



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/3
9 May 2018

ENGLISH ONLY

REPORT OF THE EXPERT WORKSHOP ON MARINE PROTECTED AREAS AND OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES FOR ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 11 IN MARINE AND COASTAL AREAS

Montreal, 6-9 February 2018

INTRODUCTION

1. Marine and coastal protected areas were recognized by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, at its seventh meeting, as an essential tool and approach in the conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biodiversity, and are highlighted as programme element 3 of the elaborated programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity (decision XII/5, annex I). Article 2 of the Convention defines “protected area” as “a geographically defined area which is designated or regulated and managed to achieve specific conservation objectives.”

2. The Conference of the Parties, at its seventh meeting, agreed that the goal for work under the Convention relating to marine and coastal protected areas should be:

The establishment and maintenance of marine and coastal protected areas that are effectively managed, ecologically based and contribute to a global network¹ of marine and coastal protected areas, building upon national and regional systems, including a range of levels of protection, where human activities are managed, particularly through national legislation, regional programmes and policies, traditional and cultural practices and international agreements, to maintain the structure and functioning of the full range of marine and coastal ecosystems, in order to provide benefits to both present and future generations.

3. In decision VII/28, the Conference of the Parties confirmed that efforts to establish and maintain systems of protected areas and areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity, in line with Article 8 on in situ conservation and other relevant articles of the Convention, were essential for achieving, in implementing the ecosystem approach, the three objectives of the Convention and thus contributing to achieving the 2010 target contained in the Strategic Plan of the Convention² and in the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development, and to achieve sustainable development and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

4. In the same decision, the Conference of the Parties adopted the programme of work on protected areas with the objective of the establishment and maintenance, by 2010 for terrestrial and by 2012 for marine areas, of comprehensive, effectively managed, and ecologically representative national and regional systems of protected areas that, collectively through, inter alia, a global network, contribute to achieving the three objectives of the Convention and the 2010 target to significantly reduce the current rate of biodiversity loss.

¹A global network provides for the connections between Parties, with the collaboration of others, for the exchange of ideas and experiences, scientific and technical cooperation, capacity-building and cooperative action that mutually support national and regional systems of protected areas which collectively contribute to the achievement of the programme of work. This network has no authority or mandate over national or regional systems.

² Decision VI/26 (2002)

5. At its tenth meeting, the Conference of the Parties adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, including Target 11, which states that, by 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.

6. Since 1993, when the Convention on Biological Diversity entered into force, coverage by marine protected areas have increased more than 20-fold, from 0.29 to 7.0 per cent. Since the adoption, in 2010, of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, marine protected areas have more than doubled in coverage, from 2.4 to 7.0 per cent of marine areas. With commitments made by a number of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, an additional 3.4 per cent of marine areas will be protected by 2020, out of which 2.9 per cent would come from additions in national waters, while 0.5 per cent would come from additions in areas beyond national jurisdiction (all in Antarctica). These national commitments include: Increases in protected areas expected from projects already funded; national priorities identified by countries under their Nation Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans submitted to the Convention; and voluntary commitments announced in advance of the United Nations Ocean Conference, held in New York in June 2017. Three quarters of these new commitments have been accompanied by implementation plans, increasing the likelihood that they will be carried out. Focusing only on areas under national jurisdiction, 16.0 per cent is currently protected, and; this percentage is projected to rise to more than 23 per cent by 2020. If these commitments are fulfilled, the world will reach or surpass the 10 per cent marine aspect of the 2020 target and also help in meeting Target 14.5³ of Sustainable Development Goal 14. There is still a need, however, to focus on other aspects of Target 11, in particular representativeness, management effectiveness, governance and equity of marine protected areas.

7. Recalling paragraph 76 of decision X/29 and subparagraph 1(b) of decision XI/24, the Conference of the Parties, at its thirteenth meeting, recognized the importance of building linkages among existing efforts on various area-based conservation measures within the framework of cross-sectoral and integrated marine spatial planning and implementation in support of achieving the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in marine and coastal areas (decision XIII/9). The Conference of the Parties then requested the Executive Secretary, drawing on the existing work by the Executive Secretary, in partnership with relevant organizations, and pursuant to paragraph 10 of decision XI/24:

(a) To compile national experiences and lessons learned on the development, and effective and equitable management, of ecologically representative and well-connected systems of marine protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and their integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes, as an input to an expert workshop;

(b) To organize an expert workshop to consolidate scientific and technical information on various approaches for, and their effectiveness in, assessing the contribution to the achievement of Target 11 of marine protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures as well as their integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes, also considering the implementation of Target 5 of Sustainable Development Goal 14;

(c) To submit the compilation of information referred to in subparagraph (a) above and the report of the expert workshop referred to in subparagraph (b) above for consideration by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at a future meeting held prior to the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

8. The Conference of the Parties, at its thirteenth meeting (decision XIII/2, para. 9 (a)), also invited Parties, other Governments, relevant partners, regional agencies, bilateral and multilateral funding agencies, in conjunction with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, taking into account information provided by, and in consultation with Parties and other Governments, to undertake a review of experiences on:

³ By 2020, conserve at least 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, consistent with national and international law and based on the best available scientific information.

