TASK FORCE ON OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES

DISCUSSION PAPER: FRAMING THE ISSUES

DECEMBER 2015

Harry Jonas and Kathy MacKinnon

CONTENTS

PART I

INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

The overall aim of this document is to help set out the issues, considerations and questions relevant to the Task Force's mandate, namely: to develop guidance for IUCN members and CBD Parties on the definition of 'other effective area-based conservation measures' (OECMs).[1]

For each element of the term 'other effective area-based conservation measures', the relevant sub-section provides an overview of how the issue(s) are dealt with in the context of protected areas (Dudley, 2008 unless otherwise stated), sets out a non-exhaustive list of relevant questions and begins to sets out Task Force members' inputs (primarily from published papers and email correspondence).

We intend this to provide Task Force members an easily accessible resource with which to approach the issues and enable focused inputs to the ongoing work. It also aims to help make explicit the arguments for mirroring, varying, ignoring, or adding criteria to the protected areas approach.

Notably, at this stage in the work of the Task Force we are not seeking to answer questions with any sense of finality, but instead working to determine the full spectrum of issues that need to be discussed and further researched towards fulfilling our mandate. We particularly welcome the following inputs:

- Ideas and views couched as issues that command further collective thought,
- Arguments for or against any of the emerging options and approaches, and
- Suggestions of case studies or existing data that relate to a particular aspect of the discussion.

BACKGROUND

In 2010, the 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP 10/CBD) adopted the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as part of the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.* Target 11 states the following:

> By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, eco- logically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and ***other effective area-based conservation measures***, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes. (Emphasis added).

Since COP 10, the CBD and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) have agreed that greater guidance is required to assist parties to the CBD and other rights- and stakeholders to implement and report on Aichi 11. Instances include the following:

---

[1] For a note on the acronym and the term 'conserved areas', please refer to Annex I.

1. CBD: In October 2013, a preparatory note by the CBD's Executive Secretary for the Seventeenth Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) identified the "*recognition and/or integration of indigenous and community conserved areas and private reserves in national protected area systems*" as one of the gaps related to the implementation of Target 11. In the same note, the Executive Secretary underscored the necessity of "*improving information on other area-based conservation measures such as community-conserved areas*" in the context of assessing the status of progress towards the Target 11 at global, regional, national and subnational levels. Moreover, the official report of the meeting states that further consideration of what constitutes OECMs for the purpose of reporting progress toward this target "would be useful".

2. IUCN: A resolution adopted at the 2012 IUCN World Conservation Congress in Jeju calls on IUCN Commissions, IUCN Members, UNEP-WCMC, the ICCA Consortium and other organizations to collaborate in support of CBD Decision X/2 to:

> Develop criteria for what constitutes 'effective area-based conservation measures', including for, *inter alia*, Private Protected Areas, Indigenous Peoples' Conserved Territories and Areas Conserved by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (ICCAs), and Sacred Natural Sites (SNS) (IUCN, 2012a).

Subsequently, in a position paper submitted to the CBD ahead of COP 11 (October 2012), IUCN called on:

> the Secretariat [of the CBD], supported by IUCN, to provide Parties with specific guidance regarding the kinds of areas that count towards the achievement of the area coverage element of Target 11. *This should clarify that areas that do not, and will never qualify as protected areas, should not be included*. Specific guidance should be provided to Parties to ensure that areas that meet the requirements, but which are not currently recognized or reported, are recognized appropriately, including those "other effective area-based conservation measures" that qualify.

In 2014, the *Protected Planet Report 2014*, which tracked progress toward global targets for protected areas (**http://bit.ly/ProtectedPlanet2014**), described the term as "poorly defined and largely undocumented." It said:

> A key challenge in recognizing 'other' sites is to acknowledge their value for conservation without overestimating the level of protection. Any definition must therefore include those sites that truly complement protected areas in conserving biodiversity in the long term, and exclude those that have no conservation value or no security of protection into the future (e.g., areas temporarily set aside for conservation before use for commercial forestry).

In 2015, after the issue was discussed at the WCPA Steering Committee meeting, an IUCN Task Force was established with a mandate to **"develop guidance for IUCN members and CBD Parties on the definition of 'other effective area-based**

conservation measures." The key criterion is that areas must provide effective conservation.

OVERALL CONSIDERATIONS

As presented in Annex II, a number of papers that directly address OECMs highlight the fact that there are high hopes for OECMs' contributions to achieving Target 11. They consistently call for a clear definition of OECMs and how they can be appropriately represented within formal conservation targets and policies.

