

# TASK FORCE ON OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA- BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES

## **CO-CHAIRS' REPORT OF THE FIRST MEETING OF INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS**

WORLD CONSERVATION MONITORING CENTRE, CAMBRIDGE: JANUARY 2016

# CONTENTS

## REPORT

1. Introduction
2. Aspirations and Concerns
3. Canadian Case Study
4. Other
5. Effective
6. Area-based Conservation Measures
7. Permanence
8. Governance and Other Relevant Principles
9. Hierarchy and Terminology
10. Form of Guidance
11. Roadmap

## ANNEXES

- I Agenda
- II Participants

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## Background

In response to CBD decision XI/24 (UNEP/CBD/COP/DEC/XI/24), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) established a Task Force on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs) to provide Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) relevant guidance. The Task Force, that has over seventy members, held its first in-person expert meeting at the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) in Cambridge, England, on 20-22 January 2016. The meeting was attended by 27 international experts, who represented Latin American, North American, European and Australian regional experiences as well as expertise in both marine and terrestrial ecosystems (See **Annex I**).

## Structure and Contents

The meeting began with a presentation by David MacKinnon, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas, who provided an overview of work on other effective area-based conservation measures in the Canadian context, which provided a useful basis for discussion. Because the subsequent comments were relatively wide ranging we have assigned them to the substantive sections to which they relate.

The report sets out the core elements of the participants' discussions. It groups the emergent ideas and provides commentary on areas of growing convergence as well as issues that require further discussion. The agenda is available in **Annex II**.

This report should be read in conjunction with the Task Force's *'Discussion Paper 1: Framing the Issues'*. It has been compiled based on notes taken at the meeting by the co-Chairs and other participants. Comments provided over email will be collated and circulated ahead of the next meeting. The outcomes of the meeting will be used to inform the forthcoming side event at the twentieth meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-20, Montreal, 25-30 April 2016) and the second international expert meeting (Isle of Vilm, 30 June – 4 July 2016).

## Acknowledgements

The co-Chairs opened and closed the meeting by underscoring their thanks to UNEP-WCMC for hosting the meeting, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation for its financial support, the participants who attended the meeting, and the broader Task Force membership for their continued investment in the process.

## Status of this Document

This is an informal document and neither constitutes official guidance nor establishes any binding precedent.

## 2. ASPIRATIONS AND CONCERNS

Acknowledging that the issues with which the Task Force is grappling have potentially wide-ranging implications for how 'conservation' is understood and undertaken, participants first discussed amongst themselves their aspirations and concerns about developing guidance on OECMs. Aspirations and concerns about the development of guidance varied considerably between participants, depending on individual experiences and background. The following sections list some of these views.

### 2.1 ASPIRATIONS

- OECMs, by definition, need to deliver 'effective' conservation, subject to the discussion about measuring effectiveness.
- Many potential OECMs, including some indigenous peoples' and local community conserved territories and areas (ICCAs) as well as private protected areas (PPAs), meet all elements of the IUCN definition of a protected area (and deliver conservation outcomes that may be equivalent or better than some designated protected areas) except for recognition as protected areas by the relevant government agency.
- OECMs may usefully augment the current system of protected areas, including enhancing ecological representation, landscape/seascape connectivity and buffer zones around protected areas.
- Guidance on OECMs might bring greater clarity to the existing definition of 'conserved areas' (including some areas governed by private individuals or groups, indigenous peoples and local communities), addressing issues of those areas' security, permanence and the monitoring of their effectiveness.
- Clear guidance on OECMs might bring increasing numbers of actors and governance models into more formal conservation networks.
- Recognizing OECMs, their biodiversity values and conservation outcomes might give them greater visibility and status, and enhance their security against threats.
- If an area is recognized as an OECM, it might change the mindset of the people governing and managing that area towards strengthening their focus on conservation outcomes.
- Official guidance might lead to national level laws on OECMs (though associated challenges were noted, below).

### 2.2 CONCERNS

- There is a need to ensure that the recognition of OECMs does not downgrade the concept and purpose of protected areas.
- OECMs must be areas maintaining high biodiversity value. It is important that recognition of OECMs does not lead to the recognition of areas of questionable or limited biodiversity value.
- Without a common understanding of the core traits of an OECM, accurate data cannot be collected.