(a) Protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, taking into account the work of the International Union for Conservation of Nature and other appropriate expert bodies;

(b) Additional measures to enhance integration of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures into the wider land- and seascapes;

(c) Mainstreaming of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures across sectors to contribute, inter alia, to the Sustainable Development Goals and as natural solutions to combat climate change;

(d) Effective governance models for management of protected areas, including equity, taking into account work being undertaken under Article 8(j);

9. In paragraph 10 of the same decision, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to develop voluntary guidance on the elements listed in paragraph 9(a) of decision XIII/2, noting lessons learned from the relevant biodiversity-related conventions and agreements, and to organize a technical expert workshop or workshops to provide scientific and technical advice on definition, management approaches and identification of other effective area-based conservation measures and their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, and report on progress to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at a meeting held prior to the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

10. Pursuant to the above-mentioned requests, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity convened an expert workshop on marine protected areas (MPAs) and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in marine and coastal areas, in Montreal, Canada, from 6 to 9 February 2018. The workshop was hosted by the Government of Canada, and convened with financial support from the Governments of Canada and Norway. It was held in conjunction with the Technical Expert Workshop on Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 (<https://www.cbd.int/meetings/PAEM-2018-01>), with joint sessions on relevant topics. As such, this workshop focused on the following objectives:

(a) To review national experiences and lessons learned on the development, and effective and equitable management, of ecologically representative and well-connected systems of marine protected areas (MPAs) and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs), and their integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes;

(b) To consolidate scientific and technical information on various approaches for, and their effectiveness in, assessing the contribution to the achievement of Target 11 on marine protected areas (MPAs) and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) as well as their integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes; and

(c) To provide scientific and technical advice on definition, management approaches and identification of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) in marine and coastal areas and their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11.

11. With the financial support of the Governments of Canada and Norway, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity commissioned a consultant to prepare a background document entitled *Cross-Cutting Issues and Key Messages Related to the Achievement of Target 11 through the use of Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures* (CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/1), the Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation of Australia to prepare a background document entitled *Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in Marine and Coastal Areas* (in non-fisheries marine sectors) (CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/3), and the Fisheries Expert Group of the IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management to prepare a background document entitled *Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures Used in Marine Fisheries* (CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/4), in support of the Secretariat in its preparation for the workshop.

12. The workshop was attended by experts from Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Costa Rica, Egypt, France, Guatemala, India, Japan, Maldives, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Peru, Philippines, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand and Ukraine as well as BirdLife International, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society, European Bureau for Conservation and Development (EBCD), Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas (ICCA) Consortium, International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity, IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management-Fisheries Expert Group, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative, Mediterranean Network of Protected Areas, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization, Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Center of Mediterranean Action Plan/United Nations Environment Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme. The full list of participants is provided in annex I.

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

13. This workshop was opened jointly with the Technical Expert Workshop on Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, held from 6 to 9 February 2018 in Montreal, Canada (<https://www.cbd.int/meetings/PAEM-2018-01>).

14. Mr. Kevin Stringer, Associate Deputy Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, Government of Canada, delivered opening remarks. He welcomed participants to the workshop and thanked the CBD Secretariat for its ongoing efforts to support the implementation of the Convention and advance marine biodiversity issues. He also thanked the Secretariat for organizing the two expert workshops taking place concurrently. Mr. Stringer described Canada's commitment to achieving the marine aspect of Target 11, including its domestic interim target of 5 per cent protection of marine and coastal areas by 2017. Furthermore, he indicated Canada's support for working under the CBD's leadership and its eagerness to engage with international experts on biodiversity conservation issues. Mr. Stringer described the current context as an exciting time for biodiversity, protected areas and other conservation measures in both the marine and terrestrial environments. He emphasized the importance of the CBD technical expert workshops in supporting the upcoming twenty-second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. In conclusion, Mr. Stringer wished participants a productive meeting and invited them to attend the 5th International Marine Protected Area Congress (IMPAC 5) in 2021 in Vancouver, Canada, to reflect on the successes of Target 11.

