



## Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.  
GENERAL

CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/9/3  
18 February 2020

ENGLISH ONLY

### REPORT OF THE THEMATIC WORKSHOP ON AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK

La Prairie, Canada, 1-3 December 2019

#### INTRODUCTION

1. The Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its fourteenth meeting adopted decision [14/34](#) on the preparatory process for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requested the Executive Secretary to facilitate the implementation of the process. The Conference of the Parties also decided that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework should be accompanied by an inspirational and motivating 2030 Mission as a stepping stone towards the 2050 Vision of “Living in harmony with nature”. In order to support the preparation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, an open-ended intersessional working group was established. Mr. Francis Ogwal (Uganda) and Mr. Basile van Havre (Canada) were designated as Co-Chairs of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, which held its first meeting in Nairobi from 27 to 30 August 2019, with discussions centred on the possible elements of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and recommendations regarding future steps for its preparation.
2. In decision [14/34](#) (para. 6), the Conference of the Parties urged Parties and invited other Governments and stakeholders to “actively engage and contribute to the process of developing a robust post-2020 global biodiversity framework in order to foster strong ownership of the framework to be agreed and strong support for its immediate implementation”. Therefore, it was agreed that regional consultations and thematic workshops would serve as a platform for the discussions. At its first meeting, the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework took note of a preliminary list of meetings, consultations and workshops for the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and requested that this be further developed and updated.<sup>1</sup>
3. The Thematic Workshop on Area-based Conservation Measures for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework was held in La Prairie, Quebec, Canada, from 1 to 3 December 2019. The workshop was organized by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity with the generous financial support of the Government of Norway and the National Geographic Society, under the guidance of the Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. The workshop was attended by 80 participants, including representatives of Parties to the Convention, as well as relevant organizations and representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities and the CBD Alliance, as well as different stakeholder groups (women and youth). A full list of participants is provided in [annex I](#).
4. The thematic workshop was an expert meeting aimed at providing specific inputs for the use of the Co-Chairs of the Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework for consideration in their work on the zero draft of the post-2020 framework. The outputs will contribute to informing negotiations at the second meeting of the Working Group. As planned, the thematic workshop explored

<sup>1</sup> For the report of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework on its first meeting, see [CBD/WG2020/1/5](#).

options for elements of goal(s), target(s), and sub-target(s) with baselines and relevant indicators on area-based conservation measures to inform the post-2020 framework.

5. A concept note was posted on the workshop [website](#), and an introductory information email was sent to participants. Three information documents were also issued: (a) general background on area-based conservation measures; (b) summaries of some recently published papers on area-based conservation measures; and (c) synthesis of views from submissions regarding area-based conservation measures in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

6. Two webinars were organized prior to the workshop to provide participants with background information, as well as the approach, objectives, expected outputs and overall expected outcome, to facilitate effective participation and contribution during the workshop.

7. Registration of participants commenced at 8.30 a.m. on Sunday, 1 December 2019.

### **ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP**

8. The workshop was opened at 9:30 a.m. on Sunday, 1 December 2019. Participants were welcomed by Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema, Acting Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. In her opening statement, Ms. Mrema reminded participants of the ongoing biodiversity crisis, as reported in the first global assessment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), and discussed some of the direct drivers of biodiversity loss and the role that area-based conservation measures could play in addressing them. She highlighted the importance of a broad range of area-based conservation measures for achieving the Convention's 2050 Vision. She also touched on the important links between biodiversity conservation and the delivery of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the need for greater emphasis on sustainable use, better integration of biodiversity into the wider landscape and seascape, and mainstreaming at all levels. She also mentioned the importance of linking future targets on area-based conservation measures with potential targets on, inter alia, restoration, ecosystem services, and climate change.

### **ITEM 2. INTRODUCTION TO AND PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP**

9. The Co-Chairs of the Open-ended Working Group on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, Mr. Francis Ogwal and Mr. Basile van Havre, provided an overview of progress in the preparatory process for the post-2020 framework. They presented the timeline for the organization of work related to the post-2020, highlighting the work completed to date, as well as the dates for upcoming meetings. They also noted a number of external processes that will be considered, as appropriate. They discussed the goals of the thematic workshops and roles of the related co-leads, and reported on some of the key messages that came out of the regional consultations carried out in the first half of 2019. They concluded with a discussion on the overarching framework for post-2020, emphasizing that it is being designed as a global framework, not limited to the Convention. Some aspects they addressed included the 2050 Vision, possible 2030 Mission and goals for the conservation of species, ecosystems and genetic diversity, among others. They also included enabling conditions, means of implementation, tools and solutions, as well as mainstreaming, and the integration of gender in the framework. The Co-Chairs of the Working Group also mentioned the role of targets for reducing threats from direct drivers, such as land use change, over-exploitation, and for meeting people's needs, among other topics.

10. Next, Ms. Marie-May Muzungaile (Seychelles) and Mr. Stefan Leiner (European Union), the co-leads for the workshop appointed by the Co-Chairs of the Working Group, provided an introduction to the meeting, by highlighting its purpose and expected outputs. Potential outputs include concrete proposals for goals, targets, indicators, and baselines for further consideration for inclusion in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. They outlined key considerations, for example proposed goals or targets should be ambitious but realistic, and reiterated the general approach to the structure and content of the post-2020 framework. They highlighted the importance of quality aspects (for example, connectivity, effective

management, representativeness, etc.) for any future goals or targets for area-based conservation measures.

### **ITEM 3. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS**

11. The participants were invited to consider the provisional agenda ([CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/09/1](#)) and the proposed organization of work, as contained in annex I of the annotated agenda ([CBD/POST2020/WS/2019/09/Add.1](#)). The agenda was adopted, following the announcement of one amendment: under item 5, Mr. James Watson's presentation was not going to directly address results of the IPBES Global Assessment.

12. Between the second and third day of the meeting there was another change to the agenda: Item 11 (Contribution to other potential elements of the post-2020 framework) was removed in order for the meeting to end earlier than originally scheduled.

### **ITEM 4. OUTCOMES OF PREVIOUS THEMATIC WORKSHOPS FOR THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

13. Presentations were made regarding the outcomes of two previous thematic workshops for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

14. Ms. Lisa Janishevski, Acting Programme Management Officer with the CBD Secretariat, presented the main outcomes of the Thematic Workshop on Ecosystem Restoration for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, as well as the two preparatory workshops covering integrated local approaches to ecosystem restoration governance and a mapping support tool developed by the International Institute on Sustainability (IIS). The outputs of the thematic workshop included a discussion on targets, including draft language for different aspects and key messages on the role of ecosystem restoration in the post-2020 framework. Four main discussion topics were covered: (a) principles/qualitative elements of a post-2020 target for restoration; (b) metrics and indicators; (c) linkages to other targets under the Convention; and (d) linkages to other international agreements. She also mentioned key messages regarding implementation and for a target on restoration, including:

- (a) There is a need for an ambitious, overarching and holistic global target on restoration;
- (b) The target needs to be outcome-oriented (reflecting biodiversity outcomes or others);
- (c) A restoration target should consider synergies with existing international and national commitments (for example, Nationally Determined Contributions under the Paris Agreement);
- (d) A restoration target should consider all ecosystems.

15. Mr. Joseph Appiott, Associate Programme Management Officer with the CBD Secretariat, then presented the main outcomes of the Thematic Workshop on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework, which was part of the 2020 Ocean Pathways Week. Some of the issues of focus for 2030 discussed included: exploitation of marine living resources; marine pollution; important marine ecosystems; ecosystem restoration; area-based planning and conservation; and threatened, endangered and declining species. Other issues identified as requiring further discussion included: climate change and ocean biodiversity; regional approaches; marine spatial planning; and the exploitation of non-living resources. Some of the discussion topics related to area-based planning and conservation covered during the workshop included: different types of area-based conservation measures; possible percentage targets; elements of quality, including representativeness, stakeholder engagement, equity, inclusiveness, connectivity, networks and integration; as well as planning approaches, such as marine spatial planning. Some of the specific points he touched on included the need to focus on quality of area-based conservation measures, in particular effectiveness, but also emphasizing and strengthening other qualitative elements such as governance, coverage of important biodiversity areas and connectivity. He reiterated that, in trying to build a global framework, there was a need to bring along different sectors and different multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).

16. The complete reports for the above two workshops are available on the meeting websites for [ecosystem restoration](#) and [marine and coastal biodiversity](#).

17. Following both presentations, questions from participants were addressed. Some of the discussion points that were raised included:

- (a) When thinking about restoration, the first step should be to halt degradation.
- (b) Integrated landscape and seascape approaches are needed for restoration.
- (c) There needs to be a connection with various elements including gender and equity issues.
- (d) There is a need to address the interaction between terrestrial, coastal and marine areas.
- (e) The exploitation of non-living resources, such as mining, also needs consideration.

#### **ITEM 5. STOCK-TAKING ON CURRENT STATE AND FUTURE TRENDS**

18. The first day was devoted to setting the stage, stock-taking, and lessons learned. Under this item, two presentations provided some background on the status and future trends of area-based conservation measures, including on the progress that has been made to date, and what is necessary in the future to inform the formulation of possible goals, targets or sub-targets.

19. Mr. Patrick Gannon of the CBD Secretariat presented an overview of progress on Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 implementation since 2010, covering all elements of the target and presenting a possible view of the status in 2020 based on the implementation of proposed national commitments. He noted that progress on the quantitative aspects of Target 11 had been significant, though progress for many of the qualitative elements had been slower. If proposed national commitments were completed as planned, both quantitative targets (17% terrestrial and 10% marine) should be surpassed by 2020.

20. Mr. James Watson, Director of the Science of Knowledge Initiative and Global Climate Change Programme at the Wildlife Conservation Society, and Professor of Conservation Science at the University of Queensland, made a presentation on lessons learned from the preceding 10 years for informing future targets for area-based conservation measures and the post 2020 global biodiversity framework. Some key points included: although growth in the global coverage of protected areas has been significant, this has led to little improvement in the proportion of important sites for biodiversity that are covered; three broad goals for area-based conservation measures should be addressed in the new framework (preventing species extinction and ecosystem collapse; stopping species and ecological decline so as to retain functional species assemblages and ecosystem integrity; and sustaining essential ecosystem services); protected area downgrading, downsizing, and degazettement (PADDD) and the increase in protected areas under intense human pressure are ongoing problems; a global retention target can be created from a set of sub-targets providing the minimum natural land area needed to achieve some goal (such as watershed protection).

21. Both presentations are summarized in [annex II](#), and all presentation slides are available on the meeting [website](#).

#### **ITEM 6. AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES AND THE 2050 VISION**

22. This item was focused on identifying relevant aspects of area based conservation measures as they relate to the 2050 Vision and included three presentations made in plenary.

23. The first presentation, by Ms. Kathy MacKinnon, Chair of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), helped to introduce various approaches to area-based conservation measures, with a particular focus on other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) as defined in [decision 14/8](#), among other approaches. She explained aspects of the OECM definition and the difference between protected areas which should have a *primary* conservation objective and OECMs, which should *deliver* effective *in situ* conservation of biodiversity, regardless of their primary management objectives.

24. Mr. Enric Sala, Explorer-in-Residence at the National Geographic Society, presented results of an ocean mapping project to inform the post-2020 framework. The project quantified priorities for marine biodiversity conservation using a framework that can also prioritize achievement of other objectives (carbon storage and food provisioning). The approach can be used to address how much of the ocean can be protected at no cost to fishing, and overlaying high priority areas for the three goals (biodiversity conservation, climate mitigation, food provisioning) could allow for the identification of areas with high priority for multiple overlapping goals.

25. Mr. David Cooper, Deputy Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, gave a presentation on the relationship between area-based conservation measures and aspects of the CBD 2050 Vision, where biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people. He discussed different types of area-based conservation, such as protected areas and OECMs, as well as strategies aimed at retaining and restoring ecosystems embedded within broader landscape/seascape planning approaches, and their roles in addressing aspects of the 2050 Vision.

26. Following the three presentations, there was some discussion in plenary. Questions were raised regarding the application of the OECM definition and criteria in marine areas—and it was confirmed that the guidance was indeed applicable for the marine realm. It was noted that there was an expert meeting organized in May 2019 by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the CBD Secretariat and the Fisheries Expert Group of the IUCN aimed at drafting advice on the implementation of OECMs in the marine capture fishery sector. It was suggested that it will be important to have a joint target for protected areas and OECMs but that they should be reported separately. Then, discussion turned to the relationship between provisioning ecosystem services and OECMs, as much of the focus is often around regulating and supporting services. Provisioning services are vital for human well-being, but actions to enhance any particular ecosystem system service in an OECM should only be done in ways that do not reduce its value for other native biodiversity.

27. On Day 3 of the workshop, an additional presentation was made on OECMs by Ms. Kathy MacKinnon (IUCN-WCPA) to provide some clarity on their definition and criteria for identification. She was joined by Mr. David MacKinnon, Vice Chair of the Canadian Council on Ecological Areas and System Planning Coordinator with the Protected Areas and Ecosystems Branch of Nova Scotia Environment, who introduced a screening tool developed in Canada to assist in the identification of candidate OECMs.

28. The discussion that followed the presentation raised the following points:

- (a) OECMs should not ignore provisioning and cultural ecosystem services;
- (b) What legal instruments are available to formally recognise OECMs?
- (c) Regarding temporary fishery closures, the fishery management laws in many countries require that these are only in place for a specific time period, which would seem to limit their ability to meet the criteria for the identification of an OECM, which is meant to be “in place for the long term or [is] likely to be”. Often the intent is for the fishery closures to be renewed, but legally they are going to be time-bound;
- (d) Bottom trawling, and other severe destructive activities, should not be permitted in OECMs or in marine protected areas (MPAs).

29. All presentations are summarized in [annex II](#).

#### **ITEM 7. LESSONS LEARNED DURING IMPLEMENTATION OF AICHI TARGET 11**

30. Participants were split into six breakout groups to discuss lessons drawn from the design, implementation and monitoring of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, so as to identify good practices and potential barriers to inform the development of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework in the



context of area-based conservation measures. The small group discussions focused on the following questions:

- (a) What worked well regarding the design, implementation and monitoring of Target 11?
- (b) What did not work regarding the design, implementation and monitoring of Target 11?
- (c) Were there specific opportunities or challenges faced in implementation, regarding specific elements of Target 11?
- (d) How can these lessons be used to inform the development of the post-2020 framework?

31. The results from the breakout group sessions were reported back to the plenary by facilitators, and are summarized in [annex III](#).

32. Some general points raised regarding what worked well included: Target 11 had high political visibility; it had some aspects of a SMART target (with some participants feeling that the percentage target drove action and ambition); the presence of many elements of quality drove a focus towards these important issues; there was a thorough process facilitated by the CBD Secretariat promoting the implementation of this target, including regional meetings, the engagement and support of Parties and a range of international organizations who created a specific supporting partnership and a regular monitoring and reporting exercise; development of a definition for OECM (allowing the recognition of effective conservation outside of protected areas); among others.

33. Regarding what did not work, participants stressed that, inter alia: many of the quality elements were confusing, and some lacked definition; the percentage targets (17% and 10%) may have created pressure to count anything, and may have diverted attention away from implementation and effectiveness; many elements of the target were not considered measurable and lacked indicators; the definition of OECMs was only adopted at the end of the 10 year period; several indicators were not developed at the same time as the target; there was nothing to ensure adequate resources necessary to ensure effectiveness; Target 11's operative phrase—“*are conserved*”—was never measured; and there was often less political support for protected areas as a whole, or for actually ensuring protections once a site is designated.

34. Going forward, it was suggested that having a time bound, measurable, clearly defined target that is generally easy to understand, as well as the continuation of an implementation support process, would be beneficial. Some other points that were raised included: quality elements should be measurable; ensuring quality should be the primary focus; outcome-based indicators are needed; the target(s) should be simple—having too many elements together may lead to some being missed or ignored; there should be agreed means of verification for area-based conservation measures to avoid ‘paper parks’; and there is a need for proper accountability for monitoring and reporting (see full list in [annex III](#)).

35. In the general discussion that followed the presentation of results from the six breakout groups, a number of points were raised, including:

- (a) Timing is an issue—we cannot wait several years to have terms defined and indicators selected, as was the case under the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;
- (b) Inter-ministerial communication and cooperation is important, the achievement of the targets should be a whole government responsibility;
- (c) There is a need to define ‘what is effective management’.

#### **ITEM 8. CASE STUDIES FOCUSED ON TARGET SETTING FOR POST-2020**

36. Case study presentations were made by representatives of four Parties:<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> A presentation was also planned from Ms. Edna Maria Carolina Jarro Fajardo, Deputy Director, Management of Protected Areas and National Natural Parks of Colombia, though she was not able to attend the meeting.

(a) Mr. Olaf Jensen, Director of the Protected Areas Programme at Environment and Climate Change Canada;

(b) Mr. Steve Kirkman, Officer and Specialist Scientist, Directorate Biodiversity and Coastal Research, Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries, South Africa;

(c) Ms. Irina Onufrenya, Protected Areas Officer, WWF-Russia, representing the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of the Russian Federation;

(d) Ms. Yan Liu, Director of Division of Nature Reserve and Biodiversity Conservation, Nanjing Institute of Environmental Sciences, Ministry of Ecology and Environment Research Center for Nature Conservation and Biodiversity, People's Republic of China.

37. The purpose of these presentations was to provide some food for thought for deliberations during the following two days of the workshop, and not meant as respective country positions, *per se*. As mentioned under item 6, the presentations are summarized in [annex II](#).

38. The discussions that followed in plenary raised a number of questions, including:

(a) How do investments in one country affect conservation in other countries, and how can this be addressed going forward?

(b) How to consider standard management practices at a regional level?

(c) Is there any conflict between Ecological Conservation Redlines (ECR) and economic development?

(d) How can ECR be delineated using both top-down and bottom-up approaches?

(e) It was noted that ECR will contribute to Target 11; how will these areas be reported?

#### **ITEM 9. AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES IN THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK: ELEMENTS OF GOALS AND TARGETS**

39. Participants were divided into rotating breakout groups to discuss six thematic issues, supported by facilitators<sup>3</sup> and note takers designated by the workshop co-leads. Groups rotated every hour, so that each participant was able to participate in a discussion on every thematic issue. The thematic issues discussed included:

(a) The potential scope of area based conservation measures to be included in the post 2020 framework (for example protected areas, OECM, indigenous lands), considering also other relevant international instruments and processes, and including possible coverage (for example the percentage of terrestrial and percentage of marine ecosystems with a special spatial management regime);

(b) Representativeness, especially areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services (areas of importance for priority conservation and for conservation overall in the long term);

(c) Connectivity (enhancing a coherent well connected network of areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services) and the ecosystem approach;

(d) Effectiveness (including means to improve and strengthen conservation effectiveness);

(e) Equity and good governance, as well as benefit-sharing (including social impacts and ecosystem services);

---

<sup>3</sup> Facilitators were: Naomi Kingston (scope and coverage), Stephen Woodley (representativeness and areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services), Gregoire Dubois (connectivity and the ecosystem approach), Jonas Geldmann (effectiveness), Trevor Sandwith (equity and good governance), and Jamison Ervin (landscape and seascape approaches including spatial planning).

(f) Landscape and seascape approaches to enhance conservation outcomes and sustainable use, including spatial planning.

40. These discussions were focused on constructive and specific proposals for goals, targets, sub-targets, and actions for area-based conservation measures in the post-2020 framework with a view towards the 2050 Vision. Each breakout group discussed and identified options for potential goals, targets, sub-targets and actions for the thematic issues listed above. Throughout the day, all participants had the opportunity to discuss each of the six thematic issues. The breakout groups did not aim to negotiate and achieve consensus, but rather, focused on developing options for potential language in the post-2020 framework.

41. The results of the six breakout groups were reported to the plenary by facilitators in the morning on Day 3 of the workshop, and a synthesis of the discussions for each of the six thematic issues is provided in [annex IV](#). Key points raised in the six summaries include:

(a) *Potential scope and coverage*: There was some discussion around the question of ‘What are Area Based Conservation Measures (ABCM)’? Some felt that the term adds confusion and one should rather use the words protected areas and OECMs:

- (i) Other points raised include, inter alia, synergies between different targets should be clear; target(s) should be more ambitious, be outcome-based and focus on quality; and alongside the target(s), means of implementation, means of review, and enabling conditions need to be included;
- (ii) Participants made a number of proposals for the post-2020 framework, for example: one overarching land-use target should address managing threats on land and sea, with sub-targets for different aspects (for example, conservation, restoration, protected areas, fisheries, etc.); overarching goals addressing the landscape/seascape scale could include “urgently halt the loss of intact ecosystems”, “100% Sustainable Earth”, or “By 2030, No Net Loss of ecosystem quality and extent, with Net Gain by 2040”;
- (iii) A nested target was proposed (though the exact percentage for each aspect was highly debated and is provided only as an example): “By 2030, [100% sustainable earth], with [50%] in areas managed for biodiversity (such as areas maintained for sustainable use, wider landscape/seascape approaches, shorter term measures, etc.), [30%] in protected areas and OECMs, of which [10%] is in highly or fully protected areas”.