The same papers also express a range of concerns relating to Target 11. These include the possibility that Target 11 may be achieved in terms of area while failing the overall conservation goal, because the areas are poorly located, inadequately managed, or based on unjustifiable inclusion of OECMs (Watson et al. 2015). The inclusion of areas with limited conservation effectiveness to advance political objectives may undermine the intent of the CBD's Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and the Aichi process (Mackinnon et al., 2015). Moreover the lack of science to define the nature and effectiveness of OECMs could leave the door open to PA downgrading, downsizing, and degazettement (PADDD), as "other" management regimes may be viewed as cheaper to maintain than formal PAs. Avoiding such perverse outcomes will require defining both ecologically sensible targets, to guide where such measures are necessary, and evidence-based metrics of effectiveness, to ensure that they are genuinely safeguarding the biodiversity for which they are important (Watson et al., 2015).

In this context, proposed questions and suggested ways forwards include:

1.   What potentially negative ramifications might arise from a greater focus on OECMs, and how can these be foreseen in advance and minimized? Could this new focus lead to a range of adverse effects, including the inclusion of land uses such as industrial monoculture plantations in CBD parties' contributions to Aichi Target 11? To avert such lowering of standards accurate measurement of conservation effectiveness will be of fundamental importance (Jonas et al., 2014).

2.   Effectiveness metrics for OECMs will be able to draw on methodologies used in PAs, but will likely need the development of additional tools as well. Strong application of science will determine whether the broader interpretation of protection that emerged with Aichi target 11 will be a positive or negative step for global biodiversity conservation (Watson et al., 2015).

3.   A twin- track approach of better-targeted PA expansion alongside increased effort to develop and implement other effective area-based approaches is needed, integrated through improved prioritization, better international coordination, and greater resourcing (Butchart et al., 2015).

PART II

ELEMENTS OF A DEFINITION

1.   OTHER

1.1   Definition of Protected Area

The CBD defines a protected area as "a geographically defined area which is designated or regulated and managed to achieve specific conservation objectives" (CBD, Article 2).

IUCN defines a protected area as: "A clearly defined geographical space, recognised, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values" (Dudley et al., 2008).

It is suggested that, despite their differing formulations, there is "tacit agreement between the [CBD and IUCN] that the two definitions are equivalent" (Lopoukhine & de Souza Dias, 2012).

The term OECM includes the word 'other'. It is assumed the word is used to differentiate OECMs from protected areas recognised and reported by governments, but it raises the core question of how different OECMs should or should not be from protected areas. A major part of this question relates to the primacy of conservation as a management objective.

1.2   Conservation as the Primary Objective

IUCN qualifies its definition of a protected area (above) in *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories* with a number of principles. The first states:

> For IUCN, only those areas where the main objective is conserving nature can be considered protected areas; this can include many areas with other goals as well, at the same level, but in the case of conflict, nature conservation will be the priority.

The Guidelines for Applying the IUCN Protected Area Management Categories to Marine Protected Areas (Day et al., 2012) spell out how this principle should be applied in the marine context. These guidelines specifically state that:

> Spatial areas which may incidentally appear to deliver nature conservation but DO NOT HAVE STATED nature conservation objectives should NOT automatically be classified as MPAs [marine protected areas], as defined by IUCN. These include:

- Fishery management areas with no **wider stated conservation aims**.
- Community areas managed **primarily** for sustainable extraction of marine products (e.g. coral, fish, shells, etc.).
- Marine and coastal management systems managed **primarily** for tourism, which also include areas of conservation interest.

- Wind farms and oil platforms that **incidentally** help to build up biodiversity around underwater structures and by excluding fishing and other vessels.
- Marine and coastal areas **set aside for other purposes** but which also have conservation benefit: military training areas or their buffer areas (e.g. exclusion zones); disaster mitigation (e.g. coastal defences that also harbour significant biodiversity); communications cable or pipeline protection areas; shipping lanes etc.
- Large areas (e.g., regions, provinces, countries) where certain species are protected by law **across the entire region.** (Original emphasis)

1.3   Questions

- Should OECMs conform to IUCN's first PA-related principle, or is this one of the potential differences between a protected area and an OECM (discussed below)?
- If an area meets the CBD/IUCN definition of a protected area, but is either *not recognized by the government or *those governing the area ask for it not to be recognized as a protected area, is that area still a protected area or better defined as an OECM? This has bearing on the discussion (below) about what is and is not a PA, and therefore what is something 'other' than a PA.
- Could the areas specifically excluded by the MPA Guidance be candidate OECMs?
- Does looking at the CBD definition of conservation and sustainable use help in this regard?