- Recognition of OECMs may lead to recorded achievement of Aichi's terrestrial and marine targets while not achieving real gains in the overall area under conservation.
- Recognition of OECMs must not work against the creation of new protected areas or lead to existing protected areas being downgraded, downsized and degazetted (PADDD).
- The official recognition of OECMs may reverse important advances on governance and lead to protected areas becoming predominantly a government-governed area-based measure, with areas governed by private, indigenous and community groups being seen as OECMs.
- If OECMs are easier to designate than protected areas, they may enable governments to avoid 'tough' conservation decisions.
- OECMs may have important conservation benefits but there is an issue over their permanence and long-term security if they lack the legislative protection accorded to gazetted protected areas (i.e. they may be easily reversed).
- The challenge of how to measure conservation effectiveness is significant.
- Any draft guidance on OECMs should be rigorously tested at the national-to-local levels before being formally considered for endorsement under the CBD.

## 2.3 DISCUSSION

In the ensuing discussion, two important issues were discussed. First, it was suggested that it would be useful to research the parties' positions during the drafting of Target 11 to better understand the drafters' intent. After some debate, the group decided that this exercise would not yield any conclusive answers and IUCN should develop its guidance unencumbered by any conflicting versions of the reasons for the phrase's inclusion in the Target.

Second, UNEP-WCMC staff clarified the types of information included in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA), confirming that when a country reports an area as a protected area it is automatically entered into the WDPA. Noting that countries are already submitting data on OECMs (and UNEP-WCMC is setting up dedicated databases) it was suggested that having clear guidance on OECMs would greatly assist in measuring progress towards meeting the Aichi targets.

## 2. CANADIAN CASE STUDY

David MacKinnon, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas ([CCEA](#)), gave a presentation entitled: 'Development of Science-based Guidance for Reporting Protected Areas and "Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures" in the Canadian Context.'

Through a series of national workshops of conservation practitioners and other experts, the CCEA developed [science-based guidance](#) for reporting protected areas and "other effective area-based conservation measures" (referred to in the Canadian context as 'OEABCMs'). This guidance is intended for use by Canadian federal, provincial, and territorial agencies when reporting protected areas and OEABCMs to

the Canadian Conservation Areas Reporting and Tracking System ([CARTS](#)), which is the primary source of information for national reporting to the WDPA and on Canada's protected area-related commitments under the CBD.

The CCEA guidance identifies key traits and thresholds of effectiveness that conservation areas and mechanisms should have, in the Canadian context, to achieve the in-situ conservation of biodiversity (defined as "the conservation of ecosystems and natural habitats and the maintenance and recovery of viable populations of species in their natural surroundings"). The guidance primarily addresses potential effectiveness of tools, based on their traits, rather than realized effectiveness 'on the ground'.

The guidance gives recognition to tools and approaches that can effectively conserve biodiversity, regardless of governance type. It does not discount the value of other kinds of conservation measures, recognizing that all have their place, but does assist those making decisions on whether to report particular areas as part of Canada's contribution to the achievement of Aichi Target 11 and [Canada's 2020 Biodiversity Target 1](#).

The guidance includes a set of consensus-based statements on the traits of Aichi Target 11 OEABCMs (see [MacKinnon et al., 2015](#), table 3 and Outcome 3), a screening tool and guidance on its interpretation (see MacKinnon et al., 2015, Figure 2), and a supplementary screening tool specifically addressing the issue of subsurface resource rights ([link](#)).

The consensus statements address five main areas:

- **Purpose:** Areas included under Target 11 as OEABCMs must have an expressed purpose to conserve nature (biodiversity). We understand that this purpose might be achieved as a co-benefit of other management purposes or activities.
- **Duration:** Areas included under Target 11 as OEABCMs must be managed for the long-term to be effective. We accept a working definition of long-term to mean there is an expectation that conservation will continue indefinitely.
- **Conservation-objective primacy:** In areas included under Target 11 as OEABCMs, in cases of conflict with other objectives, nature conservation objectives shall not be compromised.
- **Nature conservation outcomes:** OEABCMs should result in effective and significant nature (biodiversity) conservation outcomes. When there are existing measures/areas that are to be considered as OEABCMs, evidence of conservation outcomes should be used as part of the screening process.
- **Strength of conservation measures reported as OEABCMs:** Areas included under Target 11 as OEABCMs should have a management regime that, through one or more measures that are effective alone or in combination, can reasonably be expected to be strong enough to ensure effective conservation, and if there are gaps, these will be addressed over time.