(b) *Representativeness, areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services*: It was noted that representation and areas important for biodiversity should be included in a post-2020 target for ABCM (either in the target itself, or as sub-targets). Regarding ecosystem services, many felt this was a much broader topic and could be better served through a specific target, beyond just inclusion in an ABCM target:

- (i) Representation may focus on different components of biodiversity, though ecoregions are appropriate for a global target;
- (ii) Effective representation is a function of quality, so a minimum level of protection for ecoregions may differ depending on their quality, level of intactness, etc.;
- (iii) A declining percentage target based on human footprint values or levels of intactness was recommended: for highly intact ecoregions, the percent retained would be much higher (~80%) and the percentage target would decline as intactness declines, until it reaches some minimum threshold (30% or 50%); at the highest human footprint levels (lowest level of intactness) a restoration target would be defined to return intact ecosystems up to this threshold, while conserving whatever fragments of intact ecosystem remain. Issues of urgency and fairness need to be addressed;



- (iv) Retention of areas important for biodiversity is related primarily to a protected areas target but some elements may also be delivered by other targets as part of sustainable management (for example, Key Biodiversity Areas [KBAs] in production forests);
  - (v) The value of biodiversity needs to be central, and there should be a focus on conservation outcomes;
  - (vi) The most commonly discussed means to identify areas important for biodiversity were KBAs and Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs). KBAs are currently incomplete, so a target may include reference to the need to complete their identification. A range of different means for prioritising the placement of protected areas and OECMs in areas of importance for biodiversity were mentioned including *inter alia*, climate refugia, highly intact areas (old growth forests, unploughed grasslands), crop wild relatives, wilderness areas, Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs), and Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs);
  - (vii) Proposed language for a target could include: “key biodiversity areas, EBSAs, and equivalent national or regional processes are documented, retained and restored”;
  - (viii) There was discussion over where to focus a potential target for ecosystem services—what category of services should be prioritized? It was noted that all types of ecosystem services cannot be bundled and should not be treated as one (i.e. they need to be treated separately). Clarity was recommended when discussing ecosystem services, as the different categories are very different things and should not be considered together. As well, trade-offs are common between different categories<sup>4</sup> of ecosystem services;
  - (ix) There may be a strong relationship with areas of importance for biodiversity, though trade-offs and synergies will need to be addressed. A focus on areas of high carbon value could be considered for an ABCM, for areas where there is strong overlap with high biodiversity values. There is a need for mechanisms addressing fairness, resources and compensation, as biodiversity and conservation opportunities are highly uneven between countries.
- (c) *Connectivity and the ecosystem approach*: It was noted that connectivity would not have to be addressed if we had intact ecosystems and landscapes; maintaining integrity of large ecosystems should remain a priority:
- (i) Both maintaining connectivity where it currently exists and restoring connectivity where it has been lost should be addressed in the new framework;
  - (ii) Given the wide range of intactness across different landscapes, there may need to be different actions taken to maintain or restore connectivity depending on the condition of the landscape/seascape (intact, mildly fragmented, or very fragmented);
  - (iii) Connectivity is currently only mentioned in Target 11, though this may be considered misplaced, as connectivity does not need to rely only on protected areas and OECMs;
  - (iv) There is a need to stress the importance of connectivity in multiple targets in the new framework (on restoration of ecosystems, planning of conservation areas, climate change, species, etc.);
  - (v) An ecosystems target should focus on ‘no loss of integrity’, while a species target should focus on migratory species. Some suggestions for elements of a post-2020 target(s) include, *inter alia*, a focus on preserving intactness as a first priority, no further

---

<sup>4</sup> Regulatory services, provisioning services, cultural services, and supporting services.

fragmentation of ecosystems and reduction of existing barriers, and the restoration of areas that have already been fragmented;

- (vi) Connectivity is about spatial planning and prioritization—but how do we balance the weight of the priorities (such as the maintenance of intact ecosystem with little biodiversity) versus high cost of developments (for restoration or green infrastructures) in highly fragmented areas with high biodiversity?
- (vii) Connectivity is also recognized as a key element for the way of life of many indigenous communities.

(d) *Effectiveness*: This was noted as a critical component for protected areas and OECMs, though one that was not addressed adequately under the current Strategic Plan. One significant issue was the lack of an explicit focus on outcomes. Delivering on effectiveness should be a cornerstone of any post-2020 target on ABCM:

- (i) Effectiveness is related to the delivery of outcomes, which could cover a range of issues such as improving/maintaining/restoring biodiversity, reducing threats, and delivering ecosystem services). Although effectiveness should ultimately be about outcomes, all groups recognized that it was closely linked to management, and that assessing management should be an important component of any future target;
- (ii) Effectiveness is relevant at both the national and the site level;
- (iii) Ensuring long-term funding stability for protected areas after their initial designation is important;
- (iv) Enforcing effectiveness is difficult, but critical to the success of a target on protected areas and OECMs;
- (v) The four main components of the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas,<sup>5</sup> with their identified criteria and indicators, were mentioned as a useful way to operationalize effectiveness meaningfully and measurably;
- (vi) Target language for the post-2020 framework should clearly specify “*delivery of effective in situ conservation of biodiversity*” rather than “effectively and equitably managed”;

(e) *Equity and good governance*: The new framework should reflect the need for achievement of both biodiversity and social outcomes as well as accounting for the balance, responsibility and burden of these dimensions:

- (i) Post-2020 targets should draw on the voluntary guidelines on effective governance models for management of protected areas, including equity,<sup>6</sup> and many other decisions of the Conference of the Parties that already underscore the importance of good governance and equity;
- (ii) Good governance and equity are quality measures for effectiveness, which should be reflected in the future goals, targets or indicators;
- (iii) Legislation needs to be in place requiring recognition, procedural equity and benefit-sharing;

---

<sup>5</sup> Good governance, Sound design and planning, Effective management, Successful conservation outcomes (See IUCN and WCPA, 2017, *IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas: Standard, Version 1.1*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN).

<sup>6</sup> See [decision 14/8](#), annex II.

- (iv) Currently, data is primarily provided by governments; however, this may miss important action being taken by other actors. The full diversity of governance approaches and institutions need to be reflected;
  - (v) Governance plans should be adopted and integrated into spatial planning processes;
  - (vi) Good governance has to be reflected in the institutional setting for effective protected areas and OECMs, requiring an accountable governance body;
  - (vii) Compliance and enforcement mechanisms must be in place;
  - (viii) Addressing issues of equity and good governance should take place at the site and system level for ABCM; however, these also need to be addressed in the wider landscape/seascape-scale;
  - (ix) Quality standards for good governance and equity should be in place, including the Akwé:Kon principles;<sup>7</sup>
  - (x) The availability of resources to support and enhance equity and good governance are needed.
- (f) *Landscape and seascape approaches, including spatial planning*: The definition of the scale of landscape/seascape needs to be addressed—and targets at multiple scales may be needed for this:
- (i) Landscape/seascape integration cannot have a sole focus on conservation, due to the risk of the exclusion of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs). Landscape approaches have the potential to leverage the ties between cultural and biological diversity, which should be considered in the post-2020 framework;
  - (ii) Integration should be an overarching theme throughout all targets, not only for a target on ABCM. Landscapes/seascapes should be the context of the whole post-2020 framework, not just an element of a target on ABCM, and can help address different actions in the three global conditions.<sup>8</sup> As integration also covers more than connectivity, it needs to also address functional integrity, thresholds and tipping points;
  - (iii) There should be a new goal centred on landscape/seascape conservation, which may involve the following components: integrated planning, habitat conservation, abatement of threats, mitigation of negative impacts, and restoration of degraded habitats;
  - (iv) There was also discussion around proposed goal(s), target(s) and/or sub-target(s) related to landscape/seascape approaches, including spatial planning. Some examples include: By 2030 all NBSAPs and related policies incorporate the concept of landscape/seascape approaches explicitly; ABCMs are planned and implemented following an ecosystem approach, protecting key biodiversity areas, retaining intact ecosystems and buffering them through natural restoration and sustainable management of surrounding areas; the contributions of all stakeholders, including private sector actors, are integrated into the management approaches of ABCMs; By 2030, 50% of landscapes and seascapes outside of protected areas and OECMs are managed in ecologically sustainable ways that are integrated with, and supportive of, protected areas and OECMs achieving the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity in the face of climate change; By 2030 all the spatial planning process passes a strategic environmental process, including public consultations;

<sup>7</sup> See <https://www.cbd.int/traditional/guidelines.shtml>

<sup>8</sup> Highly modified cities and farms; shared landscapes; large wild areas (see Locke, H. et al. 2019, Three Global Conditions for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use: an implementation framework. *National Science Review*).

By 2030, implement integrated landscape and seascape planning to bring conservation and sustainable use policies into complementary alignment.

42. Following the six presentations, all facilitators remained for a panel discussion. Some issues raised during this discussion included:

- (a) Many of the issues being discussed need to cut across the new framework, not only to be considered in a target for area-based conservation (for example, equity, governance, connectivity, etc.);
- (b) Emphasis on the quality elements must be enhanced—all quality elements currently covered in Target 11 should be reflected in the new framework;
- (c) There was a feeling that, if a global target of 30% is adopted for 2030, this should be treated as a milestone on the way towards more ambitious targets for 2040 or 2050;
- (d) There was some discussion around the use of terms, where it was noted that oftentimes, outside of the conservation community there is limited understanding. This should be addressed, as there is a need to obtain much broader support for the new framework;
- (e) Need to be careful about proposing percentage targets and defining specific thresholds;
- (f) There was discussion around whether the target should specify some percentage as ‘highly’ or ‘fully’ protected<sup>9</sup> (as a subset of the total area under protected areas or OECMs). However, it was noted that ‘highly’ and ‘fully’ protected have not been officially defined under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and it was noted that they do not necessarily equate to any specific IUCN management category.<sup>10</sup> Only 65% of sites reported in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) apply IUCN management categories, and they are often not used in a consistent way across countries. Hence, it would be more appropriate to look at what activities are allowed or not allowed;
- (g) It was noted that some elements have limited indicators, which will need to be addressed for the new framework (see also [annex V](#));
- (h) With respect to the need for carbon sequestration, we cannot afford to lose remaining intact forests—a target focusing on no net loss of intact habitats was also mentioned;
- (i) While “100% sustainable Earth” is not necessarily the recommended phrasing, the concept is appropriate as a long-term goal. The term ‘sustainable’ is associated with “open for exploitation” by some, so careful consideration around the use of language will be needed. The ‘100% sustainable’ proposal could be linked to the planetary boundaries concept;
- (j) We need to think in a cross-sectoral manner and there is a need for the application of landscape/seascape approaches;
- (k) It is important to consider IPLCs, cultural aspects, and other issues related to people (a proposed wording could include “100% sustainable Earth with 100% respect for IPLCs”);
- (l) In many places, there has been movement away from management practices that are ‘biodiversity-supportive’ (for example with agricultural intensification, application of pesticides, etc.);
- (m) Business as usual cannot continue—we need transformative change. From the IPBES *Global Assessment*, as well as other recent assessments, one crucial issue that has been raised is the link between trade, development and biodiversity loss. These issues need to be clearly addressed in the new framework, if we are to be successful in achieving the 2050 Vision;

<sup>9</sup> See for example definitions of ‘highly’ and ‘fully’ protected in the MPA guide: <https://www.protectedplanet.net/c/mpa-guide>

<sup>10</sup> Dudley, N. (Editor) (2008), *Guidelines for Applying Protected Area Management Categories*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

(n) There is a need to address global finance and its impact on the environment; for example, there are trillions of dollars going towards fossil fuel and agricultural subsidies globally, and money going towards forest destruction is orders of magnitude higher than funding for forest restoration;

(o) The concept of Biosphere Reserves was raised as a model for area-based conservation combining conservation and sustainable use;

(p) It was noted that many current protected areas fail to meet effectiveness standards. Targets for the new framework could include some target for reaching standards of effectiveness (for example, by 2030, xx% of protected areas and OECMs reach some standard of effectiveness and equity);

(q) There was also some discussion over whether targets should be differentiated for terrestrial and marine areas;

(r) A key failing of Target 11 was a lack of consideration for achieving outcomes. However, if the focus is placed on biodiversity outcomes, it should be recognized that many protected areas do not manage for biodiversity—and were not established for this goal. Many protected areas play different roles, for example protecting iconic landscapes or areas with recreational value, among others;

(s) There should be some focus on what counts as a protected area, and some process for verification, to avoid ‘paper parks’;

(t) Regarding connectivity, the specific metric used is not the point. New metrics will continue to be developed. The goal should be to ensure the maintenance of ecological integrity and ensuring that connectivity is incorporated in spatial plans, land-use plans and other appropriate processes;

(u) There were questions regarding how to disaggregate the global target for national, or subnational, implementation. There needs to be more clarity about how global targets are applied nationally/locally, while respecting principles of fairness as well as common but differentiated responsibilities;

(v) There should be alignment between global targets, national commitments, reporting, NBSAPs, indicators, and spatial data can be used to bring all of these together.

#### **ITEM 10. BASELINE AND INDICATORS FOR EFFECTIVE MONITORING**

43. Participants divided themselves into small groups based on personal interest to discuss baselines and indicators for the six thematic areas, building on the discussions from Day 2, with the same six facilitators as for [item 9](#). The six breakout groups discussed baseline information, indicators, and the monitoring framework necessary for the development of long-term goals, targets, and sub-targets for area-based conservation measures in the post-2020 framework.

44. The results of the breakout group discussions were reported to the plenary by the facilitators. A summary of the discussions on baselines and indicators is provided in [annex V](#). Some issues covered include:

- (a) Potential scope and coverage of ABCM:
  - The discussion of protected areas and OECMs should be kept separate from discussion of other approaches that may have some potential conservation benefit.
  - Separate reporting for protected areas and OECMs was discussed.
  - A global database for reporting on OECMs was only recently established,<sup>11</sup> and we are still a long way from comprehensive reporting.

---

<sup>11</sup> The World Database on other effective area-based conservation measures (WD-OECM) was first published in December 2019 (<https://www.protectedplanet.net/c/other-effective-area-based-conservation-measures>).



- The ICCA Registry<sup>12</sup> for territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs) is available for IPLC governed sites.
  - There is no clear mechanism for reporting other ABCM, beyond protected areas/OECMs.
  - To support better reporting, there is a need for in-country capacity-building; there is a need for resource mobilization for training, workshops, etc.
  - There is a need for testing/validation to address protected area downgrading, downsizing, and degazettement (PADDD).
- (b) Representativeness, areas of importance for biodiversity, and ecosystem services:
- Representativeness should be measured at the scale of ecoregions (though finer scale data could be used where available).
  - Retention targets should be set for each ecoregion; these could vary depending on the level of intactness of the ecoregion (for example, 80% retained for highly intact ecoregions, 50% retention for moderately intact ecoregions, and for impaired ecoregions, all remnants should be retained with restoration applied where possible). This approach could apply to terrestrial and coastal areas, though it may not work for marine areas, where the main threat is often over-harvesting (here the target could be to sustainably manage all fisheries and have xx% retained in MPAs).
  - Representativeness should be measured separately for terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine areas.
  - For areas important for biodiversity, the target could be “areas of importance for biodiversity, including KBAs, EBSAs or equivalent national priorities are documented, retained and restored”.
  - As the list of KBAs is still incomplete, the indicator should include the identification of all areas important for biodiversity.
  - For ecosystem services, most do not have global indicator; they are locally consumed, and should be locally conserved. Some regulatory services, such as carbon storage or water, could have global indicators.
- (c) Connectivity and the ecosystem approach:
- Spatial planning is at the core of ensuring connectivity—this process needs to be strengthened.
  - There is a need for indicators for the identification and maintenance of ecologically intact areas (the primary goal should be maintaining intactness, rather than connectivity).
  - Indicators for connectivity will depend on what we want to connect.
  - Countries should submit action plans for corridors, addressing climate change resilience and adaptation.
  - Transboundary coordination needs to be in place.
  - See the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) for suggestions regarding connectivity indicators.
- (d) Effectiveness:
- Indicators for effectiveness need to address conservation outcomes, in addition to the current focus on management inputs and outputs.
  - Remote sensing can be used for some indicators for biodiversity outcome.
  - Protected area management effectiveness (PAME) score cards can be useful for understanding effectiveness.

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.iccaregistry.org/>

- Inclusive processes are needed for validation, including the use of Indigenous Knowledge.
  - There is a need for understanding sites' objectives, in order to assess effectiveness.
  - Need to link to accountability.
- (e) Equity and good governance:
- Indicators for equity and good governance are available from many sources but are often not applied.
  - Some examples of potential indicators that were discussed could include: SDG 16 indicators for institutions and inequality; Kaufmann-Kray indicators of good governance; indicators from Transparency International; among others (see full list in [Annex V](#)).
- (f) Landscape and seascape approaches, including spatial planning:
- Physical attributes of landscapes/seascapes can be assessed using remote sensing (and there are many indicators currently available);
  - Biodiversity state may be harder to monitor;
  - Regarding planning and social indicators, we could assess IPLC land tenure security, make use of cadastral maps, and look at governance structure, integrated marine basin plans, among others.
45. Some discussion points raised in plenary during the subsequent discussion were included:
- (a) When dealing with connectivity, specificity will be important. It was noted that 'ecological connectivity' was defined formally at CMS in 2019.
- (b) Making clear links with other Conventions will be important in the new framework, especially those who have already developed indicators for many of the issues that will be addressed in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- (c) There is need also to account for indigenous and traditional knowledge.

#### **ITEM 11. CONTRIBUTION TO OTHER POTENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE POST-2020 GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY FRAMEWORK**

46. This item was removed following discussion among the Co-Chairs of the Working Group and workshop co-leads on the evening of Day 2, in order to enable the workshop to end earlier. However, issues related to the links between ABCM and other potential elements of the post-2020 framework were raised in several of the group discussions throughout the workshop.

#### **ITEM 12. FURTHER ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION**

47. Following the suggestions provided by participants at the end of Day 2 regarding key issues that were either missing or were not discussed enough during the first two days of the workshop, participants' feedback cards were assessed, and four topics were selected for further discussion:

- (a) Resource mobilization;
  - (b) Transparency, review and reporting;
  - (c) Climate change;
  - (d) People (including various topics around the human dimension of area-based conservation measures and the post-2020 framework).
48. Discussions occurred in small groups, with participants sorting themselves into groups based on personal interest in the selected topics. Facilitators and note-takers were elected from among participants in each group. Results of these discussions were reported back to the plenary and are summarized in

[annex VI](#) (resource mobilization), [annex VII](#) (transparency, review and reporting) and [annex VIII](#) (climate change and people). Some of the points raised included:

(a) There are already significant funding shortfalls for protected areas and OECMs, which will only increase if more ambitious targets are adopted in the new framework—so, new funding mechanisms will need to be investigated. Market-based strategies, which are being explored for many other targets, may be less applicable for protected areas and OECMs. Protected areas and OECMs need sustainable funding over the long-term to ensure effectiveness. Given the uneven global distribution of biodiversity and differentiated needs regarding conservation, the principle of ‘common but differentiated responsibilities’ needs consideration when addressing funding requirements;

(b) Open and accessible data is needed, though for some protected area governance arrangements (for example, many privately protected areas) there may be privacy concerns that need to be addressed. Data needs to be useable and accessible. There were questions raised about how often data needs to be updated. For territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs), there is a need for free, prior, and informed consent. Transparency is needed around the calculation of indicator values, around assessments of effectiveness, and other important aspects. Improved reporting and peer review processes are needed for addressing transparency, in reporting for the post-2020 framework. Review is essential, but the type of review depends on the product in question; The impacts of climate change on biodiversity, as well as the role biodiversity can play in climate change mitigation and adaptation, both need consideration. Climate change should be addressed in the new framework, but outside of a target on ABCM. There is a need to avoid negative synergies between targets. The role of nature-based solutions for climate mitigation and their implementation in protected areas and OECMs was discussed. Various proposed priority actions regarding protected areas and climate change were discussed and it was also recommended that the Co-Chairs complete a climate change risk assessment of the proposed post-2020 framework;

(c) There is a need to ensure the application of a rights-based approach in ABCMs. The interdependency of biodiversity and culture and the intrinsic relationship between nature and cultural diversity need to be recognized. The Rights of Nature/right to a healthy environment need to be respected. Full, effective, inclusive and meaningful engagement and participation is needed, and there should be zero tolerance for human rights violations and evictions with respect to ABCM.

### **ITEM 13. CLOSING OF THE WORKSHOP**

49. The Co-Chairs of the Working Group and the workshop co-leads provided their reflections on the discussions of the workshop and presented the next steps regarding the process for the preparations of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the consideration of area-based conservation measures. They reiterated the process for the preparation of the post-2020 framework that will continue throughout 2020. They encouraged participants to remain engaged in this process.

50. A closing statement was made by Mr. Alexander Shestakov, Director of Science, Society and Sustainable Futures Division, CBD Secretariat. He outlined the next steps in the process, and among others, mentioned some of the other upcoming workshops and consultations. He thanked the Government of Norway and National Geographic Society for their generous financial support and thanked the facilitators and all those who provided case studies and presentations.

51. The meeting was closed at 4 pm on Tuesday, 3 December 2019.

*Annex I*

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**CO-CHAIRS OF THE WORKING GROUP**

1. Mr. Francis Sabino Meri Ogwal  
Co-Chair of the Working Group on the  
Post-2020 Global Biodiversity  
Framework  
Natural Resources Management  
Specialist (Biodiversity and Rangelands)  
National Environment Management  
Authority  
Kampala, Uganda
2. Mr. Basile van Havre  
Co-Chair of the Working Group on the  
Post-2020 Global Biodiversity  
Framework  
Director General for the Biodiversity  
Policy and Partnerships Directorate  
Canadian Wildlife Service  
Environment and Climate Change  
Canada  
Gatineau, Canada

**PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION**

**AFRICA**

**Chad**

3. Ms. Sadie Ousman Daba Director  
General  
Ministry of Environment, Water and  
Fisheries  
N'Djamena, Chad

**Eswatini**

4. Mr. Thulani Methula  
Director of National Parks  
Eswatini National Trust Commission  
Lobamba, Eswatini

**Gambia**

5. Mr. Kawsu Jammeh  
Senior Wildlife Conservation Officer  
Department of Parks and Wildlife  
Management,  
Ministry of Environment, Climate  
Change, Water and Wildlife

Banjul, Gambia (The)

**Guinea**

6. Mr. Aoubacar Oulare  
National Director of Biodiversity and  
Protected Areas  
Ministry of Environment, Water and  
Forests  
Conakry, Guinea

**Seychelles**

7. Ms. Marie-May Alice Muzungaile  
*Co-lead of the Workshop*  
Director General  
Biodiversity Conservation and  
Management Division  
Ministry of Environment, Energy and  
Climate change  
Victoria, Seychelles

**South Africa**

8. Dr. Stephen Patrick Kirkman  
Officer and Specialist Scientist  
Directorate Biodiversity and Coastal  
Research  
Department of Environment, Forestry  
and Fisheries,  
Cape Town, South Africa

**United Republic of Tanzania**

9. Mr. Thomas Joachim Chali  
Permanent Secretary and Senior  
Environment officer  
Division of Environment  
Vice President's Office  
Dodoma, United Republic of Tanzania

**ASIA AND THE PACIFIC**

**Cambodia**

10. Mr. Monyrak Meng  
Director of Biodiversity Department  
General Secretariat of National Council  
for Sustainable Development  
Ministry of Environment  
Phnom Penh, Cambodia

## **China**

11. Ms. Yan Liu  
Director of Division of Nature Reserve  
and Biodiversity Conservation  
Nanjing Institute of Environmental  
Sciences  
Ministry of Ecology and Environment  
Research Center for Nature  
Conservation and Biodiversity  
Nanjing, China

## **Japan**

12. Ms. Makiko Yanagiya  
Deputy Director  
Biodiversity Policy Division  
Nature Conservation Bureau  
Ministry of the Environment  
Tokyo, Japan

## **Jordan**

13. Mr. Raed Ahmmmed Bani Hani  
Director of Nature Protection  
Directorate CBD National Focal Point  
Ministry of Environment  
Amman, Jordan

## **Republic of Korea**

14. Dr. Hag Young Heo  
Senior Research Fellow  
National Park Research Institute  
Korea National Park Service  
Seoul, Republic of Korea

## **Palau**

15. Ms. Joan Yang  
Senior Officer  
PEW Charitable Trusts  
Philadelphia, United States

## **Sri Lanka**

16. Dr. Jinie Dhanika Shirindra Dela  
Biodiversity Consultant  
Ministry of Mahaweli Development and  
Environment  
Panadura, Sri Lanka