1.4   Proposed Ideas and Approaches

Conforms to the first Principle: One line of thought is that an OECM should be an area that *conforms* to the IUCN/CBD definition of a protected area and IUCN's additional guidance and principles, but is either:

- Not recognized by a national government, or
- Is asked not to be designated as a protected area by those governing the protected area.

The Canadian Council on Ecological Areas process has come to this conclusion. In its Decision Screening Tool for Aichi 11 Target Sites it clearly stipulates that: **"**Conservation of biodiversity is explicitly stated as the primary objective. A range of objectives may exist for the site, but in cases of conflict, conservation should prevail" (MacKinnon et al., 2015).

CCEA Guidance on OECMs

The CCEA defined criteria for inclusion of OECMs in the Target 11 commitment should be consistent with the overall intent of PAs, with the exception that they may be governed by regimes not previously recognized by reporting agencies. (2) These areas should have an expressed objective to conserve nature, be long-term, generate effective nature conservation outcomes, and have governance regimes

that ensure effective management. A decision-screening tool was developed to define core traits:

- Well-defined geographically;
- Objectives for biodiversity conservation, achieved through conservation of biodiversity as a whole;
- Conservation objectives must receive first priority when in conflict with other objectives;
- Mechanisms by which the areas are established must have the comprehensive ability to exclude, control, and manage all activities likely to have impacts on biodiversity, and must compel the prohibition of incompatible activities;
- Should be in place for the long-term;
- Mechanisms by which they are established must be difficult to reverse; and in effect year-round.

Does not conform: Are OECMs areas in which long-term and effective conservation is resulting but which *fall outside* of the IUCN/CBD definition primarily due to the fact that they do not have a primary objective of conservation.

Borrini-Feyerabend and Hill (2014) combine both approaches to suggest that OECMs should include:

- Areas well conserved and reasonably expected to remain so in the long term that are not recognised, nationally or internationally, as protected areas, and
- Area-based measures of secondary voluntary conservation and ancillary conservation with a reasonable expectation to be maintained in the long term.

In this context, Borrini-Feyerabend and Hill suggest the following definition of OECMs:

> A clearly defined geographical space where *de facto* conservation of nature and associated ecosystem services and cultural values is achieved and expected to be maintained in the long-term *regardless* of specific recognition and dedication. (Original emphasis)

Borrini-Feyerabend and Hill intend this formulation to give greater recognition to area-based measures of *secondary voluntary conservation*, *ancillary conservation* with a reasonable expectation to be maintained in the long-term, and *primary voluntary conservation* that refuses the international and/or national protected area label.[2] They provide a matrix setting out the four potential positions they consider

---

[2] **Voluntary conservation** captures the idea that conservation may be a desired result of governance as a primary objective but also as a secondary, implicit or not fully conscious, objective. The term **ancillary conservation** is more appropriate when conservation is a fully unintended consequence of managing nature.

arising in this context of areas conserved *de facto*, with a reasonable expectation that conservation will be maintained in the long term, at A-D.

	Recognised as a protected area under international definition (IUCN/CBD)	Not recognised as a protected area under international definition (IUCN/CBD)
Recognised as a protected area by national legislation and/or policy	**A.** The area is a protected area in the country at stake and internationally	**B.** The area is a protected area in the country at stake, although not internationally, where it *could* be considered an effective area-based conservation measure
Not recognised as a protected area by national legislation and/or policy	**C.** The area is a protected area internationally, although not in the country at stake, where it *should* be considered an effective area-based conservation measure	**D.** The area is not a protected area; it *could* be considered an effective area-based conservation measure

What other approaches to this important issue can be elaborated?

2.   EFFECTIVE

2.1   Protected Area-related Guidance

The term 'effective arises in two contexts in the guidance provided by IUCN on protected areas, as set out below.

Legal or other effective means: IUCN states that this element of the definition means that protected areas must be either gazetted (that is, recognized under statutory civil law), recognized through an international convention or agreement, or else managed through other effective but non-gazetted means, such as through recognized traditional rules under which community conserved areas operate or the policies of established NGOs.

To achieve: IUCN guidance suggest that this element of the definition "implies some level of effectiveness." Although the category will still be determined by objective, management effectiveness will progressively be recorded on the WDPA and over time will become an important criterion in identification and recognition of protected areas.

2.2   Questions

With regard to the guidance on legal or other effective means:

- Should and if so how would the ability (in legal and actual terms) of the authority to enact and enforce the measure (by legal or other means) be assessed?

With regard to the effectiveness of the conservation measure:

- OEMCs explicitly include the notion of effectiveness in their definition. Does this mean that – unlike for protected areas that are judged according to their

management objective (above) – OECMs should be judged, first and foremost, according to their effectiveness?