Guidance is provided on the interpretation of ‘sustainable use’ and ‘minimum standards of effectiveness’ in the context of Aichi Target 11 and Goal C of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.

The CCEA has also tested the application of its Aichi Target 11 screening tool to real-world examples of Canadian area-based conservation measures through a practitioner-led, peer-reviewed process. Outcomes of this screening exercise for four areas are shown in ‘Appendix Table 1-1’ (which will be circulated with this report). Of the four areas for which peer-reviewed screening has been completed, none were identified as OEABCMs, two were identified as protected areas that had been previously reported as such, one was identified as a hitherto-unreported protected area, and one was identified as neither a protected area nor an OEABCM. It is expected that further test application of the screening tool will identify Canadian examples of potential OEABCMs.

### 3. OTHER

Breakout groups considered the following four different types of potential OEABCMs, two of which meet the IUCN definition of a protected area and two that do not:

1. Meets all elements of the IUCN definition of a protected area, except for official recognition because:
  - a. The relevant government agency does not want to recognize it as a protected area,
  - b. The governance authority does not want the area to be recognized/listed/designated as a protected area by the relevant national government.
2. It does not meet one or more other elements of the IUCN definition of a protected area, but does conserve nature/biodiversity through:
  - a. Secondary voluntary conservation, i.e. conservation outcomes are achieved even though it is not the primary management objective.
  - b. Ancillary conservation, i.e. areas that deliver conservation outcomes as a byproduct of management activities with no conservation intent or through a lack of any management activities.

Participants were asked to consider their approach to each type of area, and provide reasons as to why they should or should not be considered to be OEABCMs.

#### 3.1 MEETS ALL ELEMENTS OF THE DEFINITION OF A PROTECTED AREA

Both types considered under this heading meet all elements of the IUCN definition of a protected area, except for official recognition. The first set is not recognized by the relevant governmental agencies. The second set is governed by authorities who - for a variety of reasons - do not want their areas recognized as protected areas.

- a. **... but the relevant government agency does not want to recognize it as a protected area**

### Comments included:

- Recognizing these areas as an OECM was considered an important step to ensure that they are rightfully included in national reports and listed in the WDPA.
- It would be desirable to recognize them as OECMs to raise their profile and thereby lessen the risks to their ecological and cultural integrity, and long-term security.
- It was asked whether recognition of such an area as an OECM might help it to transition to becoming a protected area under the right/appropriate conditions? It was felt that this approach would be useful in Colombia, for example, but would require appropriate legislation.

### Potential examples

- *Government:* Some government-governed Important Bird Areas (IBAs), Alliance for Zero Extinction sites (AZE) and other Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), Ecologically and Biologically Significant Areas (EBSAs), and as well as Ramsar sites, transboundary areas, buffer zones and ecological corridors that fit the IUCN definition of a protected area, except for official recognition.
- *Non-government:* Private, indigenous and community-governed areas that fit the IUCN definition of a protected area, except for official recognition.

### b. ... but the governance authority/landowners prefers the area not to be recognized as a PA

Participants discussed why a governing authority might not want to have an area recognized as a protected area. One example is where a national protected area law would subject that area to a series of unwelcome rules (as judged by the area's governing authority), such as mandatory changes to the existing governance structure. Comments included:

- Recognition of areas as OECMs where a governance authority prefers the area not to be recognized as a protected area would still require free, prior and informed consent of the relevant authority.
- More thought is required to assess how recognition as an OECM improves the area's security without subjecting it to regulations considered oppressive by the governing authority.

### Potential examples

Private, indigenous and community governed areas and sacred natural sites that fit the IUCN definition of a protected area, except for official recognition, because the governing authority does not want the area to be listed as a protected area.

### 3.2 DOES NOT MEET OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE DEFINITION OF A PROTECTED AREA

The following two kinds of areas do not meet the definition of a protected area. The first group is described as being conserved through secondary voluntary conservation, i.e. conservation outcomes are achieved even though conservation is not the primary management objective. The second group achieves conservation outcomes despite there being no intention to conserve the area and/or awareness of the conservation value of the area.

The discussion of these two types of area challenged the participants to consider the differences between protected areas that meet the definition by *intending to protect nature* and other areas where there is no intention but they are nevertheless *effective* at achieving conservation. This issue is further discussed in Section 3.