15. Mr. David Cooper, Deputy Executive Secretary, delivered opening remarks on behalf of Dr. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity. He welcomed participants of the two workshops, which offer a unique opportunity to share perspectives and experiences across the wide range of stakeholders engaged in area-based conservation. He thanked the Government of Canada for hosting these workshops and acknowledged with great appreciation, the financial contribution of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the Government of Norway and the Government of Italy, which supported the organization of these workshops. He noted that the adoption of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in 2010 had provided an ambitious benchmark that had facilitated action. Since 2010, the Aichi Targets have had a clear impact around the world, catalyzing political attention and action on the ground, as well as inspiring and informing other global processes, including in the development of the Sustainable Development Goals. He emphasized that Target 11 is one of the best known of the 20 Aichi Targets and has yielded the biggest impact. He pointed out that great steps have been made: global coverage of terrestrial protected areas has reached 15 per cent, bringing us close to the 17 per cent target in Target 11, while marine protected area coverage has reached nearly 7 per cent for the global ocean — an almost three-fold increase from the 2.4 per cent under protection in 2010. When areas under national jurisdiction are considered, 16 per cent are currently protected, a figure that is projected to exceed 23 per cent by 2020. He emphasized, however, the importance of all of the elements of Target 11, noting that many elements required more action, including effective and equitable management, ecological representativeness and connectivity. He pointed out that, while governments have been the primary actors in establishing and managing protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, other stakeholders can and

must also play a key role. He urged participants to make full use of expertise and interests of the participants, and to focus on how best our ambitious commitments can be delivered. He expressed his hope that these workshops would help Parties to identify steps and pathways to achieve Target 11 and set a sound foundation for the post-2020 biodiversity agenda.

ITEM 2. ELECTION OF THE WORKSHOP CO-CHAIRS, ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

16. After a brief explanation by the Secretariat on procedures for electing the workshop co-chairs, Mr. Kevin Stringer (Canada) and Mr. Moustafa Fouda (Egypt), were elected as the workshop co-chairs, as offered by the hosting Government and proposed by the expert from South Africa, respectively, and seconded by experts from Norway and Nigeria.

17. Participants were then invited to consider the provisional agenda, as contained in document CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/1, and the proposed organization of work, as contained in annex II to document CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/1/Add.1/Rev.1, and adopted them without any amendments.

18. The co-chairs nominated the following rapporteurs for the plenary session to assist them in preparing the draft workshop report together with the Secretariat staff, taking into consideration their expertise and experience, in consultation with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity:

(a) Agenda item 4 (Review of National Experiences and Lessons Learned on the Development, and Effective and Equitable Management, of Ecologically Representative and Well Connected Systems of Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures, and their Integration into the Wider Landscapes and Seascapes): Ms. Desiree Eve Maano (Philippines) and Mr. Gunnstein Bakke (Norway);

(b) Agenda item 5 (Consolidation of Scientific and Technical Information on Various Approaches For, and their Effectiveness in, Assessing the Contribution to the Achievement of Target 11 of Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures as well as their Integration into the Wider Landscapes and Seascapes): Mr. David Johnson (GOBI) and Mr. Michel Kaiser (EBCD); and

(c) Agenda item 6 (Provision of Scientific and Technical Advice on Definition, Management Approaches and Identification of Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures in Marine and Coastal Areas and their Role in Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11): Mr. Nic Bax (Australia) and Ms. Jessica Sanders (FAO).

19. Ms. Jihyun Lee (CBD Secretariat) informed the participants that the following background documents were made available by the Secretariat to facilitate the workshop deliberation:

- CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/2 (Compilation of Submissions of Information to Support Objectives of the Workshop);
- CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/1 (Background Document on Cross-cutting Issues and Key Messages Related to the Achievement of Target 11 through the Use of Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures);
- CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/2 (Background Document on Defining the Qualitative Elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 with Regard to the Marine and Coastal Environment);
- CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/3 (Background Document on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (in non-fisheries marine sectors) – Delivering Outcomes towards the Achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11);
- CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/4 (Background Document on other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures Used in Marine Fisheries); and

- CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/5 (Draft Revised Guidelines for Recognizing and Reporting Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures, prepared by the International Union for Conservation of Nature World Commission on Protected Areas, IUCN – WCPA)

ITEM 3. WORKSHOP BACKGROUND, SCOPE AND EXPECTED OUTPUT

20. This agenda item was held jointly in plenary together with the Technical Expert Workshop on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11.
21. Mr. Sarat Gidda, Head of the Conservation and Sustainable Use Unit of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and Senior Programme Officer for Protected Areas, and Ms. Kathy Mackinnon, Chair, IUCN – WCPA, briefed the meeting participants on the objectives, scope and expected outputs of the Technical Expert Workshop on Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11.
22. Ms. Jihyun Lee, Environmental Affairs Officer for Marine and Coastal Biodiversity, and Ms. Susanna Fuller, Secretariat Resource Person, briefed the meeting on the objectives, scope and expected outputs of the Expert Workshop on Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in Marine and Coastal Areas.
23. Summaries of the above presentations are provided in annex II.

