customary laws
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Through illegal activities (mining, logging, land and water grabbing, encroachment of plantations)
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long-term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	The measure is in place year-round
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	Culture based conservation framework, protection and management of endangered species, resource use policies and enhancement, incorporation in ADSDPP (Ancestral Domain Sustainable Development

	Protection Plan), FLUPs, CLUPs (Forest/Comprehensive Land-use Plans)/CDPs (Comprehensive Development Plans), conservation agreement pledges with other institutions, processed and documented cultural frameworks that integrate IKSP in BCSD (biodiversity conservation and sustainable development), best practices and knowledge transfer.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	Biodiversity conservation is an explicit management objective.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	The area is about to be proclaimed as ICCAs (Indigenous peoples and community conserved areas and territories) by the Indigenous Communities and is also an essential part of their livelihood; further on it is integrated in the LGUs plans. Therefore, there is a good chance that the biodiversity conservation objective will prevail in case of conflict.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	The measure covers most elements of biodiversity as it is a habitat and biotope related approach.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	185 forest guards engaged in forest patrolling and biodiversity monitoring; no results yet, because still in process of implementation
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?	An indicator for the effective conservation of biodiversity is the maintenance of a high biodiversity compared with surrounding areas even without official conservation status like the neighboring MANP. Measuring and monitoring will be part of the project follow up.
Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?	Due to the proclamation as ICCA and the management following customary laws, the conservation objectives and outcomes will certainly have primacy.
Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?	The current effectiveness is due to the area's governance and management
<b>7. Assessment</b>	
In relation to the draft guidance ( <b>Section 3</b> ) and the draft screening tool ( <b>Section 4</b> ), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area	Yes, I believe that the area is an OECM. It is a key biodiversity area (KBA) and is well managed by customary laws.

or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?	
Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.	The long-term conservation perspective is crucial; additional proclamations as protected areas (ICCA, NIPAS, LCA – Local Conservation Area/CH – Critical habitat Area) can strengthen this objective.

# 6. PACIFIC

**Bradfield Field Training Area, Northern Territory (Australia) - Marc Hockings**

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	<p>Bradshaw Field Training Area is a very large property over which a single management framework operates, primarily to provide training opportunities for military training activities, but which secondarily affords protection and enhancement of natural values through both passive and deliberate management of those values. Key values recognised for the site that indicate its important role as an OECM.</p> <p>Heritage: The site is listed on Australia's Commonwealth Heritage List (CHL) for natural and cultural values. It is also recognised as having indigenous heritage values that warrant CHL listing. The site contains more than 150 registered significant indigenous sites with the NT Aboriginal Areas Protection Authority (AAPA) and numerous sites of high archaeological significance (rock art, stone artefacts, hawk hides). Landscape values identified by the CHL listing include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Vast and rugged habitat;</li><li>• Diverse array of plants and animals (with an unusually rich vertebrate fauna, second only to Kakadu National Park);</li><li>• Demonstration of interplay of erosional terrains associated with coastal and fluvial environments;</li><li>• Topographic complexity;</li><li>• Substantial contribution to biodiversity conservation because of its large size, vertebrate faunal richness, floral diversity, the recent removal of grazing, and contiguous relationship with Jutpurra National Park (formerly known as Gregory National Park); and</li><li>• Importance as a site for the collection of information that will contribute to the understanding of the long-term effects of fire regimes on the flora and fauna in north-west Australia.</li></ul> <p>Biodiversity: Four EPBC listed threatened species have been recorded on BFTA (Gouldian Finch, Crested Shrike Tit, Purple Crowned Fairy Wren and</p>