#### **a. ... but there is secondary voluntary conservation**

Questions around 'secondary voluntary conservation' generated the most discussion. Participants raised a number of questions about exactly what forms of management, awareness of an area's conservation values and levels of intention to conserve (passive/active) would constitute secondary voluntary conservation.

Questions included:

- What level of awareness should the governing authority have about the area's conservation values?
- Does voluntary conservation cover instances where the outcome may be specified by the governing authority in addition to another primary management objective?
- Should there be a correlation between the management objectives and the area's ecological and/or cultural values?
- Should an area whose primary aim does not yield to conservation in case of conflict be considered to be an OECM?

A number of community conservation-related examples were provided including farmers whose practices are linked to the health of the local ecosystem, including in the context of Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Sites (GIAHS). The Canadian Haddock Box was also raised, with a number of participants raising concerns with similar types of areas being included as OECMs.

In this context, a UK-based scheme that invites protected areas governance authorities and/or managers to fill in 'statements of compliance' was offered as a practical way to demonstrate intent to manage for conservation.<sup>1</sup>

#### **Potential examples**

- Government-, private-, indigenous- or community-governed areas that are not managed specifically for conservation but do deliver conservation outcomes, in both marine and terrestrial ecosystems.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.iucn-uk.org/projects/protectedareas/tabid/65/default.aspx>

- There was a question as to whether well-managed modified or rural landscapes and GIAHS should be included under this category or the next - with the assumption that the distinction would be made according to an evaluation of the conditions of the area's governance and management.
- Some areas managed for other purposes e.g. water catchments managed to maintain their natural condition, military areas and other water catchment areas that have a conservation plan.
- There was significant concern about including sustainably managed forests (e.g., Forest Stewardship Council-certified forests or set-aside portions thereof) even as a potential example because of the well-documented impacts of forest harvest on biodiversity, uncertainty about long-term security of areas under such forms of management, and the varying degrees to which such schemes prioritize conservation of biodiversity. Instances were cited from Canada where changes in land ownership led to loss of sustainability certification, where certifications issued to different landowners accorded vastly different priorities to biodiversity conservation, and where compliance failures led to loss of specific areas ostensibly set aside for their high conservation values.

There was a call for more clarity about terminology and the provision of a range of concrete examples to illustrate the kinds of areas and activities being discussed.

## **B. ... but there is ancillary conservation**

Participants grappled with the question of whether areas where there is no intention (or even awareness) to conserve nature, that nevertheless deliver conservation outcomes, should be included as OECMs.

Some participants argued that the conservation outcome is paramount (not intention to conserve) and thus would include forms of ancillary conservation. Others argued that conservation intent may not be the primary objective but should be *an* objective (as per secondary voluntary conservation). A further group underscored that only areas that meet the first principle of protected areas (above) should be included.

### **Potential examples**

- Sacred places in which there is no conservation focus but nevertheless there are clear conservation outcomes.
- Some types of production landscapes and some fishery management areas.
- Watersheds, some types of wetland-based sewage-treatment plants, logging concessions with no conservation plan.
- Areas around infrastructure, including oil rigs and dams.
- Lands alienated from human use, such as military, security or exclusion zones, such as Chernobyl.

## **3.3 COMMENTARY**

**Four kinds of area:** Subject to more in depth consideration, the participants:

- **Converged** towards recognizing as OECMs areas that essentially meet the key elements of the IUCN protected area definition, except for official recognition, because the relevant government agency does not want to recognize it as a protected area. This was considered important as a means to ensure the areas are recognized and to promote their security, and should be done as part of a broader push to encourage governments to recognize areas that meet the protected area definition as protected areas (except where the governance authority rejects the label).
- **Converged** towards including as OECMs areas that meet all elements of the protected area definition, except for official recognition, because the governance authority prefers the area not to be recognized as a protected area. This was considered important to provide recognition and support for the area, but would still require consent of landowners.
- **Called for further discussion and case studies** about areas described as delivering: a) secondary voluntary conservation, and b) ancillary conservation.

**Incompatible activities:** The group discussed whether it would be useful to list specific types of activities that are considered incompatible with OECMs. In this context, the group remained skeptical about the conservation value of a range of (non-exhaustive and non-exclusive) areas subject to industrial uses including:

- Forestry, including certified forests;
- Extractive concessions;
- Temporary fishery closures; and
- Exclusion zones dedicated to national security and other kinds of military areas.