ITEM 4. REVIEW OF NATIONAL EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS LEARNED ON THE DEVELOPMENT, AND EFFECTIVE AND EQUITABLE MANAGEMENT, OF ECOLOGICALLY REPRESENTATIVE AND WELL CONNECTED SYSTEMS OF MARINE PROTECTED AREAS AND OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES, AND THEIR INTEGRATION INTO THE WIDER LANDSCAPES AND SEASCAPES

24. Under this item, participants had before them a note by the Executive Secretary (CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/2) transmitting a compilation of the submissions of information submitted by Parties, other Governments and relevant organizations to support the objectives of the workshop, in response to notification 2017/084, dated 1 September 2017, and notification 2017-065, dated 12 July 2017.⁴
25. Through individual presentations, and plenary and breakout group discussion, workshop participants were invited to review and share their insights on national experiences in various approaches for, and their effectiveness in, assessing the contribution to the achievement of Target 11 of marine protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures as well as their integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes.
26. First, the following presentations were provided on national or regional experiences in various countries:
- Ms. Ana Paula Leite Prates (Brazil)
 - Ms. Liisa Peramaki (Canada)
 - Mr. Thierry Canteri (France)
 - Mr. Joji Morishita (Japan)
 - Mr. David Gutiérrez Carbonell (Mexico)
 - Ms. Desiree Eve R. Maaño (Philippines)

⁴ Only selected responses to notification 2017-065 are included in this compilation, based on their relevance to the objectives of the workshop

- Mr. Alan Boyd (South Africa)
- Mr. Boris Aleksandrov (Ukraine)
- Ms. Purificació Canals (MedPAN)

27. The above presentations were followed by plenary discussion. The following points were highlighted:

National Experiences

- Progress towards achieving or exceeding the target has been made in different countries, with a clear focus on quantitative goals, particularly since 2010;
- A range of protective measures have been applied, both no take and multiple use, including locally managed marine areas (LMMAs), marine protected areas (MPAs), and a range of OECMs ;
- Bottom-up and top-down processes for protection, as well as combinations of the two, have been applied;
- A wide range of governance approaches have been applied, including by communities, government, national-level initiatives as well as combinations of these;
- Some countries have reviewed their level of protection and effectiveness;
- Development of MPA networks is in progress, with some of these including OECMs; and
- National, regional and global networks of experts and agencies can improve skills, knowledge and capacity to deliver outcomes.

Challenges

- Time is required after the establishment of area-based conservation measures before biodiversity outcomes can be assessed, and resources are needed to conduct such assessments;
- Adequate capacity is necessary for effective management and high quality protection;
- Challenges in achieving management effectiveness and the need to make better use of existing standards, to ensure that there is education on existing tools, and to mitigate pressures outside of protected areas, which are often increasing;
- Lack of consistency in mechanisms to evaluate effectiveness;
- Overlapping jurisdictions or competing government and societal interests can hinder effective protection and adoption of adequate measures to ensure protection;
- Challenges in achieving ecological effectiveness and the need to use the best information available (science and local knowledge) rather than waiting until conditions are perfect to move ahead;
- Need for improved communication on ecosystem services and cultural importance; and
- Need for improved science on connectivity, which could be partly addressed through representativeness and networks.

28. Then, participants were split into breakout groups to consolidate key lessons learned from national experiences in MPAs and OECMs in marine and coastal areas, focusing on the following questions:

Group 1: MPAs

- (a) What are the challenges in addressing the following qualitative aspects of Target 11 that are unique to marine and coastal areas:
 - Ecologically representative
 - Areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services

- Management equity and effectiveness
- Well-connected

(b) What can be done to accelerate progress in addressing the qualitative aspects of Target 11 in marine and coastal areas?

Group 2: Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs)-marine and coastal

- (a) What conditions are required for OECMs to effectively contribute to achieving Target 11?
- (b) How might the biodiversity outcomes and management effectiveness of OECMs be assessed and reported?
- (c) How might the design of MPA networks be optimised to ensure that OECMs contribute synergistically to aspects of ecological coherence and vice versa (representativeness, replication, adequacy, viability, connectivity and management)?

Group 3: Integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes

- (a) What attributes are required for integration of MPAs and OECMs into landscape and seascape approaches?
- (b) What are the key challenges faced by countries at national or regional levels in implementing landscape and seascape approaches to address the various elements of Target 11?
- (c) What aspects of management of the broader landscape and seascape are needed to ensure that MPAs and OECMs can be effective?

29. Next, participants heard a set of theme presentations, which consolidated lessons learned, drawing on national or regional experiences, as follows:

- (a) Mr. David Johnson (GOBI) on qualitative elements of Target 11 in marine and coastal areas;
- (b) Mr. Serge Garcia and Mr. Jake Rice (IUCN-Fisheries Expert Group) on OECMs used in marine fisheries; and
- (c) Mr. Nic Bax (Australia) on OECMs in non-fisheries marine sectors.

30. Summaries of the above presentations are provided in annex II.

31. Drawing on the above-mentioned presentations, participants noted the following:

- Overall, progress is lacking on ensuring the effectiveness of protection and in making progress at comparable rates on all qualitative elements;
- OECMs should be considered, and their context assessed, on a case-by-case basis;
- MPAs are often designated in areas where there is low user conflict, and as a result may not address all opportunities for protection of high biodiversity areas; there is a need to take this into account and consider how OECMs can help to address this in such cases.
- OECMs can help to achieve the connectivity aspect of Target 11;
- OECMs require screening and evaluation tools for assessment on a case-by-case basis;
- Effectiveness should be measured in a consistent manner and to the same general standards across all area-based conservation measures; and
- Landscape and seascape integration and networks allow for a variety of tools, including non-area-based management tools, to be potentially synergistic.