## **Turkmenistan**

17. Ms. Shirin B. Karryyeva  
Project Manager

Michael Succow Foundation and  
Ministry of Agriculture and  
Environment Protection Environment  
Central Asian Desert Initiative (CADI)  
Project  
Ashgabat, Turkmenistan

## **GROUP OF LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES (GRULAC)**

### **Argentina**

18. Mr. Joaquin Elias Salzberg  
Official  
Department of Environmental Affairs  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Buenos Aires, Argentina

### **Brazil**

19. Ms. Luciana Melchert Saguas Presas  
Diplomat  
Deputy Head of Environment Division  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil  
Brasilia, Brazil

### **El Salvador**

20. Mr. Carlos Giovanni Rivera  
Technician in Biotechnology and  
Ecosystem Restoration and Wildlife  
Ministry of Environment and Natural  
Resources  
San Salvador, El Salvador

### **Mexico**

21. Mr. Ignacio Jose March Mifsut  
Director for Evaluation and Monitoring  
National Commission on Natural  
Protected Areas  
Mexico City, Mexico

## **CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE**

### **Belarus**

22. Dr. Vasili Shakun  
Head of Laboratory  
Scientific and Practical Center for Bio-  
resources of the National Academy of  
Sciences of Belarus  
Minsk, Belarus



**Bosnia and Herzegovina**

23. Mr. Adnan Medic  
Cantonal Nature and Environment  
Protection Inspector  
Cantonal Administration for Inspection  
Ministry of Environment and Tourism  
Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

**Croatia**

24. Ms. Ramona Topic  
Head of Department for Nature Impact  
Assessment  
Ministry of Environment and Energy  
Zagreb, Croatia

**Republic of Moldova**

25. Dr. Victoria Nisteanu  
Coordinator of Scientific Research  
Institute of Zoology  
Ministry of Education, Culture and  
Research  
Chisinau, Republic of Moldova

**Romania**

26. Dr. Samad John Smaranda  
Senior Councillor  
Biodiversity Directorate  
Ministry of Environment  
Bucharest, Romania

**Russian Federation**

27. Ms. Irina Onufrenya  
Protected Areas Officer  
WWF-Russia, Ministry of Natural  
Resources and Environment of the  
Russian Federation,  
Moscow, Russian Federation

**WESTERN EUROPE AND OTHER  
GROUPS (WEOG)****Belgium**

28. Dr. Els Emmanuelle Paula Martens  
CBD Regional Focal Point for Flanders  
National Focal Point for Protected Areas  
Agency for Nature and Forests Policy  
Ministry for Environment  
Government of Flanders,  
Brussels, Belgium

**Canada**

29. Mr. Olaf Jensen  
Director Protected Areas  
Environment and Climate Change  
Canada  
Gatineau, Quebec, Canada

**Denmark**

30. Mr. Kristian Kvist  
Head of Section  
Nature and Climate Adaptation and  
CBD National Focal Point,  
Ministry of Environment and Food of  
Denmark,  
Copenhagen, Denmark

**European Union**

31. Mr. Stefan Leiner  
*Co-lead of Workshop*  
Head of the Biodiversity Unit and EU  
CBD Focal Point  
Directorate-General Environment  
European Commission,  
Brussels, Belgium
32. Dr. Brian MacSharry  
Biodiversity Information Expert  
European Environment Agency (EEA)  
Copenhagen, Denmark

**Finland**

33. Dr. Stig Gustaf Johansson  
Director of International Affairs  
Parks and Wildlife Finland,  
Vantaa, Finland

**France**

34. Ms. Julie Marsaud  
Senior Forest Policy Analyst  
Ministry of Ecological and Solidarity  
Transition  
Paris, France

**Germany**

35. Ms. Inka Gnittke  
Head of Division  
International Cooperation on  
Biodiversity  
Federal Ministry for the Environment,  
Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety

Bonn, Germany

#### **Israel**

36. Mr. Simon Nemtzov  
Head of International Relations and  
CBD National Focal Point  
Science and Conservation Division  
Israel Nature and Parks Authority  
Jerusalem, Israel

#### **New Zealand**

37. Ms. Maya Hunt  
Senior International Advisor, CBD  
National Focal Point  
New Zealand Department of  
Conservation  
Ministry for the Environment  
Wellington, New Zealand

#### **Norway**

38. Ms. Marie Haraldstad  
Senior Advisor at Norwegian Ministry  
of Climate and Environment  
CBD National Focal Point- Member of  
COP Bureau  
Oslo, Norway

#### **Spain**

39. Dr. Francisco Guil  
Head of Natura 2000 Service  
Ministry for the Ecological Transition  
Madrid, Spain

#### **Sweden**

40. Mr. Nils Olof (Olle) Hojer  
Senior Advisor  
Swedish Environmental Protection  
Agency  
Stockholm, Sweden

#### **Switzerland**

41. Dr. Reinhard Schnidrig  
Head of Section and Deputy Head of  
Division  
Wildlife and Forest Biodiversity Section  
Species, Ecosystems and Landscapes  
Division  
Federal Office for the Environment  
Bern, Switzerland

#### **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**

42. Dr. Liam Vincent Fleming  
Co-leader—International Team  
UK Joint National Conservation Council  
Peterborough, United Kingdom

### **ORGANIZATIONS**

#### **ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity**

43. Ms. Nosrat Ravichandran  
Protected Area Management Specialist  
ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity  
Laguna, Philippines

#### **AVAAZ—The World in Action**

44. Mr. Oscar Hector Soria  
Campaign Director  
AVAAZ—The World in Action  
New York, United States

#### **BirdLife International**

45. Dr. Noelle Kumpel  
Head of Policy  
BirdLife International  
Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great  
Britain and Northern Ireland

#### **Campaign for Nature—Resources Legacy Funds**

46. Mr. Brian T. O'Donnell  
Director  
Campaign for Nature - Resources  
Legacy Fund,  
Durango, Colorado, United States

#### **Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society (CPAWS)**

47. Dr. Candace Newman  
National Director  
Oceans Program  
Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society  
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

#### **Canadian Council on Ecological Areas (CCEA)**

48. Mr. David MacKinnon  
Vice Chair

Canadian Council on Ecological Areas  
Nova Scotia Environment  
Protected Areas Branch  
Halifax, Canada

**Centre for Large Landscape Conservation**

49. Dr. Stephen J. Woodley  
Vice Chair for Science and Biodiversity  
World Commission on Protected Areas,  
International Union for the Conservation  
of Nature  
Quebec, Canada

**China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation (CBCGDF)**

50. Dr. Zhou Jinfeng  
Secretary General  
China Biodiversity Conservation and  
Green Development Foundation  
Beijing, China

**Conservation Research Institute / Zoological Society of London**

51. Dr. Jonas Geldmann  
Research Fellow  
Co-Chair IUCN/WCPA Management  
Effectiveness Specialist Group  
University of Cambridge  
Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great  
Britain and Northern Ireland

**Dalhousie University**

52. Dr. Kristina Boerder  
Science Lead - Prototype Development  
Dalhousie University  
Halifax, Canada

**European Commission-Joint Research Centre**

53. Dr. Gregoire Dubois  
Project Leader GCAD  
Global Conservation and Development  
European Commission-Joint Research  
Centre (EC-JRC)  
Directorate D—Sustainable Resources  
Ispra, Italy

**Friends of the Earth International**

54. Mr. Isaac Rojas Ramirez  
Co-coordinator  
International Forest and Biodiversity  
Programme

Friends of the Earth International  
San Jose, Costa Rica

**Forest Peoples Programme**

55. Ms. Helen Tugendhat  
Policy Advisor, Legal and Human  
Rights & Responsible Finance  
Forest Peoples Programme  
London, United Kingdom of Great  
Britain and Northern Ireland

**Future Law—Malaysia**

56. Mr. Harry D. Jonas  
Director and Co-Founder of Future Law  
Co-Chair IUCN WCPA  
Future Law  
Sabah, Malaysia

**Global Programme on Protected Areas (IUCN-GPAP) - Switzerland**

57. Mr. Trevor Sandwith  
Director  
IUCN Global Protected Areas  
Programme,  
Gland, Switzerland

**Global Support Initiative for Indigenous Peoples and Community Conserved Areas (GSI-ICCA)**

58. Dr. Karen Richardson  
Consultant  
Global Support Initiative for Indigenous  
Peoples and Community Conserved  
Areas (GSI-ICCA)  
UNDP-Small Grants Programme  
Montreal, Canada

**Indonesian Institute of Sciences**

59. Dr. Ruliyana Susanti  
Researcher  
Plant Ecology Laboratory  
Research Center for Biology  
Indonesian Institute of Sciences  
Cibinong, Indonesia

**Man and the Biosphere**

60. Ms. Meriem Bouamrane  
Division of Ecological and Earth  
Sciences Man and the Biosphere  
Programme  
Paris, France

**National Geographic Society**

61. Dr. Enric Sala  
Explorer-in-Residence  
National Geographic Society  
Washington D.C., United States

**Parks Canada**

62. Mr. Gilles Seutin  
Chief Ecosystem Scientist  
Protected Areas Establishment and  
Conservation Directorate  
Parks Canada  
Gatineau, Canada

**Plenty Canada—Indigenous NGO**

63. Mr. Larry McDermott  
Executive Director  
Plenty Canada - Indigenous NGO  
Lanark, Canada

**PEW Charitable Trust**

64. Ms. Maria (Masha) Kalinina  
Officer  
Protecting Ocean Life on the High Seas  
PEW Charitable Trusts  
Washington D.C., United States

**The Nature Conservancy (TNC)**

65. Ms. Linda I. Krueger  
Senior Policy Advisor  
The Nature Conservancy  
New York, United States

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

66. Dr. Jamison Ervin  
Manager  
Global Programme on Nature for  
Development  
United Nations Development  
Programme  
New York, United States

**United Nations University –Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)**

67. Dr. Maiko Nishi  
Research Fellow  
United Nations University

Institute for the Advanced Study of  
Sustainability  
Tokyo, Japan

**Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)**

68. Dr. Amber Himes-Cornell  
Fishery Officer  
Fisheries and Aquaculture Policy and  
Resources Division  
Fisheries Policy, Economics and  
Institutions Branch  
Food and Agriculture Organization of  
the United Nations  
Rome, Italy

**UNEP - World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)**

69. Dr. Naomi Kingston  
Head of Conserving Land and Seascapes  
Programme  
United Nations Environment  
Programme  
World Conservation Monitoring Centre  
Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great  
Britain and Northern Ireland

**Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)**

70. Dr. James Watson  
Director of the Science of Knowledge  
Initiative and Global Climate Change  
Programme  
Wildlife Conservation Society  
University of Queensland  
Brisbane, Australia

**World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)**

71. Dr. Kathy MacKinnon  
Chair  
World Commission on Protected Areas  
Haddenham, United Kingdom of Great  
Britain and Northern Ireland

**World Heritage Centre**

72. Mr. Guy Debonnet  
Chief of Unit  
Nature, Sustainable Tourism and  
Outreach Unit,  
World Heritage Centre  
Paris, France

### **World Wildlife Fund—WWF -World Wide Fund for Nature**

73. Dr. David Olson  
Director of Conservation  
World Wide Fund for Nature  
Hong Kong, China

### **Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative**

74. Dr. Harvey Locke  
Strategic Advisor and Co-founder  
Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation  
Initiative,  
Chair IUCN WCPA beyond the Aichi  
Targets Task Force  
Banff, Canada

### **INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

#### **ICCA (territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities) Consortium**

75. Ms. Ghanimat Azhdari  
Senior Expert in Participatory GIS and  
Natural Resources Conservation and  
Management  
Centre for Sustainable Development and  
Environment,  
ICCA Consortium  
Guelph, Canada

#### **Asian Indigenous International Network**

76. Mr. Phoolman Chaudhary  
Executive President  
Asian Indigenous International Network  
Vice Chair of the United Nations  
Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues  
Kathmandu, Nepal

### **WOMEN'S CAUCUS**

77. Ms. Sarah Subba  
Consultant at World Bank,  
Founding Member and Vice President,  
Center for Indigenous Peoples Research  
and Development (CIPRED),  
Kathmandu, Nepal.

### **YOUTH GROUP**

78. Ms. Josefa Tauli  
Coordinator  
Global Youth Biodiversity Network  
Southeast Asia and Philippines  
Cordillera, Philippines

### **CBD ALLIANCE**

79. Ms. Mrinalini Rai  
Board Member -CBD Alliance  
Advisor Indigenous Peoples and Gender  
Community Conservation Resilience  
Initiative, Global Forest Coalition  
Chiang Mai, Thailand
80. Mr. Jose Gadir Lavadenz Lamadrid  
Coordinator  
CBD Alliance  
La Paz, Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

### **SECRETARIAT OF THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY**

81. Ms. Elizabeth Maruma Mrema  
Acting Executive Secretary,  
Secretariat of the Convention on  
Biological Diversity  
Montreal, Canada
82. Dr. David Cooper  
Deputy Executive Secretary  
Secretariat of the Convention on  
Biological Diversity  
Montreal, Canada
83. Dr. Alexander Shestakov  
Head of Science, Society and  
Sustainable Future Division  
Secretariat of the Convention on  
Biological Diversity  
Montreal, Canada
84. Dr. Sarat Babu Gidda  
Head of Biodiversity Science, Policy  
and Governance (BSPG) Unit and  
Senior Programme Management Officer  
Secretariat of the Convention on  
Biological Diversity



- |     |   |     |   |
|-----|---|-----|---|
|     | Montreal, Canada  |     |   |
| 85. | Ms. Megan Schmidt<br>Member of BSPG Unit<br>Secretariat of the Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br>Montreal, Canada        | 89. | Ms. Johany Martinez,<br>Member of BSPG Unit<br>Secretariat of the Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br>Montreal, Canada |
| 86. | Mr. Marc Attallah<br>Member of BSPG Unit<br>Secretariat of the Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br>Montreal, Canada        | 90. | Ms. Lisa Janishevski<br>Member of BSPG Unit<br>Secretariat of the Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br>Montreal, Canada |
| 87. | Mr. Patrick Gannon<br>Member of BSPG Unit<br>Secretariat of the Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br>Montreal, Canada       | 91. | Mr. Joseph Appiott<br>Member of BSPG Unit<br>Secretariat of the Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br>Montreal, Canada   |
| 88. | Ms. Edjigayehu Seyoum-E.<br>Member of BSPG Unit<br>Secretariat of the Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br>Montreal, Canada | 92. | Ms. Rishman Chahal<br>Secretariat of the Convention on<br>Biological Diversity<br>Montreal, Canada                          |

*Annex II***PRESENTATION SUMMARIES**

Below is a summary of presentations made throughout the meeting. All presentation slides are available on the meeting [website](#).<sup>13</sup>

**A. SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS UNDER ITEM 5: STOCK-TAKING ON  
CURRENT STATE AND FUTURE TRENDS**

**Global status of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 (*Mr. Patrick Gannon, SCBD*)**

Mr. Gannon presented progress on the quantitative and quality elements of Target 11. He noted that coverage for terrestrial areas is currently 15% while marine cover is almost 8% of the ocean; however it was noted that since the definition for other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) was only recently adopted, there is limited information on their global extent. Over the nine years since the Aichi Targets were adopted, growth in MPAs has been significant, though the increase in coverage for terrestrial areas has been more modest. If all commitments under Target 11 made by Parties to the Convention are completed as proposed by 2020 it is likely that both the 17% and 10% coverage targets would be reached. There has been some increase in ecological representation for terrestrial areas, though the improvement in representation for marine ecoregion is much more significant. For both terrestrial and marine realms, there remain many ecoregions with little protected area coverage. As of 2019, just 19% of terrestrial KBAs and 24% of marine KBAs are fully covered by reported protected areas, and more than one-third of both have no coverage. There has been little change in the average percent coverage of marine and terrestrial KBAs over the last decade. He also noted that there are significant shortfalls in protected area connectivity globally. Most countries have not met the 60% target agreed in decision [X/31](#),<sup>14</sup> regarding the completion of management effectiveness evaluations. In addition, there is currently limited information available on the outcomes of these completed assessments. There is also recent evidence to indicate that resources for staffing and budget are inadequate in many protected areas. Information regarding governance quality, effectiveness and equity is still generally lacking at the global scale. Finally, he noted that “integration into the wider landscape and seascape” is an element of target 11 that has received much less attention and has no clear metric for tracking progress at the global level. A study of national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs) revealed that very few countries have identified specific strategies to integrate protected areas into the wider landscapes and seascapes. Overall, there has been noteworthy progress on the quantitative aspects of Target 11, though progress for many of the quality elements has been slower.

**Some thoughts on future area-based conservation measures and the post 2020 global biodiversity framework: what we can learn from the past 10 years? (*Dr. James Watson, Wildlife Conservation Society and University of Queensland*)**

Dr. Watson provided some thoughts on future area-based conservation measures (ABCM) and the post 2020 global biodiversity framework: what we can learn from the past 10 years. Regarding ABCM, he discussed the four questions need to be addressed: why/what they are for; where they should be; how much; and how they should be managed to be effective. Drawing parallels to a human health response (which could involve emergency response, rehabilitation and preventative health), a ‘Biodiversity Conservation Response’ should include multiple aims, such as preventing species extinctions and

<sup>13</sup> The slides for Enric Sala’s presentation on *Ocean area-based conservation* are not being posted, as the maps and final figure are under embargo until the publication date of the article.

<sup>14</sup> “expand and institutionalize management effectiveness assessments to work towards assessing 60 per cent of the total area of protected areas by 2015 using various national and regional tools”.

ecosystem collapse, reversing species and ecosystem decline, and retaining ecological integrity to ensure processes enable ecosystem services. Over the last decade major advances have improved the mapping of many of these objectives, though mapping efforts are still incomplete (for example, with incomplete spatial data, the lack of taxonomic and geographic coverage of KBAs, etc.). There has been growth in the global coverage of protected areas, likely due to the quantitative target driving expansion; however, this has generally failed to improve the relative proportion of 'important biodiversity' sites that are covered. He noted that many species do not need protected areas to manage their security. There is a need to be far clearer about the role different ABCM play in dealing with threats to biodiversity. He noted three broad goals for ABCM (addressing the 'why/what' question): preventing species extinction and ecosystem collapse; stopping species and ecological decline so as to retain/restore functional species assemblages and ecosystem integrity; and sustaining essential ecosystem services. There is a need to address *how* ABCM should be managed to be effective. The last ten years have shown thousands of PADDD (Protected Area Downgrading, Downsizing and Degazettement) events and an increase in protected areas under intense human pressure, so that now half of all protected areas contain only areas of intense human pressure. As significant human activity within protected areas will reduce their conservation benefit, we must address what is counted as an ABCM and then measure effectiveness, which needs to be focused on outcomes (requiring indicators). He highlighted important links between Nature and the SDGs, though noted that not all ecosystem services are compatible with biodiversity outcomes, for example, many provisioning services are threats to biodiversity. ABCM should help retain ecological processes that support ecosystems that derive supporting, regulating and cultural ecosystem services. He explained that with an ecosystem services-based lens, ABCM are bigger than the CBD, for example addressing the SDGs and other MEAs. Dr. Watson closed by discussing a proposal for a headline global retention target that emerges from an example set of specific sub-targets. Each sub-target would provide a minimum natural land or marine area required to achieve some goal, for example the area of intact land cover required to achieve vital watershed protection. Defining these sub-targets and calculating the extent to which they are likely to overlap spatially reveals the headline retention target. He noted that there would be some overlap in the area identified under different sub-targets. This would require a combination of strict protected areas, OECMs, and sustainably managed lands, which can together address a range of different biodiversity and ecosystem services priorities. For example, sustainably managing lands to achieve provisioning ecosystem services (as a follow up to Target 6, 7), using OECMs to halt declines and retain functional species assemblages, areas for regulating, cultural, and supporting ecosystem services (following Targets 5, 10, and 15), and strict protected areas preventing extinctions and ecosystem collapse (as a successor to Target 12 and 13, and under a new ecosystems target).

## **B. SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS UNDER ITEM 6: AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES AND THE 2050 VISION**

### **Effective Area-based Conservation: Protected Areas and OECMs (Dr. Kathy MacKinnon, IUCN-World Commission on Protected Areas)**

Dr. MacKinnon opened by noting the importance of speaking a common language regarding area-based measures and their relation to different targets under the CBD. She went on to note that the adoption of a definition of OECMs at the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties was a significant step in formal recognition of areas that provide effective conservation beyond protected areas and a major opportunity to contribute to the post-2020 targets for effective area-based conservation. She explained the various components of the OECM definition adopted in decision [14/8](#) and explained the difference between protected areas which should have a *primary* conservation objective (i.e. their core function is to promote the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity) and OECMs, which should *deliver* the effective *in situ* conservation of biodiversity, regardless of their primary management objectives. She discussed the relationship between protected areas, OECMs, other areas that may provide effective conservation, ICCAs, and the wider landscape and seascape. She also provided examples of what might or might not count as OECMs—though reiterated that the definition needs to be applied on a case-by-case basis. She

noted that it is especially important to focus target(s) on regulating services, specifically climate regulation and water flow. Provisioning services are often too complex and too local for a global target. She also noted the opportunity to link efforts under the CBD to the work of other conventions, for example recognizing the role of nature in mitigating and adapting to climate change. She noted that a target for ecosystem integrity could be useful in the post-2020 framework, perhaps relating this to ecosystem services. She ended by discussing the path forward for future area-based conservation targets, noting that there is general support in the literature for a global protection of at least 30% for terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems (and up to 70%, or even higher), though there needs to be a much greater emphasis on quality. Though she reiterated that even 30% globally under effective conservation areas may not enough to halt biodiversity loss and that there is a need for a supportive environment including sustainable use and restoration in surrounding landscapes/seascapes, making use of other measures such as land-use planning, regulations, etc. Dr. MacKinnon highlighted the importance of mapping important biodiversity and ecosystem service areas, the importance of monitoring for biodiversity and emphasized functional networks and connectivity. She closed by stating that there is a need for ambitious targets for effective conservation areas set within a context of 100% sustainable management in production landscapes, which will provide benefits for biodiversity and human welfare. She provided one example of a potential target,<sup>15</sup> noting that the target must be time bound; should ensure that all conservation priorities are within effective conservation systems; including specific mention of ecosystem services is vital for making the connection between biodiversity and value to society; and the target should meet standards for effectiveness in achieving their conservation objectives and outcomes.