**Single species:** There was a growing consensus that single species measures that do not address the wider habitat should not be considered OECMs, though it was recognized that some protected areas set up with a primary objective of protecting a single species usefully contribute to a wider system of protected areas and OECMs, provided that management measures require that the habitat, and conditions for maintenance of key life cycle stages, for that species is maintained (i.e. that control on harvesting is not the single management measure).

**Overlapping areas and biodiversity offsets:** The group agreed it would be useful to clarify the relationship between IBAs, KBAs, EBSAs and AZEs, including assessing their overlap with ICCAs, subject to further discussions about the public disclosure of community lands, waters and resources.<sup>2</sup> It was suggested that more thought should be given to how biodiversity offsets might be figured into the emerging framework.

**Other Aichi Targets:** It was suggested that not every conservation-related activity need fall under Target 11. For example, agricultural areas may more appropriately

---

<sup>2</sup> In this context, the Global Biodiversity Information Facility was referenced: [www.gbif.org](http://www.gbif.org)

relate to Target 7.<sup>3</sup> Others, such as temporary fishing closures, might best be included under Target 6.<sup>4</sup>

## 4. EFFECTIVENESS

### 4.1 MANAGEMENT AND/OR CONSERVATION EFFECTIVENESS

Target 11 specifically mentions effective and equitable management. Management effectiveness evaluation for protected areas is defined by Hockings et al.<sup>5</sup> as “the assessment of how well protected areas are being managed – primarily the extent to which management is protecting values and achieving goals and objectives.” The term ‘management effectiveness’ encompasses three core areas of focus in protected area management:

- Design issues relating to both individual sites and protected area systems;
- Adequacy and appropriateness of management systems and processes; and
- Delivery of protected area objectives including conservation of values.

Some participants argued that because the IUCN protected area definition hinges on an *intention* to conserve nature it is appropriate for protected areas - but not OECMs - to be subject to the full remit of management effectiveness. In contrast, OECMs, whose key attribute is effectiveness, should only be subject to the third element of management effectiveness, namely conservation effectiveness. From a practical point of view, if there is only partial or no intention to conserve nature, how can management effectiveness be measured?

### 4.2 MONITORING, EVALUATING AND REPORTING

Much greater thought needs to be given to how to require monitoring and evaluation of conservation effectiveness. This might be challenging in certain areas (such as offshore) and focus would be required to co-develop appropriate methodologies with various groups, including indigenous peoples and local communities.

Two related issues were raised: a) might an overly stringent set of standards or methodology exclude certain otherwise worthy areas, and b) how can a diversity of cultural approaches to monitoring and evaluation contribute positively to the need for accurate data.

---

<sup>3</sup> By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.

<sup>4</sup> By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits

<sup>5</sup> Hockings, M., Stolton, S., Leverington, F., Dudley, N. and Courrau, J. (2006). Evaluating Effectiveness: A framework for assessing management effectiveness of protected areas. 2nd edition. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. xiv + 105 pp.

### 4.3 ADDITIONAL ISSUES

- In addition to the actual level of conservation effectiveness, should there be an additional test for the governance effectiveness (addressed below)? Any evaluation should consider both potential and realized effectiveness.
- While it would be desirable for evaluations to be data driven (including from a diversity of sciences) this could set a higher bar for OECMs than for protected areas. Would it be desirable or practical for countries or types of area (private/indigenous/community) to develop their own protocols around this issue?
- There was a reminder to retain focus on cultural values of protected areas and OECMs, and not just on ecological values.

## 5. AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES

### 5.1 BOUNDARIES

Being able to define areas' boundaries was considered to be important for reporting purposes, to guard against a lack of accuracy and/or for enforceability. In this context, questions were raised about how easily the boundaries of ICCAs could be defined. It was also suggested that in assessing criteria for OECMs, we should focus on criteria that are widely applicable and not be overly concerned with 'outliers' or relatively rare examples that disprove the rule.

### 5.2 SYSTEMS

In the context of Target 11 referencing "systems of protected areas and OECMs", the group discussions converged towards interpreting the phrase as a single measure that includes protected areas *and* OECMs as *one system* made up of a range of different kinds of area-based conservation measures.

### 5.3 CONSERVATION MEASURE

There was no discussion about the definition of 'conservation measure', and the group used IUCN and the CBD definitions of 'conservation' and '*in situ* conservation' throughout.