	<p>Northern Quoll) and a further 14 species are identified as possibly occurring on the site. 33 EPBC listed migratory species have been recorded on the site.</p> <p>Several species of flora and fauna listed under the Territory Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 2007 or which are significant because of their contribution to the CHL listing</p> <p>The wetlands on BFTA are considered to be wetlands of national significance.</p>
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Bradshaw Field Training Area is approximately 870 000 hectares.
How are the area and its boundaries defined?	The area is based on a crown land title over which a lease for Defence purposes exists. Natural boundaries of the training area are formed by the Victoria River along the southern boundary, and the Fitzmaurice River along the northern boundary.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	<p>Bradshaw Field Training Area is a long-term lease for Defence purposes managed by the Australian Department of Defence. Most management decisions are the responsibility of Defence and environmental approvals and assessment of activities are governed by either standard management practices, or by specific approval under an Environmental Clearance Certificate system. An Indigenous Landuse Agreement (ILUA) also applies over the whole property, and the areas traditional owners form an integral part of the management framework of the site. Broader community involvement is also facilitated through an Environmental Advisory Committee that includes other representatives from surrounding private and government agencies. Environmental approvals for a limited set of activities are required from the Commonwealth Minister For the Environment where prescribed by the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999) (EPBC Act).</p> <p>As Commonwealth land managed by a Commonwealth agency, all activities</p>

	on the property are governed.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	To be determined! This decision will be partly taken in discussion with Department of Environment and Energy (DoEE) and also the traditional owners.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	<p>During its establishment, the training area was jointly assessed by the Northern Territory and Australian Governments and a series of recommendations were set down in a 2008 Assessment Report prepared by the NT government under the NT Environmental Assessment Act 1982. These conditions included precautionary limitation of exercises in some suspected sensitive areas until further survey works were complete, and the delineation of a large restricted area to protect suspected important Gouldian Finch breeding habitat near Mt Thymanan and requirement for a Gouldian Finch management plan.</p> <p>Ongoing management of the site is primarily subject to the EPBC Act. Any actions or land use changes that take place are controlled by this legislation to prevent significant impacts to the environment. It additionally empowers the development of national Threat Abatement Plans and Species Recovery Plans to guide biodiversity management outcomes and investment. As a Commonwealth agency Defence cannot take an action that contravenes a Species Recovery Plan.</p> <p>The property will remain in Defence hands unless the Australian Government decides to sell the property, at which time the buyer would also be required to adhere to the EPBC Act and additional Northern Territory Legislation for any development or land use changes.</p>
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	The provisions under respective acts would require an Act of Parliament to be replaced with a new form of legislation or specific new approvals/conditions to be sought by Defence for existing conditions to be revoked.



Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Long Term
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year Round.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<p>The primary management objective for Bradshaw is to support Australia's Defence capability through provision of large landscapes suitable for large-scale training activities using a wide array of weapons systems. A key component in ensuring the area is able to provide suitable training is maintaining the environmental conditions. As such, the landscape is managed to ensure any impacts to the environment are limited, and where impacts do occur, they are remediated. This ensures a natural environment to conduct training exercises in remains over the long term. This management of the landscape results in the area also serving as an effective conservation area.</p> <p>Additionally, Defence deliberately manages environmental values that do not specifically contribute to Defence use of the site but contribute to the wider social and environmental objectives of government and to acting as a responsible steward for the land. Specific plans in place for the training area include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gouldian Finch Management Plan</li> <li>• Environment and Heritage Management Plan (draft)</li> <li>• Waste Management Plan</li> <li>• Bushfire Management Plan</li> <li>• Land Remediation Plan</li> <li>• Habitat Management Plan: Core Habitats</li> <li>• Threatened Habitat Management Plan: <i>Xerochloa</i> Grasslands</li> <li>• Habitat Management Plan: Riparian, Swamp and Monsoon Rainforest Habitats</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Threatened Species Management Plan, Angalarri Grunter (<i>Scortum neili</i>)</li> <li>Species Management Plan: <i>Melaleuca minutifolia</i> (2009)</li> </ul>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	Explicit objective
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	In general, the conservation objective does not take primacy over the capability objectives. However, in practice the area available for training provided by Bradshaw Field Training Area means that impacts on natural values are generally avoided through exercise planning and use of facilities developed to concentrate impacts in dedicated areas away from core values. Range Standing Orders include area restrictions for locations that are considered to be of sufficiently high environmental and heritage value that they do take precedence over potentially damaging military activities, including Aboriginal heritage sites and 50 km <sup>2</sup> protected area of Gouldian Finch habitat.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Defence's management framework including Environmental Clearance Certificates, and Range Standing Order restrictions measure cover all aspects of the environment entire environment. Individual threatened species or issues are additionally managed in accordance with their own threatened species management plans.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Environmental Surveys are undertaken to ascertain the condition of the environment, as well as to track populations of key threatened and invasive species as indicators of overall system health.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Conservation effectiveness is measured through regular environmental monitoring undertaken by specialist consultants
How encompassing the measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	Measures cover the full area and outcomes result from measure