- How should 'effective' be defined in this context, and how does this dovetail with the ongoing debate about how to better measure conservation effectiveness in protected areas (Geldmann et al., 2013, Nolte et al., 2013; Carranza et al., 2014)?[3]
- Do we measure effectiveness on the ability of the governance structures to implement their management plans (i.e.: *The mechanism(s) has the power to exclude, control, and manage all activities within the area that are likely to have impacts on biodiversity and *The mechanism(s) compels the authority to prohibit activities that are incompatible with the conservation of biodiversity) or by monitoring biodiversity values in the OECM?

2.3 Ideas and Proposed Approaches

In Canada, the CCEA recommended minimum standards of effectiveness for Aichi Target 11 areas.

- Consistent with the objectives of the CBD, the Program of Work on Protected Areas, and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, all Aichi Target 11 areas should be managed to achieve the conservation of ecosystems and natural habitats and the maintenance and recovery of viable populations of species in their natural surroundings;
- We believe this requires, at a minimum, the prohibition of industrial or other uses that are likely to significantly impact biodiversity; and
- Notwithstanding the foregoing, management activities such as those described in Principles and Guidelines for Ecological Restoration in Canada's Protected Natural Areas may be appropriate in Aichi Target 11 areas if undertaken for the purpose of biodiversity conservation (as determined through a science-based, peer-reviewed decision-making process) (MacKinnon et al., 2015).

In this context, participants also decided that for the purpose of CBD reporting and cross-jurisdictional comparisons, "a science-based, standardized approach is essential in both terrestrial and marine realms, and should use conservation effectiveness as the primary metric."

3. AREA-BASED

3.1 Protected Area-related Guidance

IUCN guidance states that this element includes land, inland waters, marine and coastal areas or a combination of two or more. "Space" has three dimensions, e.g. as then the airspace above a protected area is protected from low-flying aircraft or in marine protected areas when a certain water depth is protected or the seabed is protected but the water above is not: conversely subsurface areas sometimes are

---

[3] See, for example, the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool: http://www.wdpa.org/me/PDF/METT.pdf

not protected. "Clearly defined" implies a spatially defined area with agreed and demarcated borders. These can sometimes be defined by physical features that move over time (e.g. river banks) or by management actions (e.g. agreed no-take zones).

3.2   Questions

- It is clearly stated that OECMs should be 'area-based'. As with protected areas, how well defined should the borders or boundaries be?
- Could they be mobile, such as to protect ice fronts in the Arctic or upwelling in seas and oceans?
- Is there a minimum or maximum size limit, no limit or should the size be judged according to the management objectives?

3.3   Ideas and Proposed Approaches

Butchart et al. (2015) suggest that areas that might be OECMs include: locally managed marine or forest areas and other indigenous and community-conserved areas, sacred sites, sustainably managed forestry or fisheries, and areas subject to conservation easements and land trusts. MacKinnon et al. (2015) include "certain Indigenous Peoples' and Community Conserved Areas, and certain private lands dedicated to biodiversity conservation (e.g., sites owned and managed by lands trusts such as the Nature Conservancy of Canada)" but question whether areas such fisheries closures and municipal water-supply protection areas should be included as OECMs.

Watson et al. also list Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs), community-based resource management areas and various forms of traditional land use management as potential OECMs, adding that "As with the rest of Aichi Target 11, this spans governance arrangements including public, private, community, local, indigenous, customary, and mixed arrangements." They add a cautionary note, stating that:

> Measures could potentially include control of invasive species, regulation of hunting, fisheries management, and even avoidance or mitigation of impacts on biodiversity in sites otherwise dedicated to extractive and industrial activities - as long as those activities are consistent with retaining the site's biodiversity importance. From an ecological perspective, major uncertainties exist around identifying the proportion and type of biodiversity that can or cannot be effectively conserved in areas under these management regimes, and therefore how in practice this complements PAs to promote landscape and seascape scale conservation.

4.   CONSERVATION

4.1   Protected Area-related Guidance

Conservation: IUCN guidance on this element of the definition states that 'conservation' refers to the *in-situ* maintenance of ecosystems and natural and semi-natural habitats and of viable populations of species in their natural surroundings

and, in the case of domesticated cultivated species (as per the definition of agrobiodiversity),[4] in the surroundings where they have developed their distinctive qualities. **Nature**: IUCN guidance states that "nature" always refers to biodiversity, at genetic, species and ecosystem level, and often also refers to geodiversity, landform and broader natural values.