ITEM 5. CONSOLIDATION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION ON VARIOUS APPROACHES FOR, AND THEIR EFFECTIVENESS IN, ASSESSING THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGET 11 OF MARINE PROTECTED AREAS AND OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES AS WELL AS THEIR INTEGRATION INTO THE WIDER LANDSCAPES AND SEASCAPES

32. Under this agenda item, there were joint sessions with the Technical Expert Workshop on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. In this regard, the workshop selected a number of participants to join the other workshop, while the rest of the participants focused on issues related to the qualitative aspects of Target 11 in marine and coastal areas.

33. With regard to the qualitative aspects of Target 11 in marine and coastal areas, the workshop split into breakout groups, focusing on the following questions:

Group 1: Ecologically representativity, areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, management equity and effectiveness, and connectivity

- (a) What are the most effective means to create the enabling conditions that need to be in place to achieve the qualitative elements of Target 11 (Ecologically representative; Areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services; Management equity and effectiveness; Well-connected), in terms of (i) the information basis, (ii) stakeholder engagement, (iii) monitoring and enforcement and (iv) governance?
- (b) What are the most effective means to evaluate and report on the achievement of the qualitative elements of Target 11?

Group 2: Integration into wider landscapes and seascapes

- (a) What are the most effective means to create the main enabling conditions that need to be in place to integrate MPAs and OECMs into the wider landscapes and seascapes, in terms of : (i) the information basis, (ii) stakeholder engagement, (iii) monitoring and enforcement and (iv) governance?
- (b) What are the most effective means to evaluate and report on the integration of MPAs and OECMs into the wider landscapes and seascapes?
- (c) What aspects of management of the broader landscape and seascape (e.g., non-area-based tools, marine spatial planning) are needed to ensure that MPAs and OECMs can be effective?

34. The results of breakout group session were reported and further discussed at the plenary session.

35. The results of the breakout and plenary sessions are summarized in annex III.

ITEM 6. PROVISION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVICE ON DEFINITION, MANAGEMENT APPROACHES AND IDENTIFICATION OF OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES IN MARINE AND COASTAL AREAS AND THEIR ROLE IN ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 11

36. Under this agenda item, there were joint sessions with the Technical Expert Workshop on Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11.

37. The workshop split into breakout groups to discuss definition as well as criteria and key elements for identification of OECMs. The results of the breakout group session were reported and further discussed at the plenary session.

38. The results of the breakout and plenary sessions are summarized in annex IV.

ITEM 7. OTHER MATTERS

39. Participants asked the Secretariat to further develop, if necessary, and make the background information documents of this workshop available for the forthcoming meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA).

ITEM 8. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

40. Participants considered and adopted the workshop report, with some changes, on the basis of a draft report prepared and presented by the co-chairs.

ITEM 9. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

41. In closing the workshop, participants expressed appreciation to the workshop co-chairs for their leadership in steering the workshop to a positive outcome, to the Secretariat for providing, and to the Government of Canada for hosting the workshop.

42. The meeting was closed at 5:00 pm on Friday, 9 February 2018.

*Annex I***LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****Experts nominated by Parties****Antigua and Barbuda**

1. Ms. Tricia Lovell
Senior Fisheries Officer
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Fisheries and
Barbura Affairs
St John's, Antigua and Barbuda
E-mail: tricia.lovell@ab.gov.ag

Australia

2. Mr. Nicholas John Bax
Director
NERP Marine Biodiversity Hub
Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial
Research Organization
CSIRO Marine Laboratories
Hobart, Australia
E-mail: nic.bax@csiro.au

Brazil

3. Ms. Ana Paula Leite Prates
Director of Ecosystem Conservation
Biodiversity Secretary
Ministry of Environment
Brasília, Brazil
E-mail: ana-paula.prates@mma.gov.br

Bulgaria

4. Ms. Valentina Todorova
Scientific Deputy Director
Institute of Oceanology
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
Varna, Bulgaria
E-mail: vtodorova@io-bas.bg

Canada

5. Mr. Kevin Stringer
Associate Deputy Minister
Ecosystems and Oceans Science
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Ottawa, Canada
E-mail: kevin.stringer@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
6. Ms. Liisa Peramaki
National Manager
Biodiversity and Ecosystem Science
Environment and Biodiversity Science
Branch,
Fisheries and Oceans Canada
Ottawa, Canada
E-mail: liisa.peramaki@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Costa Rica

7. Mr. Guido Alonso Saborío Rodríguez
Director of the Department of Protected
Areas
Osa Conservation Area
National System of Conservation Areas
Ministry of Environment and Energy
San Jose, Costa Rica
E-mail: guido.saborio@sinac.go.cr;
gsaborio@gmail.com