**Ocean area-based conservation: Reconciling protection, production and climate mitigation (Dr. Enric Sala, National Geographic Society)**

Dr. Sala opened by noting the results of recent assessments, such as those of the IPBES and IPCC (for example, the Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate). He then presented the noticeable changes in Cabo Pulmo, Mexico following its designation as an MPA. He reported the significant difference in the recovery of fish biomass between fully and partially protected areas, reiterating the benefits of full protection for marine life. He noted that as of 2019, only 5% of the ocean was covered by implemented MPAs, less than half of which is ‘highly’ or ‘fully’ protected. For the remainder of the presentation, he reported the results of a recent study. This involved the development of global ocean maps highlighting priority areas for biodiversity conservation, as well as other objectives such as carbon storage and food provisioning. The biodiversity conservation priorities were derived by considering irreplaceability, functional diversity, evolutionary uniqueness, extinction risk, and biogeographic representation. Overlaying the high priority areas for the three goals (biodiversity conservation, climate mitigation, food provisioning) allows for the identification of areas of synergy (with high priority areas for multiple goals overlapping). The approach can be used to address how much of the ocean can be protected at no cost to fishing. He also noted that there is a need to differentiate threats that can and cannot be abated through MPAs. He reported some of the results, plotting biodiversity benefits with changes in global fish catch and total carbon benefit. This allows for presenting changes in fish catch compared to the percent of the ocean protected, while exploring total biodiversity benefit and benefits for carbon sequestration. He ended by presenting the changes in biodiversity benefit compared to the fraction of the ocean protected, noting that this would change depending on whether priorities were set globally or nationally. In both cases the biodiversity benefit would be much higher for a lower fraction of the ocean protected compared to a random placement of MPAs, highlighting the importance of mapping global priority areas when designating MPAs.

---

<sup>15</sup> By 2030, all areas of particular importance for biodiversity and associated ecosystem services are effectively retained/conserved in effective, equitable, representative and connected systems of protected areas and other effective-area based conservation measures covering at least 30% of each terrestrial, freshwater and marine realm on the planet

### **Area-based Conservation Measures and the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity (Dr. David Cooper, SCBD)**

Dr. Cooper reiterated the overarching framework for the post-2020 period and drew attention to the 2050 Vision of Living in harmony with nature: “By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.” He noted the role of the new framework for putting the world on a path to achieve the 2050 Vision. He continued by expanding on the various components of the Vision, such as conservation, ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet, and benefits for all people, including the role of area-based conservation. He noted the important role of area-based conservation for addressing aspects of the 2050 Vision. Some of these include protecting species (for example, rare or threatened species), reducing extinctions, conserving key habitats, as well as those related to ecosystem services, for example climate mitigation, the provision of local ecosystem services, ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction (Eco-DRR) and the provision of socio-economic benefits. He discussed different types of area-based conservation, as they address aspects of the 2050 Vision, such as protected areas and OECMs, as well as broader strategies aimed at retaining and restoring ecosystems, all embedded within general approaches to planning across landscapes and seascapes. He ended by highlighting the relationship between different area-based conservation targets under the current Strategic Plan (Targets 5<sup>16</sup>, 11, and 15<sup>17</sup>) and how these might be addressed going forward for the post-2020 framework.

### **Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs) (Dr. Kathy MacKinnon, IUCN-World Commission on Protected Areas)**

Dr. MacKinnon opened by noting the definition of OECMs adopted at COP14/8 and drew attention to the recently published guidelines for recognising and reporting OECMs.<sup>18</sup> The different aspects of the OECM definition were explained, and then she covered the criteria for identification<sup>19</sup>:

- Criterion A: the area is not currently recognized as a protected area;
- Criterion B: the geographically defined space, has legitimate governance authorities, and is managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained outcomes for the conservation of biological diversity;
- Criterion C: it achieves an effective contribution to *in situ* conservation of biodiversity, is sustained over the long-term, and includes a monitoring system to inform management on the effectiveness of measures with respect to biodiversity, including the health of ecosystems;
- Criterion D: covering associated ecosystem functions and services and cultural, spiritual, socio-economic and other locally relevant values.

She reiterated the difference between protected areas, which should have a *primary* conservation objective (core function is to promote the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity) and OECMs, which should *deliver* the effective *in situ* conservation of biodiversity, regardless of their primary management objectives. Added values of recognizing OECMs were discussed, including the potential for improvements in the quality elements of Target 11. She mentioned some examples of the elements of native biodiversity OECMs could effectively protect. She closed by providing some examples of what

<sup>16</sup> By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced

<sup>17</sup> By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.

<sup>18</sup> Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.CH.2019.PATRS.3.en>

<sup>19</sup> All criteria, and their explanations, are included in annex III of [decision 14/8](#), with further information available in the IUCN guidelines (<https://www.iucn.org/commissions/world-commission-protected-areas/our-work/oecms>).



might count as OECMs (such as some IPLC conserved areas or some watershed protection areas) and what might not count (such as temporary fishing closures in place only until an overfished area recovers), but reiterated that potential areas should be screened very carefully on a case-by-case basis.

### **Introduction to the Decision Support Tool (*Mr. David MacKinnon, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas*)**

Mr. David MacKinnon introduced a Decision Support Tool developed to assist Canada in meeting its National Target on protected areas and OECMs. The tool includes standards and interpretation guidance for nine screening criteria, which are aligned with international definitions and guidance, along with a reporting template. Some of the nine criteria are common to both protected areas and OECMs (for example, a defined geographical space, effective means, over the long-term) and are ranked on a three-point scale: clearly meets the standard for a protected area or OECM; may meet the protected area or OECM standard but requires further evaluation in order to make a decision; or does not meet the standard for protected area or OECM. The remaining four criteria differ between protected areas and OECMs (for example, primacy and scope of objectives) and are ranked on a five-point scale: clearly meets the standard for protected areas; may meet the protected area standard but requires further evaluation in order to make a decision; clearly meets the standard for OECM; may meet the OECM standard but requires further evaluation in order to make a decision; or does not meet the standard protected areas or OECM. There are two separate criteria addressing ‘effective means’. One addresses the availability of tools effectively managing compatible activities and ensuring incompatible activities do not occur. The other addresses how, and if, those tools are being used, addressing whether the mechanism(s) compel the governing authority(ies) to prohibit activities that are incompatible with the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity. Responses for the nine criteria help to determine whether a site should be reported as a protected area or reported as an OECM or whether a more detailed assessment is required.

## **C. SUMMARY OF PRESENTATIONS UNDER ITEM 8: CASE STUDIES FOCUSED ON TARGET SETTING FOR POST-2020**

### **Protected & Other Conserved Areas in Canada (*Mr. Olaf Jensen, Canada*)**

Mr. Jensen began by noting the size, but relatively small population, of Canada, where 90% of people live within 100 kilometres of the border with the United States, as well as the fact that there are more than 80 different types of terrestrial and marine protected areas recognized under more than 50 different national and subnational Acts. He then presented the significant growth in marine coverage that has occurred in Canada over the last few years, where its national target of 10% coverage was surpassed in 2019 (reaching 13.8%). He reported that Canada now recognizes 11.8% of the terrestrial area of the country as protected—an area of 1.17 million square kilometres (the size of Ukraine and France combined). He noted that this was aided by the inclusion of OECMs. In coastal and marine areas, OECMs make up 36% of all ABCM, while in terrestrial and freshwater areas, they make up 7%. He then explained the concept of ‘Stewardship’, the careful and responsible management of the environment. OECM may be considered as a form of stewardship. He then provided some examples of OECMs in Canada including the Disko Fan Conservation Area, the Sahtu Land Use Plan Conservation Zones in Canada’s Northwest Territories, and the Canadian Forces Base Shilo. He finished with a discussion of future opportunities for Canada’s ABCM system. He noted the distribution of rare species in Canada, which is considered when placing new protected areas. He touched on ecological representation (many terrestrial ecosystems have achieved 30% protection) and the coverage of KBAs (~45% are found within protected and conserved areas), as well as the ecosystem services provided by Canadian protected areas (for example, significant storage of soil organic carbon). Considerations for mainstreaming biodiversity and the connection with ABCM were also discussed. He mentioned that protected areas under IUCN Category I and II are a significant part of the Canadian ABCM portfolio, though stewardship areas (Category V, VI and OECM) will be part of a balanced portfolio of conservation investments in the future. He ended by discussing the potential for OECM in Canada’s managed forests and in remaining native grasslands. He noted that for OECMs, some

level of oversight is needed to ensure that the biodiversity of interest remains, but will depend on local context, and also noted that OECM will often require incentives to be effective, as they do not have the same regulatory setting as protected areas.

### **Ecological Conservation Redlines (ECRs) in China (*Ms. Yan Liu, China*)**

Ms. Liu presented on Ecological Conservation Redlines (ECRs) in China, explaining that ECRs refer to areas with important ecological functions that must be strictly protected; they represent areas necessary for safeguarding national ecological security. They usually include regions important for water conservation, biodiversity conservation, wind-proof and sand-fixing functions, and ecologically fragile areas prone to soil erosion, desertification, etc. ECRs are not a new protected area category, but rather a comprehensive ecological space with priority in the spatial planning processes. Three types of area are included under the ECR: important ecological function areas which support sustainable economic development; ecologically sensitive or fragile areas, ensuring human settlements are safe; and habitats of key species and ecosystems. ECRs are being delineated, as the existing protected land system is insufficient to maintain ecological security, and fails to form an ecological pattern to ensure national ecological security and sustainable socio-economic development. She then described the guidelines for delineating ECRs, set in 2017, and the main assessment steps in the delineation process. She provided current results regarding protection effectiveness of the ECRs, which cover more than 95% of national 'key protected species' and maintain 45% of terrestrial carbon sequestration, among other successes. She finished by discussing the management of ECRs, their contribution to several SDGs, as well as Aichi Target 11, and the role that the approach could play for site-based conservation in other countries.

### **Protected Areas & OECMs in Russia (*Ms. Irina Onufrenya, Russian Federation*)**

Ms. Onufrenya reported that the current coverage of terrestrial protected areas in Russia is 11.7%, which includes more than 13,000 sites and covers a total area of 240 million ha, noting that if considering only protected areas, few administrative regions meet the 17% target. However, in Russia, different types of OECM cover almost 60% of the country; following their inclusion, most administrative regions would surpass 17%. All protected areas are managed by the state at the local, regional or national level; half of which fall under IUCN category Ib, though including OECMs, half of all sites would fall under category VI (areas with sustainable use of natural resources). She reported on the representativeness of the system of protected areas and OECMs with respect to biomes and geographical provinces, as well as conservation of threatened vertebrate species (under the Russian Red Data Book). She also reported the representativeness of intact forests and steppe ecosystems, many of which are unprotected or under-protected, and also noted the territories requiring the creation of new protected areas. She then reported that 3.4% of the Russian exclusive economic zone (EEZ) is currently covered by protected areas or OECMs, though 25% of territorial and inner waters are protected. Almost all of these sites fall under IUCN category Ia or Ib. She noted that the Arctic is the first priority for expanded coverage, as it accounts for a large portion of the Russian EEZ, and is under increasing threats from shipping, and oil and gas projects. Following a gap analysis, making use of 195 GIS layers, it was reported that the addition of 47 areas could protect 25% of the Russian EEZ, and support a fully representative and connected system; as such 20 million hectares of new MPAs in the Russian Arctic are under discussion at different government levels. In the future, important priorities include the conservation of pristine and wild biodiversity by creating new terrestrial, coastal and marine protected areas (under IUCN Categories I-IV) to ensure 100% representativeness and sufficiency of intact and wild landscapes/seascapes, ecosystems, species, etc. in the National System of Protected Areas. She underscored the fact that an agreed system for assessing representativeness at the international level needs to be defined so that countries can evaluate their contribution at the international level. Other priorities include expanding and improving governance in the areas under IUCN categories V-VI and OECMs, to ensure connectivity and integration into the wider landscape/seascape, adaptation to climate change, and equitable management for local communities.

**Area Based Conservation Measures: CBD Target 11—Priorities and Implementation (Dr. Stephen Kirkman, South Africa)**

Dr. Kirkman opened by noting the different designations recognized in South Africa's system of protected areas. He then discussed the National Protected Area Expansion Strategy designed to achieve cost-effective protected area expansion for ecological sustainability and increased resilience to climate change, with targets set strategically and aligned with the National Development Plan. Key principles for the Plans development included a systematic approach, focusing on *inter alia*, representation (ecosystem types), persistence (ecological processes), emphasizing integrated planning across terrestrial, freshwater, estuarine and marine ecosystem types and between different organizations, and taking into account threatened species priorities, as well as areas that are critical for providing ecosystem services. Prioritization was meant to balance importance and urgency. The Plan was reviewed and updated in 2016, and makes use of updated ecosystem classifications and finer-scale mapping, and allowed for comprehensive targets for all realms to be established. This included an ecosystem condition map which could ensure that only areas in natural or near natural state could contribute towards ecosystem protection targets. He also discussed the increased integration between national and provincial levels in the updated approach. He explained Operation Phakisa, developed in 2014, and noted the recent declaration of 20 MPAs in 2019, most of which have multiple use zones—though over half of the area is designated as no-take zones. As of 2019, mainland protected areas cover 108,000 km<sup>2</sup> (8.9%, up from 6.5% in 2008), MPAs in the South African mainland EEZ cover 57,943 km<sup>2</sup> (5.4%, up from < 0.5% in 2008), and MPAs in the Southern Ocean EEZ cover 181,437 km<sup>2</sup> (38%, up from 0% in 2008), while total MPA coverage has reached 15.5%. He then discussed the representativity of the protected area system, addressing protection levels and threat levels for different species and ecosystems. He noted that targets will be updated during the next review, set to take place after 2020, and will take into account global targets in the post-2020 GBF. He finished by discussing South Africa's draft OECM framework.

### *Annex III*

## **LESSONS LEARNED FROM IMPLEMENTATION OF AICHI TARGET 11**

### **What worked well (regarding design, implementation, monitoring)?**

Several groups noted that Target 11 received high political visibility, and was considered the most discussed target. It was easy to understand and communicate, which helped direct government/national focus. It was also based on a concept that people cared about. The inclusion of aspects of Target 11 in the SDGs helped to further improve its standing and visibility. Several participants indicated that the target helped inspire action at the national level in terms of the creation of new protected areas and expansion of area coverage, for example, the creation of first National Park in the Republic of Moldova (in 2013). Some deemed Target 11 easy to translate into national targets. It gave governments a way to gain political victories; for example, after passing laws to designate a protected area, they could see immediate success. In some countries, the creation of protected areas can often be completed in length of time a typical government is in office. In addition, protected areas generally fall under one ministry, often the ministry of environment, making progress easier, unlike other targets that often require coordination among various ministries.

It was noted that Target 11 contained some elements of a SMART target, and some felt that having the percentage aspect was helpful, making it easier to track progress. Some felt that the recent growth in coverage could be attributed to the inclusion of a clear numerical target. There was also a willingness to report progress on the quantitative components as well as the availability of a global infrastructure to capture this (i.e. WDPA). The accurate and systematic mapping of areas made it easy to record progress. The coverage component, with this systematic mapping and reporting, also allowed for public scrutiny over progress. Measurability in the target allowed for it to be communicated more widely, including easier communication with the general public. This helped to promote the value of protected areas and communicate with policy makers, encouraging stronger collaboration across sectors. Having a numerical target also made it easier to understand the associated financial needs. It helped to access international funding for protected area development, including many aspects of quality beyond just designation.

Target 11 was considered comprehensive; it covered all ecosystems, and some felt that the language included all essential elements related to what makes protected areas effective. The inclusion of elements related to the quality of protected areas (representativity, connectivity, equity, etc.) in the language of the target helped to increase broader communication and focus on these important elements of quality. It also forced the community to discuss and clarify many important issues around quality, for example what is an area important for biodiversity (the global KBA standard<sup>20</sup> was completed over the course of the Strategic Plan), what is connectivity, effectiveness, representativity, etc., and how can these be measured? This led to an increase in science aimed at addressing these needs. The introduction of OECMs was seen as a major step forward, especially as the definition and criteria for identification have now been adopted.

It was noted that in some countries the Target encouraged looking beyond traditional protected area concepts. In some places, it provided an avenue for broaden understanding and for cooperation across knowledge systems (Indigenous and traditional knowledge and Western science), and promoted consultation with right-holders and stakeholders. For example, in Canada, it was promoted as one avenue for reconciliation with IPLC.

### **What did not work?**

---

<sup>20</sup> IUCN, 2016, *A global standard for the identification of key biodiversity areas*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

There was confusion over whether the target was global, or was meant for the local/national level. There was a lack of clarity regarding whether the marine target applied to the entire ocean, or only to areas under national jurisdiction. There was also lack of clarity regarding the difference between protected areas and OECMs, and what areas should be counted. Many elements of the target were considered unclear, leading to problems for monitoring and reporting. There was a feeling that many of the quality elements were confusing, and some lacked definitions. For example, the terms “ecosystem services” and “integration into the wider landscape and seascape” were not clear enough, and were thus often not addressed. The definition of OECMs came too late in the course of the Strategic Plan for them to have an impact on progress towards Target 11 (there is still no baseline for the global coverage of OECMs). Even with the definition adopted, the concept is not clear to all Parties.

Some felt that the percentages included in Target 11 (17% and 10%) were too low in ambition. There may have been a sense of complacency once the percentage targets were reached at a national level. It was also mentioned that the percentage target and 2020 deadline created pressure to count anything, leading to a proliferation of ‘paper parks’. There was some feeling that the percentage target diverted attention away from implementation and ensuring effectiveness towards simply celebrating designation of new sites.

The elements of Target 11 were not considered measurable, beyond the 17% and 10% targets. As well, in the absence of measurability for some of the other Aichi Targets (such Targets 6 or 7), actions being taken to address them were often reported under Target 11, despite a lack of connection to protected areas in some cases. It was also thought that there were too many elements under Target 11, with too many criteria that were not actually measured. The complexity regarding the many quality elements also made reporting cumbersome and difficult, and made it difficult for the public to understand.

Some felt that there was so much focus on increasing the coverage of protected areas (i.e. meeting the percentage targets) that the more important quality elements “became sidelined”. There was concern raised regarding the growth of ‘paper parks’, and concern that there was a lack of resources necessary to ensure effectiveness resulting from a rapid expansion of coverage without additional funds for management or enforcement. The various quality elements of Target 11 were often treated in isolation, even though it is only one target that should have been treated holistically. Addressing the quality elements of Target 11 may also take much more time legislatively. Several participants noted that effectiveness is still an issue.

Some participants noted there was a lack of indicators for some elements, there were tracking and monitoring issues, often not keeping up with the expansion of protected areas, as well as issues related to obtaining data. Others noted that in some cases there were too many tools available, leading to confusion for managers (for example, there are more than 60 different tools available for management effectiveness assessments). In general, there was a lack of indicators for effectiveness to assess delivery of conservation outcomes, with many participants noting that outcomes were not emphasized, and that Target 11’s operative phrase—“*are conserved*”—was never measured. It was noted that the Green List criteria and indicators are useful but too complex to adopt at a global scale. There is a need for an adequate infrastructure/ database to process and assess information on effectiveness. It was noted that there is no consistent mechanism to assess whether protected areas are meeting their objectives. As such, there was concern raised over what sites are being counted. There are also challenges regarding monitoring and reporting. For many countries, globally reported protected area maps may be incomplete. Others felt that a narrow definition of protected areas leaves out other conservation zones that are important. As reporting is completed primarily by governments, it was thought that this may exclude actions taken by other actors. Some participants also noted a lack of consultation with IPLC. There may have also been limited time to evaluate/monitor protected areas once implemented, as it took time to unpack the complex/ambiguous elements of the Target.

It was noted that there was often less political support for protected areas as a whole, or actually ensuring protections once a site is designated. Many sites are facing increasing pressures, with legislation sometimes softening to allow mining/logging/trawling, etc. A lack of coordination between different stakeholders, agencies and institutions, may also inhibit the translation of targets to on the ground action. Participants also noted that there is a need to bridge the perceived divisions between targets focused on conservation and sustainable use and address their interconnections. There was also often poor communication of the target with practitioners.

In the rush to reach the percentage targets, there may have been a lack of focus on how to sustain these sites; for example, how to manage/enforce a large estate with few resources. The lack of sustained funding makes it difficult to properly implement the target. There is often a lack of capacity and/or resources for monitoring and reporting. There is a need for more resources to ensure basic data collection, monitoring, enforcement and effective management, not only in the sense of covering management aspects but also conservation outcome.

There were a range of other issues that some participants felt were either missing or did not receive enough attention. Some of these included:

- Climate change issues were not considered.
- Gender issues and reporting on women and IPLCs.
- There was a lack of focus on freshwater issues.
- Limited representation of actions by non-state actors (private conservation, ICCAs, etc.).
- Issues such as connectivity and ecological integrity were often missed.
- Limited focus on effectiveness.
- Means to assess conservation outcomes were not developed.
- Discussion on protected areas may often be disconnected from the drivers of biodiversity loss.
- Issues related to level of assessment (site, local, national) and aggregation issues.

### **Suggestions to take forward for new framework**

From these discussions, there are a number of lessons learned regarding issues that should be considered in the drafting of the new global framework. These included:

- There is a need for the quality elements to be measurable (the 17% and 10% targets had a positive effect on encouraging action and ambition; we need to bring this focus to the elements of quality).
- Definitions for any terms in the target need to be in place from the start, to avoid confusion and avoid spending several years to unpack complex or ambiguous elements. There needs to be clarity around the targets, sub-targets and indicators from the start.
- Avoid an overly complex target; having too many elements together may lead to some being missed or ignored.
- Clear and easily reportable indicators are needed.
- Both quantitative and quality aspects need to be well covered (for example, functionality, integrity, values, etc.).
- OECMs, which were only recently defined and are currently under-reported, need more of a focus in the post-2020 framework.
- Some noted that there is a need for both a *sustainability* target and *in situ conservation* target. As well, there should be targets for both *species* and *ecosystems*.
- Reporting needs to be streamlined; advances in big data and the development of new data sets provide some possibility to improve monitoring and reporting. Other approaches, such as participatory mapping and the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge should also be explored.
- There is a need to be more ambitious (a range of different percentage targets were proposed).

- There is a need for better integration of climate change; for example, by using protected areas to deliver Nature-based solutions.
- Targets should represent human values, including culture, spirituality, etc.
- There is a need to address why we are establishing protected areas (for biodiversity conservation, for climate change, for ecosystem services?). With many different aims, there may need to be more than one target.
- There needs to be agreed means of verification for area-based conservation measures, to avoid paper parks or ‘paper ABCM’.
- There is a need to begin to engage stakeholders as soon as possible. The adoption of new technologies and next generation communication tools may help.
- Periodic review of NBSAPs, at the country-level, can be used to encourage joint action planning between different government agencies.
- Conceptual clarity around management is required, as well as clear and realistic consideration of tradeoffs and ground realities.
- Better engagement with all stakeholders and rights-holders is necessary.
- Need to engage new sectors early on in the process, especially banking and finance, as well as economic and sustainable use sectors.
- Highlight the Rights of Nature.
- Align area-based conservation with the climate crisis (this should be high on the agenda).
- Consider the full value of protected areas; they are not just a means to an end, they represent human relation to nature which is a result in itself.
- Explore possible synergies with other multi-lateral environmental agreements to simplify reporting obligations. The upcoming United Decade on ecosystem restoration provides one opportunity.
- There needs to be more concise engaging communication (i.e. we have to develop new ways of communicating) and clarity. There is a need for public buy-in for success.
- There is a need for more systematic reporting (to avoid duplications, inconsistencies and repetitive updating); this should be made a requirement for the post-2020 framework.
- Proactive design will be important especially with regards to climate change.
- There is a need for emphasis on outcomes (conservation, threat reductions, etc.).