Associated ecosystem services: This refers to ecosystem services that are related to but do not interfere with the aim of nature conservation. These can include provisioning services such as food and water; regulating services such as regulation of floods, drought, land degradation, and disease; supporting services such as soil formation and nutrient cycling; and cultural services such as recreational, spiritual, religious or other non-material benefit.

Cultural values: "Cultural values" include those that do not interfere with the conservation outcomes (all cultural values in a protected area should meet this criterion), including in particular: a) those that contribute to conservation outcomes (e.g. traditional management practices on which key species have become reliant, and b) those that are themselves under threat.

4.2   Questions

- How does the above protected areas-related guidance relate to OECMs? Does it include sustainable use and customary use of biodiversity (as referenced in Articles 1, 2, 8(j) and 10(c) of the CBD?
- Should the management objectives of an OECM cover biodiversity as a whole, including ecosystems, species and genetic diversity? Or are single species objectives acceptable, for example?

4.3 Proposed Ideas and Approaches

The CCEA explored sustainable and customary use concepts in the context of Target 11 and agreed: where sustainable or customary use is an objective for Aichi Target 11 areas (e.g., in category VI or V protected areas), it should be undertaken in a way that is integrated with and beneficial to biodiversity conservation and at a rate that does not produce significant impacts on biodiversity; and large-scale industrial uses are not appropriate in any Aichi Target 11 areas.

5.   MEASURES

5.1   Protected Area-related Guidance

Guidance related to protected areas sets out the following:

---

[4] Includes wild plants closely related to crops (crop wild relatives), cultivated plants (landraces) and livestock varieties. Agrobiodiversity can be an objective of protected areas for crop wild relatives, traditional and threatened landraces, particularly those reliant on traditional cultural practices; and/or traditional and threatened livestock races, especially if they are reliant on traditional cultural management systems that are compatible with "wild biodiversity".

Recognised: IUCN states that protected areas can include a range of governance types but that PAs would be recognized in some way (in particular through listing on the WDPA).

Dedicated: IUCN states that this element implies specific binding commitment to conservation in the long-term, through for example: a) international conventions and agreements, b) national, provincial and local law, c) customary law, d) covenants of NGOs, e) private trusts and company policies, and f) certification schemes.

Managed: IUCN assumes some active steps to conserve the natural (and other) values for which the protected area was established. It notes that "managed" can include a decision to leave the area untouched if this is the best conservation strategy.

Long-term: IUCN guidance states that protected areas should be managed in perpetuity and not as short-term or temporary management strategy. It underscores that temporary measures, such as short-term grant-funded agricultural set-asides, rotations in commercial forest management or temporary fishing protection zones are not protected areas as recognized by the IUCN.

5.2   Questions

What questions do the above stipulations raise vis-à-vis OECMs? Regarding the time frame, for example:

- Should the same standard be applied to OECMs?
- Should the time frame be *in perpetuity, *long-term (what length should this be) or could it also be *short-term where the measure is renewed on a regular basis (annual for example, such as the Haddock box in Canada)?
- How hard should it be to reverse the measure?
- Should the measure be in place for a certain time before the area can be considered to be an OECM?

6.   RELEVANCE OF OTHER PROTECTED AREA PRINCIPLES

6.1   Protected Area-related Guidance

IUCN guidance includes the following principles that apply to protected areas.

- Protected areas must prevent, or eliminate where necessary, any exploitation or management practice that will be harmful to the objectives of designation;
- The choice of category should be based on the primary objective(s) stated for each protected area;
- The system is not intended to be hierarchical;
- All categories make a contribution to conservation but objectives must be chosen with respect to the particular situation; not all categories are equally useful in every situation;
- Any category can exist under any governance type and vice versa;

- A diversity of management approaches is desirable and should be encouraged, as it reflects the many ways in which communities around the world have expressed the universal value of the protected area concept;
- The category should be changed if assessment shows that the stated, long-term management objectives do not match those of the category assigned;
- However, the category is not a reflection of management effectiveness;
- Protected areas should usually aim to maintain or, ideally, increase the degree of naturalness of the ecosystem being protected;
- The definition and categories of protected areas should not be used as an excuse for dispossessing people of their land.

6.2   Questions

- Which of these principles are relevant or redundant to an OECM discussion, and why?

7.   RELEVANCE OF OTHER ELEMENTS OF TARGET 11

7.1   Target 11's other elements

- Target 11 has a number of qualifiers within it, namely those highlighted in the text: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, *especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services*, are conserved through *effectively and equitably managed*, *ecologically representative* and *well connected systems* of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and *integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes*. (Emphasis added).