## 6. PERMANENCE

Participants argued about whether governance authorities must be able to show that the area is to be managed in a way that will deliver conservation outcomes over the long-term, in perpetuity or indefinitely (i.e. demonstrable long-term intent). They also questioned whether the governance authorities should demonstrate that the decision to maintain the conservation area is not easily reversible.

In this context, it was asked whether a track record showing long-term commitment to conservation could serve in lieu of more formal decisions? Could historical uses of land practices illustrate the level of permanence of the management practices? As

above, statements of compliance were mentioned in this context as being of potential use.

## 7. GOVERNANCE & OTHER RELEVANT PRINCIPLES

OECMs should embrace a wide variety of governance types, and should be describable and accepted by the relevant community. The methodology set out in Part II of IUCN's *Guidelines on Governance of Protected Areas* was proposed as a useful methodology for applying to OECMs.

On other protected area-related principles, and with reference to the section above on incompatible activities, one participant suggested the second protected area principle is relevant, namely: *Protected areas must prevent, or eliminate where necessary, any exploitation or management practice that will be harmful to the objectives of designation.*

## 8. HIERARCHIES AND TERMINOLOGY

### 8.1 HIERARCHIES OF CONSERVATION

The group debated the notion of hierarchy between protected areas and OECMs. At first there were suggestions that OECMs should be cast as being secondary to protected areas, which might promote areas aspiring to 'graduate' from OECMs to protected area status. But in light of the fact that all OECMs would necessarily have to provide effective conservation (subject to the discussion above about management or conservation effectiveness), the group converged on the concept that protected areas and OECMs could occupy the same range of conservation effectiveness.

### 8.2 TERMINOLOGY

Participants discussed whether 'conserved areas' might be appropriate shorthand for 'other effective area-based conservation measures' and it was felt that it was premature to make any recommendation.

## 9. FORM OF GUIDANCE

Over the three days, a number of suggestions were made about how to present the guidance.

### 9.1 OVERARCHING APPROACH

Participants suggest that, wherever possible, the advice should be the same for terrestrial and marine areas, including the inter-tidal zone. It was suggested that the guidance should unite, bring together and encourage greater conservation efforts.

### 9.2 PREAMBLE

Ideas for how to introduce the guidance, included:

- Recall the overall purpose of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;
- Note that the advice about OECMs is part of a larger shift in the way we understand conservation;
- State that IUCN “gives this advice in a rapidly changing world”;
- Recall that the targets in Target 11 were developed with protected areas in mind, not necessarily the new areas we are now considering under OECMs. Therefore, we should restate the advice given in IUCN Resolution on facilitating conservation through the establishment of protected areas as a basis for achieving Target 11 of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 (WCC-2012-Res-035-EN) that states that Target 11 should be achieved mainly through protected areas;
- State that in the post-2020 architecture, nature requires a greater percentage of the Earth’s surface than it is currently afforded;
- Place protected areas and OECMs in the broader context of climate change;
- Underscore that Target 11 states “at least”, so the aim is to surpass - not just meet - the targets at the global level by 2020;
- Suggest that in the post-2020 targets, protected areas and OECMs have different percentage targets;
- Underscore that the guidance does not ‘create’ new areas but recognizes important existing areas;
- If examples are used, they should clearly state that they are described “at time of writing” in case their nature changes and they are used for political means; and
- The preamble could also include many of the issues listed under ‘aspirations’ and ‘concerns’ (above).

### 9.3 TIMEFRAME AND TOOLS

It was suggested that presenting guidance in a phased approach would provide time for sectoral and national level consultations. Further guidance could be set out in interpretive notes or as a decision tool (with an example being provided). Finally, it was heavily underscored that any preliminary guidance should be tested in national settings.

As the meeting concluded, it was agreed that wide range of areas require further deliberation and/or explanation, including:

- Marine areas and fishery exclusion zones;
- Areas that should not be included as OECMs;
- How to measure effective conservation outside of protected areas; and
- The overlap between KBAs and ICCAs.