There were also a number of remaining challenges that were identified, for example:

- Equitable management remains a challenge.
- Nature and society are dynamic/continually changing—how can this be taken into account?
- Challenges regarding implementing and operationalising the quality components of protected areas (for example, there is often limited capacity regarding implementation).
- A lack of political will around human rights.
- Need to address protected area downgrading, downsizing, and degazettement (PADDD).
- Need for proper accountability for monitoring and reporting.
- Development of sustainable funding models.
- Some ecosystems did not receive enough attention (for example, freshwater systems and marine areas beyond national jurisdiction).
- Sustainable use needs to be included.
- There is a need for national-level outcome based indicators.
- Proper planning needs to be better incorporated from the beginning of the process; once designated, protected areas may be difficult to replace. Going forward it may be difficult to add new sites to meet the needs for important biodiversity areas.





*Annex IV*

The following sections provide a summary of the discussions from the six thematic sessions conducted on Day 2 of the meeting and reported to plenary on the morning of Day 3.

**A. POTENTIAL SCOPE OF ABCM TO BE INCLUDED IN THE POST-2020 FRAMEWORK, INCLUDING POSSIBLE COVERAGE**

There was some discussion around the question of ‘What are Area Based Conservation Measures’? Three broad topics were raised:

- Areas *dedicated for long-term conservation*—these would include protected areas and Other Effective Area Based Conservation Measures (OECMs) and contribute directly to Target 11 under the current strategic plan or its successor in the post-2020 framework.
- Broader area based management approaches and those under different governance systems—these could include areas under IPLC governance (such as ICCAs and locally managed marine areas), but also Ecological Corridors, fisheries/forest management areas, etc.
  - Some of these would be classified as a protected area or OECM.
  - They may contribute across multiple targets.
- Areas of importance for biodiversity (for example, KBAs, EBSA, wilderness areas, etc.)—these help to prioritise conservation action but do not imply any specific management approach.

Some of the key points participants raised during the discussions include:

- Area-based conservation measures are relevant across the Strategic Plan, the three objectives of the CBD, and many of the SDGs. The synergies between the different targets should be clear.
- Target(s) should be more ambitious and they should be knowledge/evidence and outcome based, and uses already defined terms and established indicators.
- In order to get political buy-in, target(s) should be difficult but within reach and should be communicated in a clear and simple way that explains their importance and the benefits of their achievement.
- Indicators need to be measurable and ‘aggregateable’ with stronger verification processes.
- The target(s) must lead to effective *in situ* conservation. This will require strengthening the quality aspects and establishing a stronger verification process.
- The target(s) need to cover all ecosystems and all elements need to have measurable indicators.
- The role of IPLCs needs to be clear. Stakeholders and rights-holders need to be engaged throughout. The new framework needs to explicitly define the equity components and the need for protected areas and OECMs to respect Indigenous claims and rights as well as IPLCs right to self-determination.
- We need to use defined terms and criteria, rather than spending time defining new terms once the new framework is adopted. As such, the term ‘ABCM’ should be avoided, as we do not need any new undefined acronyms.
- Target(s) need to cover all ecosystems, and marine components needs to include Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ).

Participants made a number of recommendations for the post-2020 framework:

- Target(s) have purpose and percentage, and should build off of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11.
- One overarching land-use target addressing how to manage pressures on land and sea, with sub-targets focused on different aspects (for example, conservation, restoration, protected areas, fisheries, etc.). However, it was noted that we must be cautious when thinking in silos with targets.

- The target(s) should be driven by the needs of ecosystems and species. There can be a list of sites for global priority areas for conservation.
- Integrate “area based conservation measures” across targets and sectors. The inter-dependencies between targets should be made clearer.
- Treat protected areas and OECM separately in the successor to Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. OECMs should not compromise the designation of protected areas. One way to keep them separate is by differentiating fully protected and partially protected areas.
- Target(s) can reflect the landscape level, with specific targets for each category. As an example, separate targets could be set for highly/fully protected areas and OECMs; other protected areas and OECMs; and sustainable use ABCMs.
- Target(s) must also consider the protection and resilience of socio-ecological landscapes. The benefits that biodiversity conservation has for people should be captured and measured.
- There should be a separate Restoration Target.
- A communication element should be included in the target(s).
- Alongside the target(s) there should be “key principles”, which are:
  - Means of implementation: these should be specific and defined and have to take into consideration the time that it will take to set these up. The means of implementation also requires self-determination.
  - Means of review: these should be measurable, reachable, trackable, etc. These can be through mandatory reporting, gap analyses, etc. The people managing the areas should be able to report on them, not solely the state.
  - Enabling conditions: there needs to be buy-in of non-state actors, cross sectoral integration, capacity development and resource mobilization.

Regarding broader goals, or general aspirations for the post-2020 framework:

- The target(s) should help us to visualize the future we want to see. It should be take a holistic approach and should engage people by showing possible future outcomes, making people feel like they are part of the solution, and allow for a visualization of what this success will look like realistically.
- The target(s) should be outcome based, and focus on quality.
- The landscape level target(s) should be more ambitious.
- Overarching ambition to reflect landscape/seascape scale:
  - 100% Sustainable Earth.
  - By 2030, No Net Loss of ecosystem quality and extent.
  - By 2040, No Net Loss and Net Gain.

Some of the ideas regarding the text of a future target included:

- The new target(s) should be more ambitious than Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and should be based on what is actually needed to achieve our desired goals. The numerical targets should be based on this information and it was suggested that the percentage should not come first in the wording of the target (to avoid primary focus on this aspect).
- IPLCs should be mentioned specifically in the equity component.
- Climate resilience should be incorporated and mentioned in the target(s).
- Suggested text included: “*urgently halt the loss of intact ecosystems*”.

The following nested target was put together representing many participants comments, the exact percentage in each section was highly debated and simply serves as an example of how the nesting target could look: By 2030:

- [100% sustainable earth];

- [50%] areas managed for biodiversity. Such as areas maintained for sustainable use, wider landscape/seascape approaches, shorter term measures, etc.;
- [30%] in protected areas and OECMs;
- [10%] in highly or fully protected areas.

Participants also discussed the translation of global targets to the national level for implementation. Some of the issues raised regarding implementation include:

- There should be regional as well as national and global targets. Though caution was urged, as some countries can only sign up for targets because they are global.
- Common but differentiated responsibilities.
  - Help countries understand what their global contribution needs to be and provide appropriate support. Countries may have varying amounts of rare species, priority ecoregions, important areas for connectivity, wilderness, etc. in need of conservation.
  - Have countries report their number of hectares conserved, expressed as an absolute number rather than percent protected. This may make simplify communication regarding differences between global targets and national responsibilities (for example, if a global target is 30%, but due to the concentration of important biodiversity features some countries needs to protect much more).
  - Compensation may be needed based on these differentiated responsibilities (see below).
- Disaggregate targets by ‘condition’ (related to level of intactness or degree of human modification).
  - Addressing different actions in the three conditions<sup>21</sup> could answer questions related to appropriate percentage targets (possibly varying percentage by condition).
- Identify areas that require immediate priority actions (Alliance for Zero Extinction sites [AZEs], intact forests, etc.).
  - Other priority areas could include rare species, priority ecoregions, important areas for connectivity, wilderness, etc.
- Transboundary cooperation is important.
- Development of a Biodiversity Compensation Fund.
  - Provide funding to countries that need to protect more, as the global distribution of biodiversity is uneven. This can be done through global subsidies or other approaches (see [Annex V](#) for further discussion).

Countries should be responsible for taking stock of the situation in their own country. There should also be mechanisms to allow for assistance in achieving goals in other countries.

## **B. REPRESENTATION, ESPECIALLY AREAS OF IMPORTANCE FOR BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES**

There was general discussion regarding the question of whether there should be separate targets for different protected area categories or separate targets for protected areas and OECMs, where there were a range of views expressed. Some other general issues raised include:

- A specific percentage only for protected areas may not be accepted by the Parties.
- There is a need to focus on outcomes, which should be effective conservation (protected areas and OECMs should be consistent in their outcome for biodiversity).

---

<sup>21</sup> Highly modified cities and farms; shared landscapes; large wild areas (see Locke, H. et al. 2019, Three Global Conditions for Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use: an implementation framework. *National Science Review*).

- Protected areas and OECMs could be counted together if we are only focusing on those providing effective conservation.
- There were differing views about what is counted, or what should be counted, as a protected area; similarly, there are different views on what counts as an OECM.
- Separating out different types of ABCM in the target was deemed by some as too prescriptive (i.e. the target cannot overlook the flexibility needed for governments regarding national implementation).

There was discussion about whether a protected area/OECM target could be complementary to a broader retention target. There was a proposal for a specific ecosystem target (such as the species target [T12] under the current Strategic Plan), which would focus on intactness, functions, etc. Possible elements would include no further loss of habitat, and the protection of intact ecosystems. One proposed option for a target is: *“by 2030, for all ecosystems, halt net declines in area, integrity and function, and move towards net gains by 2050, through conservation, restoration and effective management, including urgent protection of remaining intact areas and wilderness”*.

It was noted that there is a need for clarity in the use of terms (such as ecoregions, biomes, etc.) and that there is a need for consistency in the use of language across CBD (for example, habitats and ecosystems). Some of the questions raised and issues discussed include:

- ‘Sustainable use’ is a very broad concept, which can allow for very different measures, and fall under very different perspectives—the term loses its meaning when it is too widely applied.
- There is a need to use a straightforward language and easy to understand concepts that can capture range of biodiversity and ecological processes; the way we communicate will promote buy-in from the wider public.
- Concepts such as old growth forests and wilderness may be easier to communicate to a general audience than biodiversity.
- The way that some issues are discussed may not account for different cultural conceptions (for example, “nature” is a western concept).
- To involve IPLC the use of terms/definitions needs to be considered—there may be a need to invest in establishing common language and effort to promote cross-cultural capacity.<sup>22</sup>

### Representation

The aim for ecological representation is to “keep all of the pieces”, “the whole range of biodiversity” or to “set the ecological stage for the evolutionary play”, which should be retained in a future ABCM target. Other aspects of quality, such as connectivity, are also needed. Effective representation is a function of quality, so there is a need to consider the level of intactness, or integrity. The level of intactness may relate to the level of protection necessary to achieve representation.

Representation may focus on different components of biodiversity. Some of the main points from the discussion included:

- There is a need to address the level of ecological hierarchy when discussing representation (for example, ecoregion, ecosystem, or species); however, most of the discussion was focused on ecoregions, as there are globally consistent maps to define these.

---

<sup>22</sup> See Canada Pathway 1 as an example (<https://www.conservation2020canada.ca/>), including the National Advisory Panel’s 1<sup>st</sup> recommendation, and the important links between Aichi Targets 11 and 18.

- There was some mention of the representation of species, though it was noted that ecoregions generally reflect patterns of species turnover, at least for vertebrates and higher plants.
  - Important species assemblages, species of conservation concern, and others, are often covered under areas important for biodiversity (for example, KBAs).
- Global ecoregions may not be appropriate for conservation planning at the national level, as they may be too broad for national-level implementation. Though many countries do have finer-scale classifications in use (such as the ecosystem-level classifications used in Norway), and there are also regional examples, such as the Natura 2000 and Emerald networks in Europe.
- Finer scale sub-units should be used, where available, though globally consistent finer scale classifications are not currently in use.
  - With the availability of big data, and modern processing approaches, much finer scale analyses (at a 1x1km, for instance) are possible.

Some of the discussion around baselines, targets and aspirations for the post-2020 framework included:

- There is a need to set baselines and aspirations for ecoregions (for example, setting minimum size standards for protected areas).
- There was discussion around what a minimum level of protection for ecoregions could include.
  - For example, a minimum percentage target could be set for each ecoregion (50% of each ecoregion managed well by 2050, so “at least 30% by 2030”).
- How much would be required in protected areas and OECMs, compared to other forms of area-based conservation, and conversely how much transformation would be allowed?
- There is a need to separate out protected areas and OECMs from other areas ‘managed for conservation’.
- Any inclusion of a percentage target should require clarity on what is being counted.
- The role of different types of ABCM depends on context (for example, ecological, social, etc.).
- A target for ecological representation may require transboundary cooperation, as ecosystems, or ecoregions, often traverse national borders.

It was also discussed that any percentage target would need to be different for different ecosystems, depending on their condition (quality, level of intactness, etc.), and that a single percentage target is not appropriate for all types of ecosystems.

- A 50% threshold would be dangerous/far too low for highly intact ecosystems.
- This could be related to the ‘three conditions of the world’ (cities/farms, shared landscapes, and wilderness).
- A sliding-scale/declining percentage target based on human footprint values or levels of intactness was recommended:
  - At high levels of intactness, the percent retained would be much higher (~80%).
  - The percentage target would decline as intactness declines, until it reaches some minimum threshold (such as 50% or 30% of each ecoregion).
  - At the highest human footprint levels (lowest level of intactness), a restoration target would be defined to return intact ecosystems up to this threshold, while conserving whatever fragments of intact ecosystem remain.
  - In some places, 100% of what is left may need to be retained (for instance, wetlands in some countries).
- Retention of intact ecosystems is urgent, while restoration will take more time, and this sense of urgency needs to be reflected.
- This raised some discussion about issues of fairness, given the distribution of intact ecosystems is globally uneven. Issues such as urgency, fairness, and nationally determined contributions would need to be considered. This relates to the Common But Differentiated Responsibilities enshrined

in the Rio Declaration and would need to be linked to some kind of compensation mechanism (see further discussion of this in the section on resource mobilization).

Some participants recommended that any ‘global policy’ for ‘representation’ (such as any specific map/methodology) should come up in associated guidance or indicators and not in the target itself (for example, simply mention “ecologically representative” in the target itself).

Other issues discussed included:

- There was discussion of the concept of redundancy (or replication) in conservation planning (for example, as a strategy to help account for uncertainty, etc.), which would require a minimum percentage for ecoregions, including duplication. Although one participant raised the issue that this may not be feasible in areas of very high beta diversity.
- The concept of adequacy was also raised (such as in the CARR<sup>23</sup> framework), which is often related to the size, configuration, and protection level of protected area networks.
- COP decision IX/20 (Annex II) had provided guidance for selecting areas to establish a representative network of MPAs, with a list of required network properties and components.<sup>24</sup>
- Freshwater ecosystems have been largely overlooked (although Target 11 mentioned “including inland waters”)—and there needs to be more focus on this in the future.
- In the current Strategic Plan, there was not enough focus on under-represented biodiversity features such as seagrass, wetlands, mangroves, deep sea sponges, and others.
- Climate change may impact representativity of area-based conservation measures—there was some discussion of ‘climate-smart’ and dynamic/mobile protected areas (see [annex VIII](#)).

As ecoregions are a biogeographic classification defined to represent the distribution of plants and animals, some participants raised questions about the issue of culture? For example:

- What is the relation between ecoregions and cultures?
- How can other cultural concepts be included?
- How do we account for cultural representation?
- How do we include the human role?
- What about the two-way interaction between people and ecosystems in the creation of many landscapes? (see [annex VIII](#) for further discussion on the human/cultural dimension, discussed in more detail on Day 3 of the meeting).

An example target could include: “*Retain a representative set of land, freshwater and marine ecosystems by natural region as a key strategy to retain biodiversity, with associated ecosystem services and respecting the homelands of indigenous peoples and local communities.*” As an indicator, terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecoregions could be categorized by level of impact, intactness and ecological value into three categories, with different targets for retention and restoration (see [annex V](#) on indicators).

### **Areas important for biodiversity**

Participants indicated that areas of importance for biodiversity should be kept in a future ABCM target. It was also noted that these areas depend on ecological connectivity, especially in light of climate change.

---

<sup>23</sup> Comprehensive, Adequate, Representative, and Replicated.

<sup>24</sup> These are: Ecologically and biologically significant areas, Representativity, Connectivity, Replicated ecological features, Adequate and viable sites.



The most commonly discussed means to identify areas important for biodiversity were Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs):

- KBAs are a global standard (based on rarity, range-restricted, demographic aggregations, ecological integrity, irreplaceability) but are identified/implemented at national level.
- They allow for the addition of nationally appropriate priority areas (for example, some countries have various in-country systems for identification of areas important for biodiversity).
- KBAs are currently incomplete (only a subset of taxa and KBA criteria), so a target for areas important for biodiversity should include reference to the need to complete their identification.
- KBAs do not assume the need for specific tools (such as protected areas or OECMs).
- Value of biodiversity needs to be central; there should be a focus on conservation outcomes.
- One participant noted that KBAs do not account for the potential biodiversity value of an area (i.e. what value could be present following restoration) and recommended that prioritising areas important for biodiversity needs to also consider the potential of each region regarding vegetation. This could include important areas for ecosystem-based restoration. However, there was discussion around whether these would be better accommodated under a restoration target.

The other common prioritization for areas important for biodiversity that was often mentioned was Ecologically or Biologically Significant Marine Areas (EBSAs). Though it was noted that the EBSA process is much broader than KBAs, and many EBSAs are very large and may not be appropriate for siting of MPAs. There are also many country-level systems for priority setting. It was also recommended that regional coordination<sup>25</sup> should be used to identify nationally/regionally important biodiversity features, as well as to support implementation.

It was noted that identifying areas is important but needs to be linked to minimum/sufficient protection status. The potential for different targets for different protected area categories was discussed, with a variety of diverse and often opposing views. Perhaps for the most important sites, it may be worthwhile to link this to international designations (for example, the possibility of using World Heritage designation as some recognition for KBAs that are well protected was raised).

A range of different means for prioritising the placement of protected areas and OECMs in areas of importance for biodiversity were mentioned throughout the day, beyond the two most commonly referenced (KBAs and EBSAs). These included:

- Centres of origin;
- Centres of endemism;
- Areas of important concentrations of crop wild relatives (which are also important for ecosystem services);
- Climate refugia (areas that will be important into the future);
- Areas of cultural importance; sacred sites;
- Indigenous language areas;
- Territories and areas conserved by Indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs);
- Old growth habitats (and other areas of high intactness, such as unploughed grasslands, etc.);
- Key corridors;
- Ecological networks under CMS;

---

<sup>25</sup> Some examples provided: Regional seas organizations; Europe (Natura 2000 for EU, Emerald Network non-EU); West Africa PARCC (Protected Areas Resilient to Climate Change in five West African countries); BIOPAMA (data collection, capacity building, reports in Africa, Pacific, Caribbean); SPREP; ASEAN; REDPARQUES. All promote cooperation between countries. They should apply principles of post-2020 target when they are developing projects and working with countries.

- High carbon sequestration areas;
- Wilderness areas;
- Areas identified based on the Red List of Ecosystems;
- Vulnerable Marine Ecosystems (VMEs);
- Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (PSSAs);
- Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs);
- Important plant areas;
- Ramsar sites;
- Biosphere reserves;
- Nationally identified hotspots of biodiversity;
- Large contiguous blocks of intact habitat that span ecoregions (such as free flowing rivers, large intact areas, and large intact vertebrate fauna).

Though it was noted that if we begin to list some types of prioritization method in the Target, we will never catch all that are important—some will always be left out. So, either capture all or leave out any specific mention of any one tool. Other issues discussed include:

- There is significant overlap in many of these prioritizations, and all prioritizations are not equal in terms of importance, urgency for protection, etc.
- Many of these could be captured through the KBA process.
- These classifications for important biodiversity areas may be best captured in indicators and guidance and not necessarily in the target language itself (i.e. retain “areas of importance for biodiversity” and leave detailed systems to indicators and guidance).
- Including a specific tool in the language of the target/goal could be limiting, and even including the words “such as KBAs” could be limiting (for example, a common perception that Aichi Target 10 was a “corals target” and Target 5 was a “forest target” due to the language used).
- However, specific indicators allow for easier communication with policymakers.

It was mentioned that cultural and biological diversity are often inter-linked, and this needs to be considered in the new framework. For example:

- Prioritise areas of high biocultural diversity.
- The link between cultural and biological diversity is important for the inclusion of IPLC.
- For bridging concepts of cultural and biological diversity, language issues are vital. There is a need to invest in establishing common language and cross-cultural capacity (see Canada Pathway 1, and the National Advisory Panel’s 1<sup>st</sup> recommendation on ethical space, as an example).
- Resources for translators, to permit the communication of traditional knowledge.

The concept of ‘defensibility’ as a means of prioritising sites for conservation was also raised. If business-as-usual scenarios continue (with infrastructure expansion, etc.), certain places have the highest likelihood of remaining (are the most ‘defensible’), so could be a focus for priority conservation. Though the concept was disputed by other participants.

Proposed language to include in a target from one group was a reference to “*key biodiversity areas, EBSAs, and equivalent national or regional processes are documented, retained and restored*”.

### **Areas important for ecosystem services**

It was noted that ecosystem services are a very broad concept; there was no clear suggestion as to whether it should be kept in a successor to Target 11 or a future ABCM target. Participants mentioned that “areas important for ecosystem services” is not a defined issue, and that ‘ecosystem services’ is a fuzzy concept.

It needs to be boiled to down to some key/important issues that are measurable (such as carbon sequestration, water provision, etc.).

Some of the general discussion around ecosystem services and ABCM included:

- Conserving ecosystem services does not always require protected areas or OECMs.
- Ecosystem services are a far broader concept than protected areas and OECMs and apply across a wide spectrum of the sustainable use spectrum.
- A separate target for ecosystem services outside of a future ABCM target may be appropriate, potentially with sub-targets for different categories of ecosystem service (provisioning, regulating, cultural, and supporting services).
- Perhaps there should be a broader goal, cross-cutting theme, or general principle relating to ecosystem services, which is then articulated practically in other relevant targets or sub-targets, including one for area-based conservation.
- Ecosystem services may fit better embedded within a restoration target (with restoration focusing on biodiversity and on restoring ecosystem services) and a target on sustainable use.
- Important areas for biodiversity often do not spatially align with areas important for ecosystem services; though this is not always the case (for example, areas important for pollinators provide both supporting services and are important for biodiversity).
- Some consider biodiversity and ecosystem services as very closely tied; for example, ecosystem services may be considered as a means to promote conservation.
- There is a need to consider trade-offs, either between areas important for biodiversity and areas important for ecosystem services, or between different services (for example, enhancing one ecosystem service may diminish others).
- Trade-offs will often depend on scale (for example, benefits or losses are often scale-dependent).
- Part of the ongoing biodiversity crisis is linked to the delivery of certain ecosystem services; this should be acknowledged in the new framework.
- Rights-based approaches are needed (for example, recognize IPLC rights and include the Rights of Nature).
- 'Ecosystem services' are an anthropocentric framing—focus also needs to be given to ecosystem functions, which are critical in and of themselves.
- Intrinsic values have often been neglected in the Convention. Though others noted that intrinsic value is not a service (i.e. the Right of Nature is independent from human values).