Egypt

8. Mr. Moustafa Fouda
Minister Advisor on Biodiversity
Egyptian Environmental Affairs Agency
Cairo, Egypt
Email: drfoudamos@gmail.com

France

9. Mr. Thierry Canteri
Director
Protected Areas Department
Agence Française pour la biodiversité
Ministry of Environment
Brest, France
E-mail: Thierry.canteri@afbiodiversite.fr

Guatemala

10. Mr. Samuel Alejandro Coloma López
Professional Advisor
Marine and Coastal Affairs
CONAP - National Council of Protected
Areas
Guatemala City, Guatemala
E-mail: Samuel.coloma@conap.gob.gt;
samuel.coloma.conap@gmail.com

India

11. Mr. Rajkumar Rajan
Scientist-D
Marine Biology Regional Centre
Zoological Survey of India
Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate
Change
chennai, India
E-mail: rajkumarrajan@hotmail.com
raj@zsi.gov.in

Japan

12. Mr. Joji Morishita
Professor
Tokyo University of Marine Science and
Technology

Tokyo, Japan

E-mail: jmoris0@kaiyodai.ac.jp

Maldives

13. Mr. Hussain Ibrahim
Assistant Environment Officer
Environmental Protection Agency
Ministry of Environment and Energy
Male, Maldives
E-mail: hussain.ibrahim@epa.gov.mv

Mexico

14. Mr. David Gutiérrez Carbonell
Director General
National Commission of Natural Protected Areas
México DF, México
E-mail: daguti@conanp.gob.mx

Nigeria

15. Ms. Felicia C. Mogo
Deputy Director
Marine Environment Management
Department
Nigerian Maritime Administration and Safety Agency
Lagos, Nigeria
E-mail: felichimogo@yahoo.com

Norway

16. Mr. Gunnstein Bakke
Senior Legal Adviser
Directorate of Fisheries
Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries
Bergen, Norway
E-mail: gunnstein.bakke@fiskeridir.no

Peru

17. Ms. Nena Gonzales Meza
Specialist on Climate Change and
Environmental Management
Directorate for Climate Change, Fisheries
and Aquaculture Biodiversity
Ministry of Production
Lima, Peru
E-mail: ngonzales@produce.gob.pe

Philippines

18. Ms. Desiree Eve R. Maaño
Supervising Ecosystems Management
Specialist
Biodiversity Management Bureau
Department of Environment and Natural
Resources
Quezon City, Philippines
E-mail: desireemaano@gmail.com;
desireemaano@14.alumni.u-tokyo.ac.jp

South Africa

19. Mr. Alan Boyd
Director
Biodiversity and Coastal Research
Ocean and Coastal Branch
Department of Environmental Affairs
Cape Town, South Africa
E-mail: AJBoyd@environment.gov.za

Sweden

20. Ms. Lena Tingström
Senior Analyst
Swedish Agency for Marine and Water
Management
Göteborg, Sweden
E-mail: lena.tingstrom@havochvatten.se

Thailand

21. Mr. Nipphon Phongsuwan
Specialist
Department of Marine and Coastal Resources
Resource and Environment in Marine and
Coastal Ecosystem Research
Office of Natural Resources and
Environmental Policy and Planning
Bangkok, Thailand
E-mail: nph1959@gmail.com

Ukraine

22. Mr. Boris Aleksandrov
Professor
Director of the Institute of Marine Biology
National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
Odessa, Ukraine
E-mail: imb@nas.gov.ua

Experts nominated by Organizations

BirdLife International

23. Ms. Carolina Hazin
Global Marine Policy Coordinator
BirdLife International
Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland
E-mail: carolina.hazin@birdlife.org

Canadian Council on Ecological Areas (CCEA)

24. Ms. Natalie Ban
Director
Canadian Council on Ecological Areas
Halifax, Canada
E-mail: nban@uvic.ca

European Bureau for Conservation and Development (EBCD)

25. Ms. Despina Symons
Director
Fisheries Expert Group
IUCN Commission of Ecosystem
Management
Brussels, Belgium
E-mail: despina.symons@ebcd.org

26. Mr. Michel J. Kaiser
Chair in Marine Conservation Ecology
School of Ocean Sciences
Bangor University
Anglesey, United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland
E-mail: michel.kaiser@bangor.ac.uk

ICCA Consortium

27. Ms. Kim Sander Wright
Strategic Advisor on Marine, Coastal and
Island Environments
ICCA Consortium
Vancouver, Canada
E-mail: kim@iccanconsortium.org;
kim@sanderwright.com

International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity

28. Mr. Onel Masardule
Executive Director
Foundation of the Promotion of the
Indigenous Knowledge
Comarca Gunayala, Panama
E-mail: masardule@gmail.com;
masardule@icloud.com

IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN – WCPA)

29. Mr. Stephen Woodley
Vice Chair for Science and Biodiversity
IUCN World Commission on Protected
Areas
Chelsea, Canada
E-mail: stephen.woodley@iucn.org