**Cable Zone, Hauraki Gulf, Southwest Pacific Ocean (New Zealand) – Marc Costello**

<b>Overview</b>	
Brief description, including natural, cultural and social values, and reasons for considering the area as an OECM	Fishing and anchoring is prohibited in the area because a major telecommunications cable runs through it.
<b>2. Boundaries &amp; Geographical Space</b>	
What size is the area?	Over 100 km long and 10 km wide
How is the area and its boundaries defined?	About 5 Km each side of the cable.
<b>3. Governance Type</b>	
Description of the area's governance arrangements e.g. private, indigenous etc.	National protection.
Do the groups with rights, responsibilities or authority for the area recognize and support its status as an area-based conservation measure?	No. Its aim is to prevent cable damage. Conservation benefits are coincidental.
<b>4. Permanence</b>	
Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)	Yes.
How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?	Very difficult.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	Permanent.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	No. In effect all year around.
<b>5. Management Objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	Prevent cable damage from trawling and anchoring.
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective?	No.
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	n/a
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	No. Mostly subtidal sediment habitat. But likely to cover representatives of species preferring this habitat.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	No.
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	

Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured?	Preliminary surveys indicate some protection to fish populations due to reduced fishing. However, considerable fishing at edges.
How encompassing is measure is, and is the current effectiveness due to the measure, or just the fact that damaging activities haven't been targeted there yet	It is effective and could be more so if officially designated a Marine Reserve with appropriate boundary markers.

### Zaira Community, Vangunu Island, Western Province (Solomon Islands) - Joe McCarter and Simon Albert

1. Overview	
Name and location of the area	Zaira Resource Management Area, Vangunu Island, Western Province, Solomon Islands
Brief description, including natural, social and cultural values, for including as OECM	The Zaira Resource Management Area (ZRMA) is a ridge to reef community-governed conservation area in a biodiversity hotspot. Based on traditional practices (known as <i>hope</i> ) and under leadership from customary owners, the efforts of the Zaira community have conserved a large and intact watershed, representing the largest area of intact primary forest in the Marovo Lagoon. Natural heritage includes a population of endangered monkey-faced bat ( <i>Pteralopex taki</i> ), nesting sites for the critically endangered leatherback turtle ( <i>Dermochelys coriacea</i> ), and over 10 species of amphibian including the endemic and vulnerable <i>Litoria lutea</i> . Zaira community continues to provide an example of resource governance that resonates throughout the Solomon Islands, where commercial logging and mining remain a major threat to biodiversity and community wellbeing.
2. Boundaries and geographical space	
What is the size of the area?	5150 ha total – 2850 ha in terrestrial area, and 2300 in marine
How is the area and boundaries defined?	The ZRMA is geographically demarcated, as it sits in a crater between three peaks (Tita, Olasana, and Nimbri), and enclosed to the west and east by major rivers. The ZRMA is customary land held under tenure by three tribal groupings, the boundaries of which were mapped during 2010 and 2011 in a collaborative effort between tribal leaders and the University of Queensland

	(UQ). The boundaries and important cultural sites are documented in the community management plan for the ZRMA.
<b>3. Governance type</b>	
What is the area's governance type, as per the IUCN guidance: i.e. government, shared, private or Indigenous peoples/local communities?	Indigenous peoples / local communities
Please describe the governance arrangement in greater detail	<p>As across much of Solomon Islands, land and sea tenure at Zaira is held under customary tenure governed by family units known as <i>butubutu</i>.<sup>27</sup> The ZRMA has been managed over successive generations using a customary management system (<i>hope</i>), which allows certain resources to be restricted at certain times, and considers connectivity and feedbacks between the cultural interactions of people with land and sea systems.</p> <p>In 2010, customary leaders from the three Zaira tribes independently adapted their customary resource management mechanisms to more formalized planning and implementation under a management plan. The plan covers management rules for all linked ecosystems within the customary land and sea tenure boundaries of three cooperating tribes and has objectives that are focused on the maintenance of culture and tenure, food security, iconic species and education. The plan is discussed during annual meetings, with a 5- year timeline for review. The description and formalizing of this plan has enabled the local management committee to enforce their authority on outsiders who are interested in resource extraction; recently, one high-profile case of a peaceful boarding of an international logging vessel that was illegally entering the management area was settled with significant financial compensation paid to Zaira community members. Meanwhile, internal conflicts and punishments for local offenders are dealt with through customary mechanisms.<sup>28</sup></p>