There was discussion throughout the day over where to focus a target for ecosystem services, if this was included with an ABCM target (for example, what category of ecosystem services should be prioritized<sup>26</sup>). Some of the discussion around different categories of ecosystem services included:

- Primary focus should be on overlap areas prioritising multiple ecosystem services, or areas important for both biodiversity and ecosystem services (i.e. multiple benefit areas).
- The focus should be on regulating services for an ABCM target, especially globally important services (such as climate regulation or services related to water).
- Some participants mentioned that the framework needs to address ecosystem services in general, and not just focus on regulating services

---

<sup>26</sup> For example regulatory services (for climate, water, disease prevention, disaster risk reduction, etc.); provisioning services (such as fish, food, medicine); cultural services (including sacred sites, recreation, science, etc.); and supporting services (such as pollination, oxygen production).

- The idea of Carbon Parks or climate stabilization areas as potential protected areas and OECMs was discussed, given the large amount of area that is needed for carbon sequestration to address climate change.
  - Some felt that if these areas are included, the goal should be ecosystem resilience, not just storing carbon.
  - Others felt that the idea was only useful when they would also provide specific biodiversity benefit.
- Other participants mentioned that provisioning services were important (discussion of provisioning services may also be one means to engage different sectors).
  - In many countries, ecosystem services are understood primarily as provisioning services.
- The economic aspect is important (for example, for local communities with respect to benefit-sharing, for governments financial sustainability is important).
- When planning protected area/OECM networks, there should be consideration given to the needs for agriculture, or other development areas.
- Enhancement of provisioning services was often a major driver of unsustainable use.
- There is a need to include cultural ecosystem services, as they often lead to support for conservation.
- It is important to account for diversity of people/diversity of values (choices regarding priority places to protect will depend on values and different contexts).
- Many IPLC have a holistic view of ecosystems, and treatment of cultural ecosystem services in a post-2020 target may be one way to engage IPLC.

It was noted several times that all types of ecosystem services cannot be bundled and should not be treated as one (i.e. they need to be treated separately). Clarity was recommended when discussing ecosystem services, as the different categories of ecosystem services<sup>27</sup> are very different things and should not be considered/discussed together.

There was discussion around the involvement of different stakeholder groups:

- Different stakeholder groups need to be involved from the start, as we design targets/indicators (for example, creating dialogue with broader stakeholder groups to get buy-in/ownership of targets), and it was suggested that the inclusion of ecosystem services may be one way to do this.
- The treatment of ecosystem services (or the use of Nature-based solutions) in the post-2020 framework could be used to link with/reflect the work of the other Rio Conventions (UNFCCC and UNCCD).
- There is a need for engagement at the local/sub-national level, and the need for sectors to be involved (different sectors rely on different ecosystem services, and value different services).
- The link between conservation and consumption needs consideration, for example with the link between cities and unsustainable practices in rural environments and the need to focus on indirect drivers of biodiversity loss.
- Biosphere Reserves were discussed as a model of the integration of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use at the spatial level of communities (where people are living and conserving).
- Along these lines, a goal for 100% sustainable management, beyond just xx% protected/conserved (for example, aim by 2050 to convert all unsustainable use to be sustainable).

An ecosystem services target proposal from one participant was: **“By 2030, ecosystem services important for biodiversity and people are mapped, assessed, and preserved”**, with four sub-targets:

---

<sup>27</sup> Regulating, provisioning, cultural, and supporting services.

- *“Areas important for supporting and regulating ecosystem services are identified”*
- *“Policies are designed in order to maintain and enhance these ecosystem services”*
- *“Negative effects of financing mechanisms, spatial planning strategies, and economic sectors’ activities are assessed and minimized”*
- *“Incentives are designed and implemented to support ecosystem service preservation by land-owners and rights-owners/holders”.*

### C. CONNECTIVITY AND THE ECOSYSTEM APPROACH

Connectivity may be considered in terms of the persistence of species, especially wide-ranging and migratory species, but should also include ecosystem functions and processes. It was noted that integrity is the key issue that needs to be addressed, not necessarily connectivity (connectivity is a response to loss of integrity). It was also noted that there is no global standard definition of connectivity. The CMS definition<sup>28</sup> had aspects (‘the flow of natural processes’) that were considered by some as vague or unclear.

Some participants noted that over the last decade, too much focus was put on creating new protected areas, and in the future, more effort needs to be put on connectivity. Some of the general issues related to the treatment of connectivity in the post-2020 framework discussed include:

- It may not be possible to develop a single connectivity target, as it is highly context-dependent.
- The temporal dimension of connectivity needs consideration, especially when addressing migratory species.
- Connectivity is species dependent.
- Issues of scale need to be addressed.
- OECMs could be a good contributor for connectivity.
- Rather than increasing connectivity, maybe it is a question of reducing fragmentation; connectivity is only an issue when ecosystems/landscapes are fragmented.
- Non-natural aspects of connectivity need consideration.
- Building resilience for small-scale areas through connectivity and buffer zones.
- We need to address both maintaining connectivity where it currently exists, and restoring connectivity where it has been lost.

Given the wide range of intactness and the variation in fragmentation across different landscapes, there may need to be different actions taken to maintain or restore connectivity. Three global conditions<sup>29</sup> of landscapes in the world have been proposed for thinking biodiversity conservation, each with different consequences for conservation and connectivity. The three approaches include:

1. Keep large wild areas,<sup>30</sup> with inherent connectivity, intact (for example, 80% of the area must remain under native vegetation);
2. For semi-fragmented ecosystems in shared landscapes,<sup>31</sup> restore and maintain connectivity;
3. In highly fragmented areas,<sup>32</sup> retain all remaining native vegetation, prevent further fragmentation, and employ restoration where possible.

<sup>28</sup> “Ecological connectivity is the unimpeded movement of species and the flow of natural processes that sustain life on earth.”

<sup>29</sup> Highly modified cities and farms; shared landscapes; large wild areas (see Locke, H. et al. 2019).

<sup>30</sup> Low human footprint areas, with <0.5% under intense human uses.

<sup>31</sup> Between 1 and 50% under intense human uses.

<sup>32</sup> Intensive land use > 50%.

There was discussion around the question of whether connectivity should be incorporated as an element in a target (or multiple targets), or whether it should be included in its own target in the post-2020 framework? Some felt that there should be a target solely on connectivity. Others mentioned that connectivity should be treated as a qualifier for an ABCM target in the new framework. While other participants stated that connectivity should be included in multiple elements of the structure of the post-2020, not just in an ABCM target, as connectivity is a much broader concept. Connectivity is currently nested in the protected areas target, though this may be considered misplaced. Connectivity does not have to rely only on protected areas. Some issues raised by participants included:

- Connectivity is better suited to targets on sustainable use.
- Connectivity is more related to ecosystem health.
- Protected area managers often have no control on connectivity planning.
- Connectivity should be taken into consideration for targets on restoration, on sustainable use, and for land-use or landscape/seascape planning.

Participants also noted that when defining targets, we need to associate them with the outcomes. So, what is a good outcome for connectivity? What are the outcomes and what would the benefits be? Is connectivity an outcome, or a broader guiding process? It was mentioned that if connectivity is considered as both a guiding principle and as a target, it will have a greater chance of halting the loss of connectivity.

For the post-2020 framework, targets are needed for both ecosystems and species. An ecosystems target should focus on '*No loss of integrity*'. With respect to connectivity, a species target should focus on migratory species, ensuring the maintenance of connectivity through all means, including corridors and stepping stones. Some suggestions for elements of a post-2020 target, as well as general points raised regarding targets, include:

- The first priority should be to preserve intactness.
- There should be an ecosystem integrity target with elements or sub-targets on connectivity.
- 20% of intact area is a good minimum to measure intactness.
- No negative impacts on integrity.
- 75% of protected areas are well connected.
- A minimum width should exist for corridors (for example, a 2km width is used in South American forests).
- The target needs to address the management of species' movements.
- All key biodiversity corridors within intact areas should be conserved ("100% of key corridors maintained").
- There should be no more loss of connectivity moving forward.
- Retain and where necessary improve the integrity of ecosystems including by addressing drivers of damage or fragmentation.
- Protect areas and processes that are vital to the integrity of ecosystems.
- Restoring and regaining areas that have been fragmented.

Connectivity may require different approaches, and may need to be addressed independently, for marine, terrestrial and freshwater environments.

- For freshwater connectivity, attention to upstream impacts is needed, which may require transboundary cooperation.
- Connectivity between terrestrial and marine environments (such as ridge to reef approaches) should also be considered.
- Connectivity in the ocean is complicated by jurisdictional issues in the high seas.

- Vertical marine connectivity also needs to be considered, given the three-dimensional nature of the marine environment.

There was some discussion around corridors, which are one important tool for maintaining connectivity. Some the questions raised and issues discussed include:

- Do we have enough data for corridors?
- Corridors area species-dependent; for some species, important corridors have been identified, but for many species, more data is needed.
- In the Russian Federation, they have identified two different types of corridors: geographic corridors and ecological corridors.
- Corridors are only a response to connectivity issues, there is still a need to focus on measures of intactness.
- Studies on established key corridors can be a guide for countries to implement.
- One potential negative consequence of improved connectivity from better integration of corridors that needs to be considered is the possibility for the expansion of invasive species.

A number of issues were discussed on the relation between connectivity and climate change. For instance:

- Connectivity along latitudinal corridors/altitudinal gradients needs to be maintained for climate change adaptation.
- May consider that the borders of protected areas may move due to climate change.
- The role of mountains needs to be discussed.
- Conservation measures should follow the dynamic nature of climate change.

Ensuring the maintenance and restoration of connectivity may require transboundary coordination, so there is a need to stress the regional dimension. For example, rivers running across borders may complicate the maintenance of connectivity for the freshwater system (examples from Europe and Argentina were mentioned). There are many examples of existing transboundary reserves, and other transboundary approaches such as the conservation of flyways (see for example, the East-Asian Australasian Flyway Partnership involving 18 countries and 145 network sites). A range of issues related to connectivity and transboundary coordination were discussed:

- The level of border permeability needs to be considered.
- International cooperation to remove barriers that encourage the dissection of corridors.
- Political aspects of connectivity will need consideration.
- We need spatial planning at a transboundary scale (for instance using Strategic Environmental Assessment [SEA], sensitivity mapping, etc.) and there is need for guidance and tools to support this planning.
- More transboundary protected areas are necessary.

There were a number of major risks or threats to connectivity identified, including, *inter alia*, roads and development corridors, agriculture and dams. It was recommended that guidelines for safeguarding integrity and connectivity be considered. With sometimes conflicting priorities between connectivity and development, Green infrastructure is a good middle ground.

There was some discussion regarding possible indicators for tracking connectivity (though see below for more details). Some of the issues discussed include:

- The lack of clear metrics for connectivity is a problem; while some basic connectivity metrics exist for different groups of species, current large-scale datasets produce ‘naive experiments’, where our current maps do not capture the reality on the ground.



- A new global map will be published shortly, for key biodiversity areas and corridors.
- There is a need to identify key landscape-scale corridors.
- Tracking the status of migratory species can display improvements or losses of connectivity.
- There is a need to safeguard mobile species.
- Species' ranges need to be considered.
- There should be a focus on connectivity in NBSAPs.
- There is a need for indicators to measure ecosystem integrity.
- We need to address functional connectivity; measures of structural connectivity (such as distance), are proxies for achieving functional connectivity.
- Barrier hotspots could be assessed (i.e. the degree to which a region is disconnected).
- Mapping the bottlenecks should address both natural and non-natural bottlenecks.
- Measures of intactness should be used.
- You can go overboard with SMART targets: make sure to not be too quantitative.
- Indicators for drivers regarding human activity must consider IPLCs.
- Fragmented area is much easier to define and a good way to simplify the indicator for connectivity.
- Integrity is more measurable than connectivity (the spectrum of highly intact to highly fragmented is a spectrum that measures integrity, rather than connectivity).
- The difference between 'intact' and 'modified' needs to be maintained (areas can be completely intact but be completely modified, for example the area downstream from an upstream modification may still be intact but experiences the effects of upstream modification).

Some participants noted the importance of changing the narrative of how we think of conservation measures by involving people. There were a range of topics discussed relating to issues around traditional and cultural aspects of connectivity, including:

- The need to respect IPLC rights.
- The potential role of ICCAs in maintaining connectivity.
- We must not forget the human dimension that is connected to nature conservation.
- The role of corridors of cultures and spiritual corridors in conservation.
- Engagement of people should be required in land-use and corridor planning.
- Participatory planning should be adopted.
- Negative impacts of dis-connectivity on people and livelihoods needs to be considered.

Regarding spatial planning, an important tool for maintaining and enhancing connectivity, it was noted that there is a need for biodiversity to be integrated in all steps. The inter-sectoral aspect of spatial planning also needs to be addressed, and different stakeholders must be involved. Spatial planning should be reported in NBSAPs.

#### **D. EFFECTIVENESS**

Participants noted that effectiveness is relevant for all ABCMs and that it was a critical component, though one that was not addressed adequately under the current Strategic Plan. Most participants found the term 'ABCM' confusing and preferred keeping to protected areas and OECMs, while recognizing that many other governance forms could deliver conservation benefits. Though in many cases, some of these could be included in protected areas and/or OECMs.

There were a number of critical concerns related to effectiveness mentioned by participants during the discussion, some of which included:

- There was broad understanding that:

- Effectiveness (protected area/OECM quality) was an extremely important aspect of Target 11 and an aspect that had not been realized sufficiently.
- Moving forward, emphasis on effectiveness was essential and that delivering on effectiveness should be a cornerstone of any post-2020 target on ABCM.
- ‘Quality’ was not the same as ‘qualitative’—i.e. that protected area/OECM quality could be measured both qualitatively and quantitatively (see [Annex V](#) for further discussion on indicators for effectiveness).
- The current wording related to effectiveness and quality in Target 11 contained many important elements; the challenges were related to the lack of specific sub-targets and indicators for the elements of quality.
  - This gap transferred focus to the coverage element without qualifying the effectiveness of the area covered.
  - Some participants suggested that this indicated the need to replicate a similar quantitative measure (such as the 10% and 17% targets) for effectiveness.
  - Another subset of participants voiced the opposite opinion and believed percentage targets—even if being applied to effectiveness—would lead to perverse outcomes.
- Most participants indicated that the lack of an explicit focus on outcomes in the current targets had been a significant issue.
  - Some participants related this to fact that the current Target linked ‘effective’ with management and not with the effective delivery of outcomes (i.e. Target 11: states “... effectively and equitably managed ...”).
- There was mention that equity and management should not be separated in new target(s).
- Most participants noted that one problem with Aichi Target 11 was that it has not led to adequate resource mobilization for protected areas (see further discussion in [Annex VI](#)).
  - This was potentially directly linked to the overwhelming focus on the coverage element (the 17% and 10% targets) which allowed countries to “deliver” without committing sufficient resources.
  - The importance of ensuring long term funding stability for projects passed the initial designation was mentioned by several groups.
- All groups mentioned that the lack of strong, internationally agreed (and supported) indicators for effectiveness made it difficult to track and report. It was suggested that reporting be done in a synergistic way with other Conventions and other global processes such as the SDGs.
- Most groups mentioned that the lack of baseline indicators and clear objectives for ABCMs made it difficult to understand what should be perceived as effective.
- Many groups also mentioned that ‘paper parks’ are a major issue and that Target 11 had not been effective in eliminating the reporting of these.
  - Enforcing effectiveness is difficult, but critical to the success of a target on protected areas and OECMs.

Participants discussed a range of issues related to the treatment of effectiveness in the post-2020 framework. Some of these included:

- Most participants mentioned that effectiveness is about delivering outcomes and that outcomes covered a range of issues, such as:
  - a) Improving/maintaining/restoring biodiversity;
  - b) reducing threats;
  - c) delivering ecosystem services.
- Although effectiveness should ultimately be about outcomes, all groups recognized that it was closely linked to management, and that assessing management should be an important component of any future target.

- Likewise, all groups recognized that resources and accountability are essential aspects of achieving effectiveness and should be integrated into any targets on effectiveness.
- Effectiveness should help to leverage financing and that resource mobilization is a key element that should be included in future targets on effectiveness (see further discussion in [Annex VI](#)).
- In all groups, participants reiterated the need for the establishment of institutional arrangements that guarantee participatory and inclusive processes, especially for Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (see also section on [governance and equity](#)).
- In all groups, participants noted that the four components of the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas<sup>33</sup> was a useful way of covering key elements contributing to effectiveness and could be used to operationalize effectiveness in a meaningful and measurable way.
- It was mentioned by several groups that permitting (or not effectively avoiding) resource extraction (for example, commercial fishing, forestry or mining) is incompatible with effective protected areas and OECMs.
- The challenge of reporting at the site level, or national level, was mentioned in many of the groups, and advantages and disadvantages of both approaches to reporting were discussed.
  - Participants mentioned that finding a simple way of determining and monitoring outcomes, then aggregating this information at the national level would likely be necessary.
  - Effectiveness was often seen as a site-level attribute which would be useful to capture.
- It was mentioned by some that thinking of effectiveness related to outcomes rather than management meant that looking at the wider landscape was important as this would contribute to the delivery of improved outcomes.
- A few participants suggested that ABCMs are a tool and not a target and therefore merging the current Target 5 (on habitat loss, degradation, and fragmentation) and Target 11 (on protected areas) might help to make clear that the focus is on maintaining habitat—ABCMs are an important part of the strategy for achieving this. However, others disagreed.

Participants made a range of recommendations regarding the treatment of effectiveness in a future goal, target, or sub-target (and indicators):

- Most participants mentioned that effectiveness needs to be an integral part of any goal(s) and target(s) on ABCMs, and that making effectiveness as explicit as possible was needed. This would ensure that current implementation and assessment gaps related to delivering effective outcomes are not repeated in the post-2020 framework.
- Equity and effectiveness should be treated at the same time.
- One group suggested that changing the current target language (“*effectively and equitably managed*”) to “*delivery of effective in situ conservation of biodiversity*” might help to make clear that effectiveness is about delivering outcomes and not management.
- A goal or target should include measurable elements across the four Green List components:
  - a) Good governance;
  - b) Sound design and planning;
  - c) Effective management; and
  - d) Successful conservation outcomes.
- A few participants mentioned that the IUCN protected areas management categories could be useful for assessing the quality of protected areas, but it was made very clear that this would require considerable work to standardize their application (the current use of these categories is variable across countries—effectively making it impossible now).

---

<sup>33</sup> Good governance, Sound design and planning, Effective management, and Successful conservation outcomes (See IUCN & WCPA, 2017).

- It was mentioned by all groups that data is essential for delivering on effectiveness and one place where we currently have a major shortfall.
- Some suggested that an explicit target on producing data/evidence for tracking progress would be useful. It was also suggested that it might be possible to integrate this into the current Aichi Target 1 (“Awareness increased”), or its potential successor in the new framework.
- In several groups, participants mentioned that remote sensing provided a potential avenue for producing globally standardized measures of ecological outcomes for protected areas or OECMs. This could be through high-resolution landcover change maps for the terrestrial realm and through maps of human activity in the marine realm. Such maps would not capture all elements important for tracking biodiversity outcomes but would be a significant step forward.
  - This would require investment to ensure quality.
  - This would likely need to be hosted by a CBD-relevant institution and not driven by NGOs or other organizations that are dependent on private funding and where the data cannot be guaranteed to be freely available (UNEP-WCMC was mentioned as an example).
- Similarly, participants indicated that a measure that could capture management processes would be needed. This should cover:
  - a) resourcing/staffing;
  - b) integration of relevant stakeholders;
  - c) existence of an up-to-date management plan related to key objectives, and
  - d) assessment of threats to the site.
  - This would call for developing a simple standardized assessment of management effectiveness.
- Targets could be related to how many sites deliver outcomes and how many have appropriate management and governance conditions to deliver long-term *in situ* conservation.
- No specific numbers were discussed, but most participants indicated that targets should be very ambitious to ensure coverage is not inflated by ‘paper parks’.
- It was mentioned in one group that individual Parties clearly stating national goals/objectives for protected areas/OECMs could provide a benchmark against which to report effectiveness.

## **E. EQUITY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE, AS WELL AS BENEFIT-SHARING**

Equity, as one component of the three objectives of the Convention, should underpin the entire post-2020 framework. It was noted that good governance and equity are principles that should apply to all post-2020 targets, not be limited to a target on ABCM. Some issues regarding the treatment of governance, equity and responsibility in the new framework include:

- The primacy of nature should be asserted (for example, addressing the voice of nature, the rights of nature, nature in relation to other development sectors, etc.).
- There is a need to reflect both intra- and inter-generational equity.
- The post-2020 framework should reflect the need for mutual achievement of biodiversity outcomes and social outcomes and the balance, responsibility and burden of these dimensions.
- Respect for all traditions and knowledge systems is necessary.

COP 14 adopted voluntary guidelines on effective governance models for management of protected areas, including equity,<sup>34</sup> which provide a range of suggested steps for enhancing and supporting governance diversity, and suggested actions that could be taken to enable and support effective and equitable

---

<sup>34</sup> See annex II of [decision 14/8](#).

governance models tailored to their context for protected areas under their mandate. This voluntary guidance, and many other COP decisions, already underscores the importance of good governance and equity—post-2020 targets should draw on these sources.

A range of issues were discussed by participants relating to how governance and equity should be reflected in a future target for protected areas and OECMs. Some of these include:

- Good governance and equity are important quality measures for effectiveness.
- They are not only a means to achieve biodiversity goals but an outcome for a society living in harmony with nature.
- Quality standards for good governance and equity are needed.
- Good governance has to be reflected in the institutional setting for effective protected areas and OECMs—an accountable governance body is required.
- Compliance and enforcement mechanisms must be in place.
- Appropriate recognition and support for voluntary governance.
- Some participants noted that governance and equity aspects are still poorly understood. Considerations related to notions of justice may be a better means of communicating these issues.
- The availability of resources to support and enhance equity and good governance needs to be addressed (see [annex VI](#) for further discussion on resource mobilization).

A range of conditions are necessary to ensure equity in area-based conservation measures, some of the conditions discussed include:

- Effective laws, policies, institutions in place.
- Full and meaningful participation in decision-making.
- Access to information.
- Access to justice.
- Compliance with international human rights laws, standards, and frameworks.