8.1 Questions

- With reference to the literature (particularly Watson et al., 2015), how do these qualifiers relate to OECMs?
- Does Target 11 propose 'systems of protected areas' - as a unit - and OECMs as an additional approach that augments those systems, or 'systems of protected areas and OECMs'?

8.   GOVERNANCE

8.1   Protected Area-related Guidance

The IUCN publication *Governance of Protected Areas: From Understanding to Action* establishes that PAs can have four forms of governance:

1. Government: Federal or national ministry or agency, sub-national ministry or agency, government-delegated management.
2. Shared: transboundary governance, collaborative governance, joint governance.
3. Private: Conserved areas established and run by private land owners, non-profit organizations, for profit organizations

4. Indigenous peoples and local communities: Indigenous peoples' conserved areas and territories, community conserved areas and territories.

8.2   Questions

- Should there be any kind of governance-related guidance for OECMs, such as types that can or cannot govern OECMs. Can, for example, an extractive (oil, gas, mining) company, a power company or a logging company govern an OECM so long as the OECM complies with all the other guidance? If not, why not?

ANNEX I

TERMINOLOGY

A discussion about acronyms and terminology was raised by members over email. We are using the acronym OECM as a simplified version of OEABCM. We are not using the term 'conserved areas' as shorthand for OECMs as it is currently defined in a different context as:

> "…area-based measures that, regardless of recognition and dedication, and at times even regardless of explicit and conscious management practices, achieve *de facto* conservation and/or are in a positive conservation trend and likely to maintain it in the long term." (Borrini-Feyerabend and Hill, 2015)

ANNEX II

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following is a list of directly relevant documents, categorized to help Task Force members locate relevant resources and provide inputs. We welcome inputs by members.

1.   CBD documents relevant to OECMs

CBD COP 5, 15-26 May 2000. Decision V/6, 'Decision V Approach' in Decisions Adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its Fifth Meeting, UNEP/CBD/COP/5/23 (15-26 May 2000) Annex, para 1.

CBD Decision VII/28 (2004). 'Protected areas (Articles 8 (a) to (e))' in Decisions Adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its Seventh Meeting, UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/VII/28 (13 April 2004), Programme of Work on Protected Areas.

CBD Decision X/2 (2010). 'Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020' in Decisions Adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its Tenth Meeting.

CBD SBSTTA Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda, 'The Identification of Scientific and Technical Needs for the Attainment of the Targets Under Strategic Goal C of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020' UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/17/2/Add.3

CBD SBSTTA 17, 6-17 October 2014. Report of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice on the Work of its Seventeenth Meeting. UNEP/CBD/COP/12/2.

Glowka, L., Burhenne-Guilmin, F., and Synge, H. (1994). 'A Guide to the Convention on Biological Diversity' IUCN Environmental Policy and Law Paper No. 30, 2.

2.   Relevant IUCN Resolutions

IUCN (2012a).WCC-2012-Res-035-EN, 'Facilitating conservation through the establishment of protected areas as a basis for achieving Target 11 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020' in IUCN, *Resolutions and Recommendations.* IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.

IUCN (2012b). 'Position Paper on Protected areas', Agenda Item 13.4. Submitted to the eleventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

3.   Papers that directly address OECMs

Auster, P. (2015). Can Fishery Closed Areas Be Considered OECMs (Other Effective Conservations Measures) for Conservation of Biological Diversity: A Case Study From the Western Gulf of Maine (NW Atlantic). Working Paper.

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., and R. Hill (2015). 'Governance for the Conservation of Nature', in G.L. Worboys, M. Lockwood, A. Kothari, S. Feary and I. Pulsford (eds.) *Protected Area Governance and Management,* pp.169-206, ANU Press, Canberra.

Butchart, S., M. Clarke, R. Smith, R. Sykes, J. Scharlemann, M Harfoot, G. Buchanan, A. Angulo, A. Balmford, B. Bertzky, T. Brooks, K. Carpenter, M. Comeros-Raynal, J. Cornell, G. Ficetola, L. Fishpool, R. Fuller, J. Geldmann, H. Harwell, C. Hilton-Taylor, M. Hoffmann, A. Joolia, L. Joppa, N. Kingston, I. May1, A. Milam, B. Polidoro, G. Ralph, N. Richman, C. Rondinini, D. Segan, B. Skolnik, M. Spalding, S. Stuart, A. Symes, J. Taylor, P. Visconti, J. Watson, L. Wood, & N. Burgess (2015). Shortfalls and Solutions for Meeting National and Global Conservation Area Targets. Conservation Letters, September/October 2015, 8(5), 329–337

Canadian Council on Ecological Areas (2013). *Interpreting Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in the Canadian Context: Towards Consensus on "Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures"*. Summary and Results CCEA.