<sup>27</sup> Hviding, E. 1998. Contextual flexibility: present status and future of customary marine tenure in Solomon Islands. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 40(964):253–269

<sup>28</sup> Jupiter, S. D., A. Wenger, C. J. Klein, S. Albert, S. Mangubhai, J. Nelson, L. Teneva, V. Tulloch, A. White, and J. E. Watson. 2017. Opportunities and constraints for implementing integrated land–sea management on islands. *Environmental Conservation* (March):1–13.

	<p>Under the management plan, the ZRMA is governed by a leadership system constituted of a Chief's Committee (chief and two spokesmen), a Conservation Committee (chairman, secretary and treasurer and tribal members from each of the three groups). Annual discussions of the plan are often held during December holidays, when many community members return for holidays at Zaira. There is also a team of male and female rangers within the community, who are appointed to implement management activities and enforce rules.</p>
<p>How does the governance of the area promote conservation outcomes?</p>	<p>The governance of the ZRMA explicitly promotes conservation outcomes. Protection of the conservation area is at the core of management planning, including ridge to reef connectivity and the specific maintenance of valued species and habitat types (e.g., leatherback turtles). Because the management plan is based in customary <i>hope</i> practices, the governance of the ZRMA also supports cultural links between the land and sea, and seeks to maintain and transmit an ethic of conservation and resource stewardship.</p>
<p><b>4. Permanence</b></p>	
<p>Is there a legal or other instrument/decision that sets out the area's governance and conservation management arrangements, as well as other factors (below)</p>	<p>The governance of the area is set out in the ZRMA Management Plan. The Plan was first drafted in 2011, and was updated in 2016. The ZRMA has been consulted with neighboring tribes and submitted to national government for registration under the national Protect Areas Act (2010). While formal registration and recognition has not occurred to date, the formalization of the customary management into a resource management plan provides powerful recognition of the validity of the conservation area.</p> <p>The authority of Chief Jino is recognized under tribal law. He was 'enthroned', or recognized following customary due process, in December 2016.</p>
<p>How easily can the instrument/decision be overturned?</p>	<p>The customary ownership of land and resources is recognized in the constitution of Solomon Islands and represents a powerful force. Although it</p>

	is possible that specific rights relating to natural resources can be subverted through corrupt legal processes, the multiple layers of management in Zaira with involvement of rangers, customary owners, church and NGOs makes it unlikely that the management area can be overturned.
Over what time-frame is the measure in place: long-/medium-/short-term	ZRMA management planning is a long-term investment in the maintenance of a vibrant land- and seascape in the Zaira area. As noted above, management planning is explicitly built on customary resource governance measures, and seeks to ensure that conservation of the land and sea will take place over coming generations. For example, the management plan includes specific provision for the transmission of traditional knowledge and practice of the forest area, and the conservation committee makes explicit efforts to include a wide range of youth as rangers in decision making and monitoring of the ZRMA.
Is the measure in place year round or only part of the year? If the latter, which management practices are applied when the measure is not in effect?	Year round
<b>5. Management objectives</b>	
What are the area's management objectives?	<p>The objectives of the ZRMA are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To protect the conservation area through legal declaration and registration, and ensure the continuous assessment of the health of its natural landscapes, ecosystems and habitats, important plants and animals including other harvestable stocks.</li> <li>• To properly manage and sustainable use of natural resources (renewable and non-renewable resources) to meet the basic livelihood needs of the dependent local community and not undermining present and future generations development aspirations</li> <li>• To protect critically endangered, endemic or rare, threatened species listed under the IUCN Red List found in the conservation area (e.g., leatherback turtles, dugong, New Georgian monkey faced bat), including their range of habitats from harvesting and</li> </ul>