Discussion on how governance and equity should be operationalised in a post-2020 target included a range of topics. For one, it was noted that all dimensions of equity need to be addressed, including distributional equity (benefit-sharing and mitigation of costs), procedural equity (such as effective participation, access to justice and transparency), and recognition. Legislation needs to be in place requiring recognition, procedural equity and benefit-sharing (i.e. covering all dimensions of equity).

Equity considerations also need to address the potential burdens of conservation and opportunity costs associated with foregoing areas for development. For example:

- The potential impacts on human well-being resulting from various policy decisions need to be addressed.
- A full assessment of costs and benefits is needed, to ensure equitable distribution of benefits and mitigation of costs.
- Benefits come in a variety of forms.
- Community support and rights to access resources need to be addressed.
- Both benefits and responsibilities need to be addressed.
- Balancing competing views of stakeholders regarding benefits and burdens is important.
- Attention needs to be paid to balancing the costs of conservation action, and addressing issues of scale (for example, are costs localised but benefits global?).

Some of the issues around aspects of procedural equity that were discussed include:

- Different stakeholder, and the potentially conflicting views, need to be accounted for in decision-making.
- Stakeholder engagement is necessary.
- It is critical to consider social justice in the process.
- Participatory approaches to decision-making should be applied.
- Legal obligations are needed to ensure effective participation.
- Accountability is necessary.
- Access to justice is a necessity—there needs to be concrete means to address this.
- Some participants noted accountability regarding human rights remains low in many cases.
- Ecological and social outcomes are often dependent on participation.
- A sense of responsibility and shared belonging among people helps.
- Transparent access to information and decision-making.

Regarding recognition, some of the topics discussed and questions raised include:

- There needs to be a full recognition of indigenous people's rights.
- Rights-based approaches are critical.
- Legal recognition and implementation regarding ICCAs.
- Rights of local people should be addressed in all types of protected areas/OECMs.
- What about recognition of rights outside of protected areas/OECMs?
- Recognition of rights needs to be stressed when addressing participation.
- Cultural integration should be addressed—a diversity of cultural identities could be accounted for in management decisions.
- Not all countries have Indigenous peoples, though there is still a need for respecting a diversity of knowledge systems.
- What are the measures needed to achieve effective recognition?
- Is it legal recognition, or some other means of recognition?

The identification of governance diversity and institutions through overlay of biodiversity priorities with governance mechanisms provides a means to improve understanding. Currently, data is primarily provided by governments; this may miss important action being taken by other actors. It was noted that there is a need for the recognition of the diversity of governance types in protected areas and OECMs. Some of the points that were raised include:

- The importance of recognizing the effective role of non-government actors.
- Private actors and private conservation needs to be included.
- Stronger coordination with civil society is needed.
- More cooperative and shared governance models.
- Recognizing the role of locals is significant.
- Sometimes there is under-recognition of private and locally governed protected areas.
- The percentage of protected areas or OECMs under different forms of governance could be used as an indicator for governance diversity.
- In some cases a centralized governance system is needed.
- Conservation plans may be developed by national and sub-national governments, but may also be developed by other stakeholders.
- In some areas, the governance authority may be unclear.
- There are also cases with overlapping governance. In cases of overlapping governance regimes, there is possibility for conflict if joint approaches are not taken.
- Governance type may impact social and ecological outcomes, though this may depend on context.
- The role of IPLC needs to be addressed in all governance types.

A governance ‘plan’ should be adopted and integrated into land-use planning. Planning processes are needed at regional and at local/grassroots levels, to incorporate broader landscape-based management beyond the boundary of protected areas. Biosphere Reserves are examples of this sort of integrated approach. The needs of IPLC need to be addressed, where good planning and management needs to ensure shared responsibility and benefits. Work plans need to include all stakeholders. This requires mechanisms for participation, transparency, and accountability, among others. There is a relationship between fairness and justice in society and aspects of environmental sustainability; conserving biodiversity will have a positive effect on social outcomes and vice versa. These considerations are needed at the level of strategic planning.

There is a need to report, track and verify progress on recognition and other components of equity, as well as the assessment and enhancement of governance diversity, quality and effectiveness. The inclusion of governance and equity should be supported by measurable indicators to make clear what is required to achieve the standards. It was noted that there are a variety of indicators currently in use under other existing processes and frameworks<sup>35</sup> that could be adopted (see [annex V](#) for more details). Addressing issues of equity and good governance are needed at site-level for ABCM; however, these also need to be addressed at the landscape/seascape-scale. Some other issues related to measuring or assessing governance and equity in protected areas and OECMs that were discussed include:

- Assessment of governance quality can be accomplished through universal application of a rapid assessment tool (for example, SAGE).
- Consider the Rights of Nature (the International Tribunal of Mother Earth Rights was raised as one example).
- Consider both biodiversity outcomes and social outcomes.
- Cross-sectoral analysis of equity is needed.
- Country-level indices for various components of equity are available and could be explored for wider use (an example from Mexico was mentioned, where a Gender Equity Index is being applied with local participation).
- Quality standards for good governance and equity should be in place, including the Akwé:Kon principles<sup>36</sup>—the bar should be high for all areas, not only protected areas and OECMs.
- Data on IPLC engagement should be explored.
- Means to track accountability are needed.

Issues around sustainable use were raised by several participants, as were issues related to sustainable land management in areas surrounding protected areas and OECMs. Some noted that there has been a lack of focus on the social dimension of sustainability. Rather than talking about human impacts, we should re-focus the conversation around sustainability. New messaging around the human role in conservation is needed: humans are parts of nature and not just a threat to it. Several participants also noted important links with the SDGs. For example, there are possible synergies with SDG 10 (Reduce inequality) and SDG 16 (Peace, justice and strong institutions).

## **F. LANDSCAPE AND SEASCAPE APPROACHES TO ENHANCE CONSERVATION OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABLE USE, INCLUDING SPATIAL PLANNING**

---

<sup>35</sup> For example: Escazú Agreement; Aarhus Convention; Indigenous Navigator; Universal Declaration of Human Rights; United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples; United Nations Special Rapporteur on Human Rights, Indigenous Peoples’ Rights, and the environment; among others.

<sup>36</sup> See <https://www.cbd.int/traditional/guidelines.shtml>



A range of issues were discussed related to landscape/seascape approaches to enhance conservation outcomes and sustainable use, including spatial planning. Below is a list of some of the general reflections from the six small group discussions:

- The definition of scale (global, national, regional, local) of landscape/seascape needs to be addressed; it was not incorporated in the current target and does not directly address social and cultural contexts. Different countries have different interpretations of landscape/seascape.
- Current definitions are good, but ecological connectivity is a major gap (how does this relate to landscapes/seascapes? Buffer zones?).
- Biocultural corridors and transboundary protected areas are one way to practice integration with the wider landscape.
- ABCMs need a more integrated management regime that looks at all land use patterns, not just protected areas and high biodiversity areas; it is important to treat biodiversity, economic, social, and cultural issues as an integrated whole.
- Landscape/seascape integration needs multi-stakeholder mechanisms to be effective.
- There is a need to address incentives in order to influence mainstreaming zones around protected areas or OECMs and enhance integration with the wider landscape/seascape.
- There is a need for cost efficiency and the concentration of efforts in specific landscapes; requiring a need to prioritize and focus efforts (finding the investment equilibrium/thresholds for different landscapes—when to move on and when to prioritize).
- Landscape/seascape integration cannot have a sole focus on conservation, due to the risk of the exclusion of IPLCs; ABCMs need to be linked with sustainable management and ABS (access and benefit sharing).
- Modelling and spatial planning have to be used for effective landscape/seascape management.
- There must be a reference to spatial planning in the new framework since we work in a mosaic of patches. If there is a target for planning, this does not replace the need to have a target for protected areas/ABCM lands.
- Inclusion of the sustainable use/management sector is important to ensure the success of landscape/seascape integration.
- An anthropocentric approach to conservation, in general, has been proposed; this should be part of a paradigm shift that acknowledges humans as part of nature.
- Work is needed on species and genetic connectivity, as well as social connectivity, and how this relates to broader concepts, such as landscape/seascape.
- Landscape/seascape integration is not currently being done, it is often an afterthought; often there are not any buffer zones in use.
- There are no adequate tools to address threats to protected areas from the wider landscapes and/or seascapes.
- Landscape/seascape approaches are much broader than protected areas; as such they should not be part of a protected areas target.
- One major challenge relates to a misalignment of policies; contradictory policies for neighboring pieces of land (for example, carbon forests, nutrient loads in rivers, etc.) can produce significant negative consequences.
- Issues related to jurisdiction and responsibilities need to be addressed; areas may be overlooked if there is not clarity around the boundaries of landscapes and seascapes.
- Landscape and seascape approaches should cover 100%, with protected areas and OECMs embedded in the broader conservation landscape/seascape. This requires addressing the post-2020 framework for the whole planet, for the 2050 Vision to be achieved; not only national ecosystems but for a healthy planet overall.
- Landscape approaches have a huge potential to fully leverage the links between cultural diversity and biodiversity—this needs to be considered in the post-2020 framework.

- The separation of land and sea is deep and institutional; however, the integration of these areas is vital for addressing many impacts.
- Disputed territories in the marine environment lead to many issues being ignored.
- There is a lack of specific metrics to measure progress; within spatial planning there is a lack of Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) metrics and tools.

There was also discussion around proposed goal(s), target(s) and/or sub-target(s) related to landscape/seascape approaches, including spatial planning. Some of the issues discussed throughout the day, including possible target/sub-target language, are listed below:

- Bring about transformative change through landscape/seascape approaches (this needs to include cross-sectoral/multi-scale integration).
- The CBD, with the consensus of Parties, should define and describe at least five models or approaches to integrate protected areas (and all ABCMs) into broader landscapes or seascapes.
- The integration of agrobiodiversity should be considered as a core element for conservation within the integrated management of landscapes/seascapes.
- Productive activities must demonstrate that their impacts on the ecological functions of protected areas and OECMs are positive or neutral to the sites' objectives.
- Stakeholders are involved in landscape/seascape integration of protected areas (for example, relating to governance, financing, outcomes, reporting, etc.)
- Biodiversity hotspots (landscapes and seascapes) are interconnected and conserved collectively and holistically.
- Intergenerational equity is a necessary operational criterion with respect to landscape/seascape management. We need to account for the wellbeing of future generations, and their access to a healthy planet.
- The contributions of all stakeholders, including private sector actors, are integrated into the management approaches of ABCMs.
- Clarify what landscapes and seascapes are crucial on a national and transboundary level to maintain and develop biodiversity and involve local communities.
- Establish a network of priority landscapes/seascapes as a model for cost-efficient preservation and the involvement of stake holders. Decide on a higher percentage for the protection of these landscapes/seascapes.
- An integrated approach to landscapes/seascapes that takes into consideration different values (ecological, social, cultural, economic).
- Developing mitigation hierarchies<sup>37</sup> on the landscape approach.
- The more you increase protected areas and OECMs the less you have to worry about integration into the wider landscape/seascape.
- Recognizing that biodiversity loss will only be abated by actions across landscapes and seascapes, any wider landscape/seascape goal needs to be framed within an ecosystem framework with retention and/or restoration of integrity as the indicator.
- There should be a new goal centered on landscape/seascape conservation; this should involve the following components:
  - Integrated planning;
  - The ecosystem approach;
  - Optimizing habitat conservation;

---

<sup>37</sup> It is commonly treated as the prioritization of impact avoidance before moving to minimize impacts, then the rehabilitation/restoration of impacts that cannot be avoided/minimized, and finally offsetting/compensation for residual impacts; however, other approaches may be available.

- Abating threats;
  - Mitigating impacts; and
  - Restoration of degraded habitats.
- Landscapes/seascapes should be subject to spatial planning to support biodiversity conservation (and wider social/cultural goals); protected areas should be an integral part of such planning.
- Integration should be an overarching theme throughout all targets, not only for a target on ABCM; maybe this should be included in the mission statement.
- Landscapes/seascapes should be the context of the whole post-2020 framework, not just an element of a target on ABCM. With this approach, we can address different actions in the three global conditions.<sup>38</sup>
- Integrative approaches are needed for water and land protection activities.
- Proposed target: By 2030, all National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and related policies explicitly incorporate the concept of landscape/seascape approaches. This will require:
  - Clear conceptualization;
  - Concrete strategies and action plans;
  - Programming activities at the sub-national level.
- By 2030, 50% of landscapes and seascapes outside of protected areas and OECMs are managed in ecologically sustainable ways that are integrated with and supportive of protected areas and OECMs achieving the *in situ* conservation of biodiversity in the face of climate change.
- By 2030, implement integrated landscape and seascape planning to bring conservation and sustainable use policies into complementary alignment.
- Should take a ‘whole-ocean’ approach, whereby 30% is highly or fully protected and 70% is sustainably managed.
- Ensure that land use planning in the larger landscape/seascape around protected areas and OECMs considers biodiversity conservation as an important objective in order to ensure integrity of the protected area/OECM.
- Safeguard buffer zones and connect remaining intact ecosystems, reduce the loss and degradation of intact areas, ensuring connectivity and resilience, and ensuring the provision of essential ecosystem services through landscape/seascape-level conservation at ecologically relevant scales.
  - By 2030 all the spatial planning process passes a strategic environmental process including public consultations.
  - By 2030 at least xx% of ABCMs/protected areas/OECMs have adequate buffer areas and/or are functionally connected to other important areas.
- Target proposal, for marine areas: The promotion of marine spatial planning that incorporates strategic environmental assessment, and incorporates socio-economic and cultural considerations, in line with national and/or regional priorities, which leads to protected areas and OECMs that are strategically placed for better connectivity, ecological representation, management, and are complementary to other sustainable marine measures, etc.

---

<sup>38</sup> Highly modified areas (cities and farms): shared landscapes; and large wild areas (see Locke et al. 2019 for details).

*Annex V*

**BASELINE, INDICATORS AND MONITORING**

**A. SCOPE AND COVERAGE**

Current indicators for the coverage of protected areas and OECMs were discussed. Some of the comments raised by participants include:

- Indicators and baseline for the coverage of protected areas is well developed (see for example the WDPA).
- Development of indicators and baselines for the coverage of OECMs is just getting started (there is no global baseline for OECMs, though the World Database on OECMs has now been launched).
- Protected areas and OECMs need to be reported separately.
- Governance types of reported protected areas and OECMs should be tracked (IPLC governed sites may also be recorded in the ICCA Registry).
- Tracking IUCN category is important, though currently data is insufficient.
  - There should be a breakdown of percentages for each category.
  - This brings up issues of level of protection (fully, highly, minimally protected, etc.), though the relation to different management categories is not always clear.
  - The protected area categories used in many countries do not necessarily match IUCN categories, and not all countries report on this to the WDPA (currently around two-thirds of sites in the WDPA have their IUCN management category reported).
- Outside of protected areas and OECMs, should ensure we stay within safe planetary boundaries.

There are many challenges related to the indicators discussed above. Some of the challenges that were mentioned by participants include:

- Data is almost exclusively submitted by governments (this may end up with an under-representation of non-state governed sites).
- There needs to be a verification and validation process for reporting on protected areas.
- Reporting is a challenge, there are often time lags—countries may not be reporting to WDPA what they are saying to CBD through national reports.
  - Making it more clear what is accepted and how to report to WDPA would be beneficial.
- Effectiveness is an ongoing concern (see further discussion [below](#)).
- There is some confusion regarding the reporting of sites that would meet the IUCN protected areas definition but are not considered as ‘protected areas’ under national law.
  - It is the national governments decision if they want them reported as either protected areas or OECMs.
- Countries need to have the capacity for reporting on OECMs (and a realistic implementation strategy is required).
- Regarding data quality, there may be difficulties with information coming from some sub-national entities.
- The level of in-country capacity varies.
  - Frameworks in countries may have reporting divided between different ministries, in different locations.
  - There is a need for streamlined reporting.
  - Processes under the UNFCCC may provide an example to follow.

There were a range of topics discussed relate to what is needed in terms of indicators and what is needed in the target itself. For one, there was the issue of reporting and verification. Other issues discussed include:

- The WDPA needs to be able to account for all of the target elements and have ways for countries to report these so that the value of sites for different aspects of the target can be assessed.
- Overarching target should allow for areas to be reported under multiple elements and not waste time figuring out which target the site best fits under.
- There is a need to speak with other sectors, many of which already have some of the relevant information needed for reporting.
- Protected area coverage and other information on attributes of the site should be reported; mechanisms and host institutions for reporting area-based measures in production landscapes/seascapes may be more difficult.
- Ensuring that there is sectoral integration with biodiversity central to national spatial planning. The spatial management can be process based; it does not necessarily need a percentage target, but ensuring that sectors/land stewards are considering no net loss/net gain for the area they are managing.
- Budgeting/resource indicators: How do we find a way to report on adequate/inadequate levels of budgeting or finances, related to the sites effectiveness?
- Compensation also needs to be addressed.

The revision of protected areas or OECMs was also discussed. For example, there needs to be a procedure to deal with sites that no longer meet the criteria/definition of a protected area or OECM. For this, a revision process would be necessary. Sites cannot just be reported once, without mechanisms for further assessment (for example, related to PADDD). There needs to some mechanisms for updated frequency of reporting. However, who is responsible for validating the data?

## **B. REPRESENTATION, AREAS IMPORTANT FOR BIODIVERSITY, AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES**

Ecoregions are the main scale for tracking progress on representation, though finer-scale data should be used where available. Ecoregions are defined for all terrestrial areas, and freshwater ecoregions have also been mapped; there are ecoregions for coastal/marine area, and pelagic provinces for open ocean areas (also deep-sea biogeographic classifications). It was noted that freshwater, terrestrial, and marine areas could have separate approaches for assessing representation.

Targets for each ecoregion were discussed (such as xx% of each ecoregion maintaining intactness or function). It was noted that ‘at least 30% by 2030’ is a simple target, easy to communicate with policy-makers and the public. However, different ecoregions have differing levels of intactness, so percentage targets for retention that differ according to level of intactness may be appropriate. An example target could include: *“Retain a representative set of land, freshwater and marine ecosystems by natural region as a key strategy to retain biodiversity, with associated ecosystem services and respecting the homelands of indigenous peoples.”*

As an indicator, terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecoregions could be categorised by level of impact, intactness and ecological value into 3 categories:

- Category 1 (intact and high value) would have an 80% retention target.
- Category 2 (relatively intact) would have a 50% retention value.
- Category 2 (highly modified) would have a 10% retention (or retention of all remaining intact areas) in addition to restoration.

However, it was noted that a flexible ecoregion retention target (based on intactness) may be complicated for governments to understand/implement. It was also noted that this approach may not apply to open ocean areas, where the main threat is over-harvesting and where restoration is un-proven. So, a target could be to sustainably manage all fisheries, then have xx% pelagic provinces in MPAs.

For indicators of areas important for biodiversity, there were a range of different prioritising scheme mentioned by one or more participants (see [list above](#)).

- KBAs were referenced by most participants.
- EBSAs were also often discussed; however, it was noted that some EBSAs may be too large to act as a priority for conservation.
- Some other examples included the largest blocks of intact ecosystems in each ecoregion, and the top 10% of largest intact blocks globally.
- Although all AZEs are included as KBAs, there was some mention of the importance of accounting for/reporting these separately.
- As KBAs are currently incomplete globally, completing their identification should be included as an indicator for a post-2020 target.

If a target was along the lines of “*By 2030, areas of importance for biodiversity, including important biodiversity areas, ecologically or biologically significant marine areas are documented, retained and restored*”, potential indicators could include:

- Percent of important areas identified by country against full criteria set.<sup>39</sup>
- Percent of known areas retained (protected or otherwise stewarded).
- Percent of known areas restored.

For ecosystem services, most do not have global indicators (most ecosystem services are locally consumed and should be locally conserved, and hence have no global indicator). Some regulating services could have global indicators (for example, relating to carbon and water). Some of these are currently mapped by the EC-JRC’s Digital Observatory for Protected Areas (DOPA)<sup>40</sup> or through the NatureMap project. A target could aim for the top 30% of areas (in terms of carbon storage) managed in a way that would not release net Carbon above background rates. There was also discussion around a target for Nature-based solutions, for example: “*Nature-based solutions deliver at least 30% of global climate mitigation needed by 2030*” (tracked in NDCs). For provisioning services, the level of protection needed to increase fish production could be examined (for example, to improve fish production by xx% by 2030, where the indicator is % protected). Potential indicators for cultural services could include those identified by the IPBES/UNESCO work on cultural indicators.<sup>41</sup>

Another issue introduced related to the incorporation of new data. If we are focusing on 2050, and not just on a 10-year target, what we know now will be enhanced dramatically; so, how does a target allow for the incorporation of new information (for example, new information on the global distribution of biodiversity features, etc.)?

---

<sup>39</sup> For full description of criteria and indicators, see: IUCN, 2016, *A Global Standard for the Identification of Key Biodiversity Areas*, Version 1.0, Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

<sup>40</sup> <https://dopa.jrc.ec.europa.eu/en>

<sup>41</sup> See: <https://whc.unesco.org/en/culture2030indicators/>

## **B. CONNECTIVITY AND THE ECOSYSTEM APPROACH**

Discussions focused on three general areas: ecosystem integrity, maintenance of migratory species, and spatial planning.

It was recommended that there should be a target on ecosystem integrity. This should focus on maintaining and restoring ecosystem integrity. Connectivity was considered as one means to ensure integrity. Participants noted that connectivity and integrity should be woven into the same target so that it is clearer for policymakers. It is what noted that a target stating ‘no further fragmentation’ or ‘no further degradation’ would be useful. Participants also noted the importance of addressing issues related to scale when discussing connectivity. There was also discussion around different levels of intactness and the possibility of different targets or indicators for ecosystems related to their level of intactness. Relatedly, there was also discussion on the possibility for different frameworks for each of the ‘three global conditions’ (highly modified areas/cities and farms; shared lands; large wild areas).

The concept of ‘no net biodiversity loss’ for migratory species was discussed. However, it was noted that ‘No biodiversity loss’ is unachievable and unrealistic (‘No *net* biodiversity loss’ would be a better framing). Some of the key issues to consider regarding migratory species that were discussed include:

- Maintenance and restoration of important corridors.
- More research is needed for mapping where corridors should be located to increase connectivity.
- Gene flow between populations (maintenance of genetic diversity).
- Key species reflecting connectivity.
- Physical barriers sometimes block connectivity between countries or regions (some other UN bodies address this and we should maximize opportunities for synergies with them).