## 10. ROADMAP

### 10.1 ROADMAP

- Submit to the CBD Secretariat an update of our work to date in time for it to be included in an information document at SBSTTA-20 (April, Montreal,);
- Host a side event at SBSTTA-20;
- Advance our thinking in Vilm (30 June - 4 July) and at the WCC (September, Hawai'i), by testing evolving guidance against a range of specific case studies of potential OECMs;
- Provide the Secretariat a further update on our progress together with a consultation draft to be circulated to Parties for consultation prior to COP-13 (December, Cancun);
- Host a side event at the COP to update parties and other interested groups about our work and related WCC outcomes;
- Host a side event at the Ramsar Scientific and Technical Review Panel (2017); and
- Develop interim guidance (“consultation draft”) in 2017 and road test it to be able to finalize guidance by COP-14.

## 10.2 RELATED INITIATIVES

The group briefly discussed ongoing initiatives that are relevant to the Task Force’s work, that include:

- Ongoing processes to better define and recognize IBAs, KBAs, AZEs and EBSAs;
- IUCN governance assessments (that will include, among others: Colombia, Peru, Vietnam, Kenya, Brazil, and Ecuador, Tanzania, Senegal, Iran, Philippines and Indonesia);
- Specialist Group on Governance of Protected and Conserved Areas, ICCA registry;
- Specialist Group on Management Effectiveness;
- Joint WCPA-SSC Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas completing the global KBA standard and assessing what makes protected areas have positive biodiversity outcomes;
- Ramsar Secretariat research on the number of Ramsar sites that are not protected areas; and
- Expansion of work on Green List on Protected and Conserved areas, the Conservation Assured | Tiger Standards and on connectivity conservation.

## ANNEX I: ATTENDEES

Attendees, in alphabetical order by surname:

1. Heather Bingham, Protected Areas Programme, UNEP-WCMC
2. Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Global Coordinator, ICCA Consortium
3. Neil Burgess, Head of Science, UNEP-WCMC
4. Christie Chute, Fisheries and Oceans Canada
5. Pepe Clark, Birdlife International
6. Peter Cochrane, Protected Areas Expert
7. Nigel Dudley, Equilibrium Research
8. Edgar Fernandez, Researcher
9. Sarat Gidda, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
10. Terence Hay-Edie, UNDP GEF-Small Grant Programme
11. Robert Hélie, Vice Chairperson, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas
12. Mark Hockings, Protected Areas Expert
13. Sabine Jessen, Oceans Programme, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society
14. Harry Jonas, Natural Justice (Task Force Co-Chair)
15. Naomi Kingston, Protected Areas Programme, UNEP-WCMC
16. Dan Laffoley, Marine Conservation Expert
17. Thierry Lefebvre, IUCN France
18. David MacKinnon, Chairperson, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas
19. Kathy MacKinnon, WCPA Chair (Task Force Co-Chair)
20. Julia Miranda Londono, WCPA Deputy Chair
21. Jacques Perron, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas
22. Trevor Sandwith, Director, IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme
23. Sue Stolton, Equilibrium Research
24. David Thomas, Birdlife International
25. Sue Wells, Marine Conservation Expert
26. Stephen Woodley, Protected Areas Expert
27. Lew Young, Secretariat of the Ramsar Convention

## ANNEX II: AGENDA

DAY 1	
9:15-10:30am	Overview of the meeting followed by an icebreaker discussion on our aspirations/concerns about OECMs
10:30-11:00	Opening comments on the agenda and framework paper, including initial feedback
11:00-11:30	Break
11:30-13:00	Presentation about the <b>Canadian experience with defining OECMs</b>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-15:30	Plenary/breakout groups to consider relationship of OECM to PAs ('Other')
15:30-16:00	Break
16:00-17:30	<b>Feedback and consolidation of views and issues for follow up</b>
DAY 2	
9:15-11:00	Consideration of <b>Effective</b>
11:00-11:30	Break
11:30-13:00	Consideration of <b>Area-based Conservation and Measures</b>
13:00-14:00	Lunch
14:00-15:30	Discussion of <b>terrestrial OECMs</b>
15:30-16:00	Break
16:00-17:30	Discussion <b>marine OECMs</b>
19:00	Dinner hosted by Kathy MacKinnon at Haddenham
DAY 3	
9:15-11:00	Consideration of other relevant issues including <b>Governance &amp; Monitoring</b>
11:00-11:30	Break
11:30-13:00	Recap and consideration of the discussion thus far. Identification of appropriate research and case study needs and linkages to other processes (such as the UNDP/IUCN governance assessments)
13.00 -14.00	Lunch
14:00-15:00	Discussion of the roadmap towards CBD COP-13 (including SBSTTA-20, Vilm and the WCC), expected deliverables and fundraising