Jonas, H. and Lucas, S. (2013). *Legal Aspects of the Aichi Biodiversity Target 11: A Scoping Paper*. International Development Law Organization: Rome.

Jonas H.D., V. Barbuto, H.C. Jonas, A. Kothari, F. Nelson, 2014. "New Steps of Change: Looking Beyond Protected Areas to Consider Other Effective Area-based Conservaiton Measures." *PARKS 20.2*. IUCN: Gland.

Laffoley, D., and D. MacKinnon, 2015. A Brief Examinatioin of 'Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures' and what htey mean for Protected Areas'. MPA News Volume 16 Number 5.

Lopoukhine, N., and de Souza Dias, B. F. (2012). 'Editorial: What does Target 11 really mean?' *PARKS* 18(1) 5.

MacKinnon, D. C. J. Lemieux, K. Beazley, S. Woodley, R. Helie, J. Perron, J. Elliott, C. Haas, J. Langlois, H. Lazaruk, T. Beechey, and P. Gray (2015). Canada and Aichi Biodiversity Target 11: understanding 'other effective area-based conservation measures' in the context of the broader target. Biodiversity Conservation, DOI 10.1007/s10531-015-1018-1.

Watson J., E. Darling, O. Venter, M. Maron, J. Walston, H. Possingham, N. Dudley, M. Hockings, M. Barnes and T. Brooks (2015). Bolder Science Needed Now for Protected Areas. Conservation Biology, doi: 10.1111/cobi.12645.

Woodley, S., Bertzky, B., Crawhall, N., Dudley, N., Londono, J.M., MacKinnon, K., Redford K., and Sandwith, T. (2012).'Meeting Aichi 11: What Does Success Look Like For Protected Area Systems?' *PARKS* 18(1) 23.

4. Protected Areas

4.1 IUCN Guidance

Day, J., Dudley, N., Hocking M., Holmes G., Lafolley, D., Stolton, S., and Wells, S. (2012). *Guidelines for Applying the IUCN Protected Areas Management Categories to Marine Protected Areas*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Dudley, N. (ed.) (2008). *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

IUCN (1994). *Guidelines for Protected Area Management Categories.* Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Stolton, S., P. Shadie and N. Dudley (2013). *IUCN WCPA Best Practice Guidance on Recognising Protected Areas and Assigning Management Categories and Governance Types*, Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 21, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

4.2 Literature discussing the definition

Dudley, N., and Courrau, J. (2008). *Filling the gaps in protected area networks: A quick guide for protected area practitioners*. The Nature Conservancy.

Dudley, N., Parrish, J.D., Redford, K.H., and Stolton, S. (2010). 'The revised IUCN protected area management categories: the debate and ways forward ' Flora & Fauna International - *Oryx* 44(4) 486.

Gillespie, A. (2009). 'Defining Internationally Protected Areas'. *Journal of International Wildlife Law & Policy* 12:4 229.

Govan, H., and S. Jupiter (2013). 'Can the IUCN Protected Areas Management Categories Support Pacific Island Approaches to Conservation.' *PARKS* 19.1.

Phillips, A. (2004). 'The History of the International System of Protected Areas Categorisation' *PARKS* 14:3 4.

5. Other

[…]

6. Effective

Bertzky, B., Corrigan, C., Kemsey, J., Kenney, S., C. Ravilious, C. Besançon and N. Burgess, (2012). *Protected Planet Report 2012: Tracking progress towards global targets for protected areas.* IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, UK.

Carranza, T., A. Manica, V. Kapos and A. Balmford, (2014). 'Mismatches between conservation outcomes and management evaluation in protected areas: A case study in the Brazilian Cerrado', *Biological Conservation*, 173.

Dudley, N., D. Baldock, R. Nasi and S. Stolton (2005). Measuring Biodiversity and Sustainable Management in Forests and Agricultural Landscapes. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society. 360, 457-470.

Geldmann, J, Barnes, M, Coad, L, Craigie, ID, Hockings, M & Burgess, ND (2013), 'Effectiveness of terrestrial protected areas in reducing habitat loss and population declines' *Biological Conservation*, vol 161, pp. 230-238., 10.1016/j.biocon.2013.02.018

Leroux, S.J. *et al.* (2010) Global protected areas and IUCN designations: Do the categories match the conditions? Biological Conservation 143: 609–616.