30. Mr. Dan Laffoley
Marine Vice Chair
IUCN World Commission on Protected
Areas
Peterborough, United Kingdom of Great
Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: danlaffoley@btinternet.com

IUCN Commission of Ecosystem Management, Fisheries Expert Group (IUCN/CEM/FEG)

31. Mr. Serge Garcia
Chair

Fisheries Expert Group
Paris, France
E-mail: grcsgm@gmail.com

32. Mr. Jake Rice
Chief Scientist - Emeritus
Department of Fisheries and Oceans
Ottawa, Canada
E-mail: jake.rice@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations

33. Mr. Kim Friedman
Senior Fishery Resources Officer
Food and Agriculture Organization
Rome, Italy
E-mail : kim.friedman@fao.org

34. Ms. Jessica Sanders
Fishery Officer
FAO Sub Regional Office for the Pacific
Islands
Apia, Samoa
E-mail: jessica.sanders@fao.org

Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI)

35. Mr. David Johnson
Director
Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative
Secretariat
Romsey, United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland
E-mail:
david.johnson@seascapeconsultants.co.uk

36. Mr. Daniel Dunn
Assistant Research Professor
Nicholas School of the Environment and
Duke Marine Lab
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina, United States of
America
E-mail : daniel.dunn@duke.edu

Mediterranean Network of Protected Areas (MedPan)

37. Ms. Purificació Canals
President
Mediterranean Network of Protected Areas
Marseille, France
E-mail: pcanals@tinet.org

Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO)

38. Mr. Pierre Pepin
Co-Chair Scientific Council Working Group
on Ecosystem Science Assessment
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization
Darmouth, Canada

E-mail: pierre.pepin@dfo-mpo.gc.ca

**Specially Protected Areas Regional Activity Center
of Mediterranean Action Plan
(UNEP/MAP-SPA/RAC)**

39. Mr. Daniel Cebrian
SAP BIO Coordinator
Mediterranean Action Plan
UNEP/MAP-SPA/RAC
Tunis, Tunisia
E-mail: daniel.cebrian@spa-rac.org

United Nations Environment Programme

40. Mr. Takehiro Nakamura
Chief
Marine and Coastal Ecosystems Unit
Ecosystems Division
United Nations Environment Programme
Nairobi, Kenya
E-mail : Takehiro.Nakamura@un.org;
Takehiro.Nakamura@unep.org

Resource Person

41. Ms. Susanna Fuller
Consultant
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity
Montreal, Canada
E-mail: susannadfuller@gmail.com

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

42. Mr. David Cooper
Deputy Executive Secretary
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
Montreal, Canada
E-mail: david.cooper@cbd.int

43. Ms. Jihyun Lee
Environmental Affairs Officer for Marine
and Coastal Biodiversity
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
Montreal, Canada
E-mail: jihyun.lee@cbd.int

43. Mr. Joseph Appiott
Associate Programme Officer
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
Montreal, Canada
E-mail: joseph.appiott@cbd.int

44. Ms. Jacqueline Grekin
Programme Assistant
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological

Diversity
Montreal, Canada
E-mail: jacqueline.grekin@cbd.int

45. Ms. Johany Martinez Quinto
Programme Assistant
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
Montreal, Canada
E-mail: johany.martinez@cbd.int

44. Mr. Changsung Lim
Individual Contractor
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
Montreal, Canada
E-mail: changsung.lim@cbd.int

45. Mr. Areeb Butt
Individual Contractor
Secretariat of the Convention on Biological
Diversity
Montreal, Canada
E-mail: areeb.butt@cbd.int

*Annex II***A. SUMMARIES OF PRESENTATIONS UNDER AGENDA ITEM 3****Introduction to the Workshop: Protected and Conserved Areas and their Contribution to Target 11 (by Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda, SCBD)**