Spatial planning was discussed as one possible approach that could help build resilience to climate change and conserve species movements. Though it was noted that spatial planning is only a tool, and its implementation differs significantly between countries. There were questions raised regarding how the effectiveness of spatial planning could be measured. Participants noted that just using spatial planning is not enough to ensure its implementation is robust and will promote conservation or sustainability. Some other issues related to spatial planning that were discussed include:

- Spatial planning should be about organizing plans for ecological networks.
- A system of legally binding spatial planning is one possibility.
- Mapping and spatial planning should be used as tools for improving the understanding of politicians (these are good tools to drive home high-level messages).
- Better planning needs to also consider people; for example, land owners can often support or enhance connectivity.
- Including IPLC is important for spatial planning (in many places ICCAs are often the last remaining areas of high ecological integrity); these communities are generally willing to be a part of this effort to increase integrity and connectivity.
- The objectives for spatial planning need to be addressed; it should not be assumed that all spatial planning will result in conservation outcomes.

Regarding metrics and indicators, it was noted that many countries do not have metrics or indicators for ecosystem integrity. There needs to be a ‘metric matrix’ to cover the basic indicators to measure ecosystem integrity at the global level. We need to work with key metrics for ecosystem integrity, taking into consideration key species.

### C. EFFECTIVENESS

Any indicator for judging effectiveness of area-based conservation measures needs to assess whether the site is delivering on outcomes. There was some discussion of existing indicators and approaches for management effectiveness evaluations. It was emphasised throughout the discussion that indicators need to be focused on outputs and outcomes. Management effectiveness assessments are currently captured in the Global Database on Protected Area Management Effectiveness (GD-PAME), though it currently only provides binary yes and no answers on whether assessment is completed (and reported). This does not give an indication on actual effectiveness of management—results of protection (ecological changes). Some of the indicators mentioned during this discussion include:

- Criteria and indicators from the IUCN Green List<sup>42</sup> could be used.
- World Heritage Outlooks provide examples of criteria and indicators that could be used.
- Global Forest Watch and Global Fishing Watch provide open access data relevant for assessing ecological outcomes.
- Species and ecosystem reporting for Natura 2000 and Emerald networks.
- OECMs are focused on outcomes, by definition—this needs to be clear when sites are reported
- SAGE (governance assessment indicators).
- The Living Planet Index has some useful information on the status of biodiversity based on population trends.
- Changes in land use categories, threats, and pressures could be assessed using remote sensing.
- Conflict indicators.
- There are many other scientific approaches that should be evaluated and considered.

However, it was noted that none of the measures discussed are adequate on their own, or have the potential to address the purpose set forward. Some of the key issues and questions related to existing indicators that were discussed include:

- Lack of adequacy of existing indicators.
- Lack of training and resources.
- Concern that we need to avoid the tool or measure becoming the target—when the focus should be on the outcomes (ecological or social).
- Do we need different metrics for different ABCM categories?
- Complexity needs to be addressed.
- Assessments need to be simple (for example, simple checklists).
- Many indicators are available but often lack adequate baselines for comparison, or specific conservation targets to compare them against.
- Baselines should be related to objectives, processes, goals, biodiversity status, etc.
- There is a need to report at the network level; but who is responsible for this, and how is information going to be aggregated from site level assessments?
- Socio-economic data is often limited, or missing.
- Indigenous and traditional knowledge needs to be documented—they are often missing in current indicators (though much knowledge exists at the local community level).
- How can we develop indicators that will be useful for governments?
- Indicators need to be linked to accountability and compliance.

---

<sup>42</sup> The IUCN Green List contains 17 criteria, with 50 indicators, covering components of good governance, sound design and planning, effective management, and successful conservation outcomes (see IUCN & WCPA, 2017, *IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas: Standard, Version 1.1*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN).



- Any proposed tool needs to be able to capture differences/changes in threats, management effectiveness, ecological and social outcomes, etc.
- A key element needed for an indicator is the ability to capture the whole management effectiveness cycle.
- There needs to be a consideration of planning (legal aspects, design, etc.), inputs (staff, funding, etc.), capacity (including the involvement of IPLC), and processes; but we also need to look at the outputs to get an adequate indicator.
- Reporting has to be based on a standardized methodology.
- World Heritage Site conservation assessments provide a good model—can this approach be applied more broadly?
- Ecological and socio-economic outcome indicators have to be applied to effective management indicators to generate appropriate results, and provide information in order to be allow for corrections or changes to management activities.

#### D. EQUITY AND GOOD GOVERNANCE

Indicators are needed for measuring governance diversity and quality, as well as the three dimensions of equity (Rights, Procedure, and Distribution). A range of different frameworks were discussed, many of which have existing indicators or approaches that could be adopted to address issues related to governance and equity in the post-2020 framework. Some of these include:

- Indicators under SDG 16.<sup>43</sup>
- the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and the Indigenous Navigator (“a framework and set of tools for and by indigenous peoples to systematically monitor the level of recognition and implementation of their rights”).
- Kaufmann et al. indicators of worldwide governance.<sup>44</sup>
- For issues of equity related to gender, there is the [CBD Gender Plan of Action](#).
- UN special rapporteur on Human Rights/Rights of Indigenous People.<sup>45</sup>
- System-wide protected and conserved area governance assessments should be required<sup>46</sup>
- Legislative Frameworks.
- Tools for protected area management effectiveness may cover some elements of governance and equity, though they may be incomplete.
- Denmark Agenda 21 on Community Participation.
- Indicators on youth engagement.
- Aarhus Convention on access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental issues in the EU.
- Transparency International produces a number of indices.

---

<sup>43</sup> SDG 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. All targets and indicators available at: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg16>

<sup>44</sup> See for example Kaufmann D., Kraay A., & Mastruzzi M. (2011). The Worldwide Governance Indicators: Methodology and analytical issues. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, 3, 220–246.

<sup>45</sup> See for example: Report of the Special Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council on the rights of indigenous peoples, Victoria Tauli-Corpuz ([A/71/229](#)) and Report of the Special Rapporteur of the Human Rights Council on the issues of human rights obligations relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment, John Knox ([A/HRC/34/49](#)).

<sup>46</sup> A range of tools have recently been developed (see for example, Franks, Small, and Booker, 2018, *Social Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (SAPA). Methodology manual for SAPA facilitators*. Second edition. IIED, London; Booker and Franks, 2019, *Governance Assessment for Protected and Conserved Areas (GAPA). Methodology manual for GAPA facilitators*. IIED, London).

Participants noted that an indicator framework should be in place and accepted no later than COP-16 (in 2022). In summary, various frameworks exist and there is a need to make a strong connection among them with a focus on their relation to the SDGs.

### **E. LANDSCAPE/SEASCAPE APPROACHES, INCLUDING SPATIAL PLANNING**

Some general comments that were raised during this discussion included:

- It is necessary to take a large-landscape approach.
- It is necessary to address transboundary issues.
- Ecological integrity needs to be addressed.
- Important drivers of loss (for example road networks, forestry, agriculture) need consideration.
- Maintaining core areas for wildlife is one important approach.
- There is a need for updated information on how landscapes are used (for example, tract directives, land use planning and intended uses).
- Context is important, as is appropriately defining the scale.
- There is a need to prioritize conservation values and have a thematic profile for landscapes.
- Strengthening the links with reporting on the SDGs.

A range of issues were discussed in terms of land-use planning as well as spatial planning:

- The three dimensional nature of seascapes needs to be considered.
- Land use planning should integrate development activities and sectors.
- Land use change and trends, as well as security, in relation to IPLCs.
- Interested stakeholders' structure, including governance structures, needs consideration.
- Spatial planning covers both land and sea; the interrelationships between landscape and seascape needs consideration (for example ridge to reef approaches).

Regarding indicators for this thematic issue, it was noted that there are three general types of indicator that should be used: 1. Physical aspects of the landscape/seascape; 2. The state of biodiversity or outcomes; 3. Policy practices, governance, and compatibility (what is done on the outside of protected areas and OECMs is compatible with management objectives inside). Some of the various indicators, or issues related to indicators, that were discussed include:

- Relative changes in landscape/seascape indicators are more important than a static target.
- Texture/character of landscape (for example, forest coverage, distance from roads, etc.).
- Percentage of EEZ managed in an integrated way.
- Existing indicators that are used in the SDGs and other frameworks (for example social indicators on women, youth, IPLCs, etc.).
- Implementation/recognition of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
- Indicators used under SDG 5.1/5.a (gender), and operationalization of [CBD Gender Plan of Action](#).
- Integrated land use planning should address cultural diversity (see examples under Article 8J, biocultural community protocols, Satoyama/healthy landscape approaches).
- Cultural indicators used under UNESCO.
- Unified and integrated mapping.
- Changes in mitigation measures over time.
- Restoration changes over time.
- Operationalization in terms of processes (NBSAP processes provide an example of an existing assessment process).
- In terms of integrity, the national NBSAP and LBSAP processes provide a start.
- State investments and subsidies in the landscape/seascape (and their biodiversity or social impacts)
- Data on how landscapes are used (for example, tract directives, land use planning, and intended uses).

- Legal status of land use.
- Land use rights, cadasters, etc.
- The language used regarding land use and land stewardship or ownership needs consideration as there are differences in the terms that are appropriate in different contexts.
- Common mission and objectives in landscape/seascape integration.

*Annex VI*

**RESOURCE MOBILIZATION**

During the discussion on resource mobilization, it was noted that discussions related to general financing needs for the post-2020 framework are ongoing, but this is rarely specific to the funding needs of area-based conservation measures (ABCM). How do we ensure ABCM financing is not left out, as it often differs from other financing needs? The discussion began with a summary of several studies that are currently underway. The conclusions of these studies will contribute to the post-2020 agenda. It was noted that discussions around the scientific aspects of the post-2020 framework are further along than resource mobilization issues.

It was noted that if a 30% target for 2030 was adopted, there would be significant funding shortfalls for meeting this target, especially considering the needs to ensure effective conservation in these areas and the fact that resources are already limited for the current protected area estate. There was discussion around where this additional funding could come from, but also where it will be spent, considering the uneven distribution of biodiversity and protected areas, in the context of common but differentiated responsibilities. Some potential mechanisms for additional funds discussed included:

- Private resources and corporate funding (though these are often less applicable for ABCM compared to other areas).
- Long-term endowments, which would confer a permanent resource commitment for some protected areas and OECMs.
- Potential synergies with the Green Climate Fund (GCF), though currently few of these resources are going towards Nature-based solutions.
- The concept of a ‘Marshall Plan for Nature’ was mentioned.
- Development banks (Global, EU, regional, etc.) should look into addressing biodiversity co-benefits.
- Payments for ecosystem services.
- Payments from companies accessing countries resources.
- Moving harmful subsidies from destructive activities to fund ABCM.
- A ‘GoFundMe-type page’ which can connect countries/projects in need of funding for biodiversity conservation with potential investors (investors often want to see direct measurable outcomes, rather than putting funds into a general pot where they cannot track where it goes).

It was noted that other targets are looking largely at market-based strategies, though this is much less of an option for ABCM, as such, funding needs to come from elsewhere (governments, philanthropy, and private sector). With the short timeframe we have, in the immediate term we will likely need to rely on government and philanthropy.

Beyond just looking at the costs of meeting ambitious targets, it is also necessary to explore the costs of inaction. The costs of actions destroying biodiversity should also be explored; for example, subsidies which are increasing drivers (direct and indirect) of biodiversity loss.

In expanding protected area cover, there is also a need to account for opportunity costs to other sectors or other development needs that may rely on these resources. This is something that is being explored, at least for agriculture, which is the main competitor for space in terrestrial areas. In marine areas, studies have also explored the potential food provisioning benefits of expanding marine protected areas.

While there is some cost in protected area designation, there is much more funding and resources needed for management and enforcement. These costs need to be considered from the start, as enforcement is often difficult to fund/support over the long-term, though this is what makes a protected area or OECM

effective. Protected areas need sustainable funding over the long-term to ensure effectiveness, which can be difficult when GEF funding is temporally limited. Some general issues related to accessing funds were also discussed, including:

- It was noted that there is currently no mechanism/infrastructure for capturing the volume of financing that is needed.
- There is generally a lack of biodiversity-specific funding (often it is targeted towards investment in green infrastructure, etc.).
- Several participants noted that there are often problems with the time it takes to receive GEF funding (if this continues to be a problem, other mechanisms need to be explored).
- GEF funding is scarce in some countries.
- GEF is inadequate for the current global protected area estate, let alone accounting for the expansions that may be required to meet a post-2020 target.
- Additional funding via GEF needs business sector involvement regarding co-financing.
- It is even harder for local communities attempting to access these funds; where it is already very difficult for governments in many cases.
- There will be increased difficulties with respect to OECM financing.

There is a need to address the speed at which funds make it on the ground (for example, from GEF). There is often a time lag in getting money on the ground from when a project is approved (for example, for a five year project, funds may not be received until the second or third year). The model followed for climate financing may be an option, where the GCF is used for 'big ticket items', but smaller funds that can be allocated more quickly are used for smaller projects. Some participants also noted the problems with current timing of GEF replenishments, and its lack of alignment with the current Strategic Plan as an issue that needs to be addressed for the new post-2020 framework. Participants noted that one of the biggest failures with the current Strategic Plan is that it took too long to study how much Aichi Targets would cost, followed by time to raise and distribute funds. There is a need for estimates up front, in order to get large funding commitments up front in Kunming. If we decide on Targets in 2020 but then it takes two years to assess the costs, then the enthusiasm may be gone and obtaining the necessary funding may be more difficult.

Differentiated needs regarding biodiversity conservation also require consideration, following the principle of 'Common but differentiated responsibilities'. To achieve ambitious post-2020 targets may require many developing countries not developing some of their natural resources (resources that developed countries have already exploited). If there is a global target, countries will have different burdens. How do we create mechanisms to link these local and national-level requirements for conservation funding with a global target and global responsibilities?

Some other general issues discussed include:

- Government interest is often focused on the big, charismatic areas, though there are many others in need of funding to ensure effective conservation.
- Many of the drivers of biodiversity loss are outside of protected areas and OECMs (some of these may be somewhat addressed through improving financing mechanisms).
- Some participants discussed the possibility of 'biodiversity screening for finance', in the same vein as climate screening which is beginning to be applied in some financial institutions.
- It was noted that we need to think about more than just the funding needed for protected areas and OECMs, but to also begin to address how other funding is impacting biodiversity, and how some of this can be redirected towards biodiversity-supporting activities (for example, tens of trillions of dollars in infrastructure spending is expected over the upcoming decades, orders of magnitude more than what is available for conservation).

- We should take advantage of lessons learned from the climate sector, for example starting with a strong rights-based framework, in relation to IPLC and others.
- As a global target places a larger burden on some countries, there is responsibility on the side of countries that have already exploited many of their resources and destroyed much of their biodiversity.
- Can we adopt something similar to the ‘polluter pays’ principle, but related to biodiversity loss?
- There is a need for both ‘carrot and stick’ approaches, by requiring governments and businesses to pay for the ecosystem services that are being used (which requires legislative responses), but also by demonstrating the possible benefits.

Business engagement is necessary, though we need to develop innovative ways to attract investment for conservation. What innovative ways can be developed at the CBD-level? Currently most support for protected areas comes from government/philanthropy, but little from the business community. Some participants noted that Party-level interaction with the private sector may be difficult. To speak to these financial audiences, it may be useful to have an ‘envoy’ who can speak to these communities about biodiversity issues in a language that resonates with the finance and/or business community.

The issue of human resources/capacity was also raised. In many cases ensuring effective area-based conservation is not just a funding issue, but one related to a lack of staff available for monitoring and enforcement, for example in many Small Island Developing States. Participants also raised the issue that the capacity to request, access, and distribute funds also needs to be addressed. For example, capacity to complete project application forms, etc. It was noted that the bureaucratic side needs to be simplified, especially if the funding needs are going to increase to meet newly adopted ambitious targets. There may also be cases where capacity exists at the local/community level, though it does not at the national government level. This needs to be addressed when considering future financial mechanisms.

There was also some discussion of scientific cooperation, for example related to genetic resources, KBAs, Ramsar sites, etc. In some cases, other non-financial assistance may be useful, for example the provision of technology, camera traps, and methodologies, among others.

*Annex VII*

**TRANSPARENCY, REVIEW AND REPORTING**

It was noted that open and accessible datasets are needed for species and habitats. In some cases these already exist but need to be expanded. Necessary indicators need to be set based on these data, as appropriate. One participant noted that many issues around transparency and reporting can be approached through the development of a few good third party indicators. How can these be applied in the case of national reporting? It was noted that for all of the data and indicators that will be agreed upon for use in the new framework, all processes and all steps involved in transforming data and calculating indicator values have to be transparent.

For some protected area governance arrangements (for example, many privately protected areas) the landowners/rights-holders may not want to offer information about themselves or about their property, limiting the potential for reporting all of these sites in global databases which are used for developing indicators. In the case of ICCAs, there is also a need for free, prior, and informed consent, which can require time. Certification is not acceptable to many IPLC. However, verification is important so that everyone is accountable for decisions.

It was recommended that a peer review process be applied for CBD reporting, to ensure that what a country is claiming is actually being achieved, and the data is clear. Though it was noted that any proposed mechanism for audit or peer review would need to be voluntary in order for Parties to accept it. The question was whether Parties would agree that all of their data and information go through peer review as some data sets contain sensitive information. It was proposed that a feedback loop between reporting and review could help resolve some of the issues being raised. National reporting processes need to be used to develop recommendations for action.

There was concern raised around transparency regarding accounting and reporting processes and also the content of some national reports. It was noted that reporting should be directed toward ‘what matters/what is essential’. The need to streamline the current reporting process was highlighted. The difficulty in extracting usable data from CBD national reports was mentioned as an example of a common problem. One participant also remarked that there are often too many sources of information, with too many updates, leading to confusion. SDG reports were cited as a potential model to follow; there is a common set of indicators and each country brings its own report. This provides an incentive to encourage countries to develop concise reporting. One participant noted that both bottom-up and top-down approaches may be needed for ensuring better reporting, through National Reports, NBSAPs, etc. However, the processes for developing national reports do not necessarily provide the opportunity for the public to contribute.

There needs to be transparency around the assessment of effectiveness from Parties. One proposal would be to involve third-party, non-government assessment (for example, including NGOs). It was noted that the IUCN Green List provides one example of a transparent methodology for reporting the effectiveness and equity of protected areas and is also applicable to OECMs. It was proposed that the Principles of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development<sup>47</sup> could also help. Transparency should be applied in all activities, and should be based on real participation and engagement; though it was noted that this may not always be possible. Also, it was mentioned that there are occasions where GEF funding finishes and there is no way of continuing the project to get to results that can be reported. It was also noted that there is also often a lack of transparency regarding financial issues.

---

<sup>47</sup> The 27 principles of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development can be accessed online here: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/ref/rio-declaration.shtml>

CBD reporting is often focused on National Reports and National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs); some participants noted that improved reporting methods and processes are needed for addressing transparency, review and reporting in the new framework. These should be able to account for all the essential processes and the activities of different ministries. Transparency necessitates communication; this should include communication on the results and on the processes as well. Reporting is important from an effectiveness perspective, though this needs to include an assessment of biodiversity outcomes as well as social/equity outcomes.



*Annex VIII*

**A. CLIMATE CHANGE**

The discussion on climate change touched on the need to consider the impacts of climate change on biodiversity, as well as the role biodiversity can play in climate change mitigation and adaptation. Protected areas provide one possible means for both climate change mitigation and adaptation. There was also mention of the need to consider both synergies and potential trade-offs regarding biodiversity and approaches to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Many participants thought there should be some connection with UNFCCC. One participant noted that urgent action to conserve carbon rich ecosystems would be on means to promote synergies between climate mitigation and biodiversity. Another option is through a target for the retention of natural habitats. There was also discussion around the feasibility of using nationally determined contributions (NDC) under the Paris Agreements to ensure contributions for biodiversity. As countries invest a lot of effort into reporting to different Conventions, the use of shared indicators would simplify reporting. There was discussion around possible synergies in financial mechanisms, for example accessing financing to maintain and restore protected areas. The concept of 'carbon parks' was also discussed, though it was noted that areas chosen for their high carbon storage value will not necessarily be the same areas needed for biodiversity. One participant raised the issue of some target or actions related to protected areas under the UNFCCC.

Regarding mitigation, potential emission reductions from the restoration of different ecosystem was discussed (an example from Finland was provided, whereby restoring peatlands could cut national emissions by ~20%). There was some discussion around the role of Nature-Based Solutions (NBS) for climate mitigation, with one participant noting that they could provide 20-40% of the necessary mitigation. Though one participant noted that there is a need for a clear definition of NBS and raised concern about the intrusion of market-based solutions.

The potential impact of climate change on biodiversity features needs to be considered in adaptation plans. It was noted that protected area management plans will also need to begin accounting for potential species range shifts; under climate change, static plans and targets are no longer appropriate. Protected areas may end up with degraded ecosystems and changes in species composition. To allow for local adaptation, there is a need for connectivity. One participant also raised the concept of ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction (Eco-DRR) which could be considered in relation to the use of area-based conservation measures.

There was also discussion around the topic of using mobile/dynamic climate-responsive protected areas, though the idea seems to be more developed and possibly more feasible in marine areas. A number of potential concerns with the approach were raised.

A range of proposed priority actions regarding protected areas and climate change were discussed, including, *inter alia*:

- Develop climate change adaptation strategies in protected areas at the site-level.
- Protect climate refugia.
- Complete vulnerability assessments for protected areas.
- Conserve carbon rich ecosystems promote.
- Consider the link with invasive species as a result of climate change.
- Ensure protected area management plans account for climate change.

Finally, it was also recommended that the Co-chairs complete a climate change risk assessment of the proposed post-2020 framework.

## **B. PEOPLE**

During the discussion on people, a range of topics were discussed in relation to the human/cultural dimension of area-based conservation measures and the post-2020 framework. Some of the key points raised included:

- There is a need to ensure the application of a rights-based approach for area-based conservation measures.
- Promote and encourage political will for supporting indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs).
- Recognize conservation outcomes with a human dimension.
- Recognize the interdependency of biodiversity and culture.
- Recognize the intrinsic relationship between nature and cultural diversity.
- Ensure the Rights of Nature/right to a healthy environment are respected.
- Put in place a precautionary principle to sustainable use within area-based conservation measures (regarding customary sustainable use, and other uses).
- In any target related to area-based conservation measures, must ensure the full and appropriate recognition and support for IPLCs rights and responsibilities to their collective territories, land and waters, in accordance with their self-determined customary laws, governance systems and management practices.
- Update and operationalize the CBD 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action<sup>48</sup> in the post-2020 period (it was noted that we need structural and institutional mechanisms in place to make the guidelines functional and operational).
- Full, effective, inclusive and meaningful engagement and participation (IPLCs, women, youth and other relevant stakeholders, persons with disabilities, and rights-holders), at all levels, with respect to area-based conservation measures.
- Zero tolerance for human rights violations and evictions with respect to area-based conservation measures, putting mandatory grievance and redress mechanisms into place.

---

<sup>48</sup> Information on the 2015-2020 Gender Plan of Action can be accessed at: <https://www.cbd.int/gender/action-plan/>