	<p>disturbances.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To establish an education learning center for the current and future generations through research and training opportunities in the area.</li> <li>• To maintain traditional resource management regime and local leadership that recognizes their cultural values at the time protecting historical heritages</li> </ul>
Is biodiversity conservation an explicit or implicit management objective? Or is there another way of describing the way this issue arises in the area's management?	As above, biodiversity conservation is an explicit objective
If there is an explicit/implicit biodiversity conservation objective, does it take primacy over other objectives in case of conflict?	In the community context, biodiversity conservation is fundamentally linked to social and cultural health. This sense, there is no conflict – where threats exist to biodiversity, the management planning considers them also threats to community vitality. Clearly, this is community-managed area and management needs to make sense for the community as a whole, however conflicts are managed through the creation of spatial zones for different use types (e.g., garden area); the use of temporary open areas for special occasions (e.g., during the 2015 centenary of the church arriving in Zaira, the marine protected area was opened); and through an open and deliberative approach to decision making.
Does the measure cover all or most elements of biodiversity in the area or only certain species?	Management efforts in the ZRMA target specific culturally important species, (e.g., leatherback turtles) as flagships to focus community support for the initiative. However the central motivation for the management area is to strengthen integrity of the entire bio-cultural system from the montane forests high on the ridges to the deep sea.
Is management effectiveness measured? If so, how and what are the results?	Management effectiveness is assessed via a monitoring and evaluation framework, as detailed in the management plan. This includes marine, freshwater and terrestrial measures. Monitoring is conducted by a trained group of rangers with support from local and international NGOs, including primary partners the Solomon Islands Conservation Partnership and the



	<p>University of Queensland as well as other groups (e.g., the American Museum of Natural History). While data for these surveys do exist (e.g., point counts and visual surveys for amphibians, bats, and birds; leatherback turtle nesting success; and Catch Per Unit Effort outside the protected area), the major purpose of data collection exercises to date is to provide a training and discussion forum for community rangers to interact with national and international ecologists and conservation scientists.</p> <p>In terms of the social sustainability of the ZRMA, recent surveys by the American Museum of Natural History indicated a high degree of acceptance of rules and management efforts around the protected area, including high ratings of aspects of leaderships (&gt;80% of respondents noting they are 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with current leadership) and perceptions of fairness and effectiveness of management planning rules (e.g., &gt;90% of interviewees noting that rules were fair). The same survey indicated that vernacular language in the Zaira area is strong, that most people have adequate access to land and sea resources, and that respondents were relatively optimistic about the trajectory of management efforts.</p>
<b>6. Conservation Effectiveness</b>	
<p>Is the area effectively conserving biodiversity and how is conservation effectiveness measured and monitored?</p>	<p>Yes. As above, monitoring and evaluation is detailed in the management plan, and includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual monitoring of Catch per Unit Effort and availability of valued plant species</li> <li>• Biannual monitoring of coral reef species, with a focus on target invertebrates</li> <li>• Seasonal monitoring of leatherback turtles</li> <li>• Annual monitoring of abundance of valued plant species</li> </ul>
<p>Irrespective of whether or not the area has conservation objectives, do conservation outcomes take primacy in cases of conflict among objectives, management approaches or activities?</p>	<p>As above, yes.</p>

<p>Is the current effectiveness due to the area's governance and management, or due to the fact that damaging activities have not yet taken place?</p>	<p>Unarguably, the governance of the Zaira area by Chief Jino, using the rules described in the management plan, has been effective in deterring damaging activities in the conservation area. The pressure for industrial logging of the ZRMA forests is intense and the strength of customary governance is the only reason the Zaira environment remains intact.</p>
<p><b>7. Assessment</b></p>	
<p>In relation to the draft guidance (Section 3) and the draft screening tool (Section 4), do you think the area is an OECM? If not, is it a protected area or a measure that contributes to another Aichi target?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Please add any further comments here. Many thanks.</p>	