Nelson, A. and K.M. Chomitz, (2011). 'Effectiveness of Strict vs. Multiple Use Protected Areas in Reducing Tropical Forest Fires: A Global Analysis Using Matching Methods'. *PLoS ONE*, 6(8): e22722. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0022722.

Nepstad, D., S. Schwartzman, B. Bamberger, M. Santilli, D. Ray, P. Schlesinger, P. Lefebvre, A. Alencar, E. Prinz, G. Fiske, and A. Rolla, (2006). "Inhibition of Amazon Deforestation and Fire by Parks and Indigenous Lands". *Conservation Biology*, 20(1): 65-73.

Stolton, S., and N. Dudley, (2006). Measuring Sustainable Use: A method to assess the conservation benefits from sustainable management outside protected areas and to include this information in ecoregional planning.

7. Area-based

[…]

8. Conservation

[…]

9. Measures

[…]

10. Governance

Borrini-Feyerabend, G. and R. Hill, (2015).'Governance of nature', in Worboys et al (eds.) (2014). *Governance and Management of Protected Areas*.

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., N. Dudley, T. Jaeger, B. Lassen, N. Pathak Broome, A. Phillips and T. Sandwith (2013). *Governance of Protected Areas: From understanding to action*. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 20, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. p. 5.

Nolte, C., A. Agrawal, K.M. Silvius, and B.S. Soares-Filho, (2013). 'Governance Regime and Location Influence Avoided Deforestation Success of Protected Areas in the Brazilian Amazon'. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(13): 4956–4961.

9.1 Governance by Indigenous Peoples' and Local Communities

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Pimbert, M., Farvar, M.T., Kothari, A. and Renard Y. (2004). *Sharing Power: Learning by doing in co-management of natural resources throughout the world.* International Institute for Environment and Development, IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy, and CENESTA, Tehran, Iran.

Borrini-Feyerabend, G., Lassen, B., Stevens, S., Martin, G., Riasco de la Pena, J. C., Raez-Luna, E. F. and Farvar, T. (2010). *Biocultural Diversity Conserved by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities*, ICCA Consortium and Cenesta for GEF SGP, GTZ, IIED and IUCN CEESP, Tehran.

Das, B., Ghosh S., Lahkar, B and Kumar, C.B. 2014. in Murti, R. and Buyck, C. (ed.) Safe Havens: Protected Areas for Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN. xii + 168 pp.

Eghenter, K. (2004). Community Conserved Areas as a Sustainable Forest Management Alternative around the Kayang Mentarang National Park. WWF: Indonesia.

Kothari, A. and Neumann, A. 2014. *ICCAs and Aichi Targets: The Contribution of Indigenous Peoples' and Local Community Conserved Territories and Areas to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-20*. Policy Brief of the ICCA Consortium, no. 1, co-produced with CBD Alliance, Kalpavriksh and CENESTA and in collaboration with the IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme.

Lovgren, S., (2003). "Map Links Healthier Ecosystems, Indigenous Peoples". *National Geographic News*. Available online at: http://bit.ly/1kENKxB.

Martin, G., del Campo, C., Camacho, C., Sauceda, G.E., and Juan, X.Z. (2010). 'Negotiating the web of law and policy: Community designation of indigenous and community conserved areas in Mexico.'*Policy Matters* 17: 195-204.

Molnar, A., Scherr, S. and Khare, A. (2004). *Who conserves the world's forests: community driven strategies to protect forests and respect rights.* Forest Trends and Eco-agriculture Partners, Washington, D.C., USA;

Porter-Bolland, L., et al., (2011). "Community managed forests and forest protected areas: An assessment of their conservation effectiveness across the tropics". *Forest Ecology and Management*, doi:10.1016/j.foreco.2011.05.034.

Stevens, S. (2014). Indigenous Peoples, National Parks and Protected Areas: A New Paradigm Linking Conservation, Culture and Rights. USA: University of Arizona Press.

Working Group on ICCAs (Indonesia) (2014). Customary Territories, Community Traditions, Nature Conservation: A collection of Indonesian Stories and perspectives on ICCAs.

WWF (2010). ICCAs: The Role of Incentives and Rights in Promoting Good Governance in Conservation. A CBD Briefing by WWF Indonesia.

9.2   Governance by Private Entities

Archipelago Consulting and Equilibrium Research (2013). *Private Protected Areas: Initial outputs from a workshop in Bristol*.

Stolton, S., Redford K. and Dudley, N. (2014). *The Futures of Privately Protected Areas*. Cambridge, UK: WCMC.

Other resources

IUCN and UNEP-WCMC (2014), The World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) [On-line]. Cambridge, UK: UNEP- WCMC. Available at: www.protectedplanet.net.