Mr. Gidda introduced the workshop by providing definitions of “protected areas” and “*in-situ* conservation” provided in Article 2 of the text of the Convention on Biological Diversity. He traced how the concept of “conserved areas” became integrated with “protected areas” and evolved through successive decisions of the Conference of Parties. Calling attention to the three important factors for the success of the CBD programme of work on protected areas, hailed by the Parties to the Convention as well as conservation agencies as one of the programmes of the Convention with the highest rate of implementation, he described the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, especially Strategic Goal C and Aichi Target 11. Referring to the status of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as of 2014, as reported by the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, he underscored that significant progress had been made on Target 11 and that with more focussed attempts by, many elements of the target, both marine and terrestrial, could be achieved by the deadline year of 2020. He reiterated that in order to achieve the target, it was imperative to know the current status, the gaps, what needs to be achieved and finally the course of action required to meet the needs. At that point, efforts could be made to facilitate implementation of those actions collectively by all Governments and partners in a coherent manner. He also showed how implementation of actions under Target 11 address requirements under other multi-lateral environmental agreements, relevant Sustainable Development Goals and goals under the Paris Agreement, to make the case for implementation by Parties as well as donors to invest and support implementation at national levels. He reminded participants that Target 11 includes both protected areas and OECMs, and that the significant progress in achieving Target 11 was based on only the reported protected areas in the World Database on Protected Areas. He explained that information on OECMs is not yet collected due to lack of clarity on what they are and are not, both in the marine and terrestrial realm. The Conference of the Parties (COP), in decision XIII/2 (paragraph 10 (b)) decided that a technical workshop/workshops be organized to provide scientific and technical advice on definition, identification and management approaches of OECMs and their contribution to Target 11. Accordingly, the objective and outcomes of the workshop flow from this decision. He further informed participants that the final day of the workshop, when the joint plenary of the workshops adopts consolidated guidance on OECMS, would be a historic occasion, as translating the guidance into on-the-ground reality would not only contribute to achieving elements of Target 11, but would also contribute to achieving relevant targets of Sustainable Development Goals 14.5, 15.2 and 15.3. He also recalled that the COP adopted the programme of work on protected areas in February 2004, thus adoption of the consolidated guidance would, like the programme of work, also contribute significantly to the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures: Definition and Guidance (by Ms. Kathy MacKinnon, IUCN – World Commission on Protected Areas)

The Guidelines for Recognizing and Reporting Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures, prepared by the International Union for Conservation of Nature World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN-WCPA) and presented as an information document to the workshop (CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/5), have gone through extensive consultations, including review and comment by Parties through a notification process organized by the CBD Secretariat in November 2017. The guidelines provide a draft definition, criteria for identification of OECMs and information on the types of management approaches that provide biodiversity outcomes through primary, secondary and ancillary conservation. Ms. MacKinnon explained that the definition and criteria are applicable to all ecosystems – terrestrial, marine and inland waters. OECMs do not necessarily need a conservation objective but they should be effective in providing long-term biodiversity outcomes. OECMs are expected to include areas of high biodiversity value and can cover areas under a range of different governance types, including governance by government agencies, indigenous peoples and local communities, and the private sector. Often cultural and traditional management practices will contribute to the biodiversity outcomes.

Recognition and support for OECMs can contribute to Target 11 through increasing ecological representation, enhanced coverage of areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services and connectivity. Recognition of OECMs can engage a broader range of stakeholders and sectors.

Workshop Background, Scope and Outputs (*by Ms. Jihyun Lee, SCBD*)

Ms. Lee introduced the Convention's work on marine and coastal diversity. She explained that although marine protected areas are an important element of the Convention's programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity, this was the first workshop being convened focusing on marine issues under Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and explained that it was being organized in close cooperation with the programme of work on protected areas. She proceeded to outline the scope of the workshop, which would include consolidating national experiences and lessons learned in achieving Target 11 in marine and coastal areas. Noting that the global community was set, not just to achieve the 10 per cent threshold set by Target 11, but to surpass 23 per cent by 2020 in marine areas within national jurisdictions, she emphasized, however, that despite this very real success, there were some very important qualitative elements that needed to be discussed. She outlined the objectives of the workshop, established by COP decisions XIII/9 and XIII/2, as well as the expected outputs, which would focus on the qualitative aspects of Target 11 as well as the definition, management approaches and identification of other effective area-based conservation measures, the latter through joint sessions with the Technical Workshop on OECMs, taking place concurrently with the present workshop. She highlighted the efforts of the Secretariat, through the marine and coastal programme of work, to engage various sectors in the achievement of the Aichi Targets. For example, after continued efforts over the past decade, the fisheries sector was now engaged in efforts to achieve the targets in their entirety, not just Target 6, including through the "Sustainable Ocean Initiative (SOI) Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations and Regional Fisheries Bodies on Accelerating Progress Towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets". She emphasized the importance of engaging key sectors in the achievement of this very important target and the need to consolidate experience and provide more guidance. She introduced the CBD criteria for ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs), and cautioned that EBSAs are not MPAs, fishing closures nor do they have any implications for jurisdictional matters. Ms. Lee explained that the EBSA process has thus far addressed more than 74 per cent of the ocean, and that 19 per cent of the total ocean area was now described as meeting the EBSA criteria; she referred participants to the EBSA website (www.cbd.int/ebsa) for more information. Finally, she noted that EBSAs provide an important scientific input to marine spatial planning.

Overview of Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures: Towards 2020 (*by Ms. Susanna Fuller, Resource Person*)

Ms. Fuller explained that Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, as reiterated in Sustainable Development Goal 14, commits CBD Parties to protect 10 per cent of their marine and coastal environment by 2020. Progress is being made towards this target, with the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) quantifying 6.97 per cent of the target met for the global ocean, and additional commitments totalling 4 per cent expected to be achieved by 2020. Other estimates that take into account only strongly protected areas have assessed protection of the global ocean at 3.6 per cent. It is likely that Aichi Target 11 measures will assist with meeting other Aichi Targets as well as other international commitments and agreements, as spatial measures can result in multiple benefits to species, biodiversity, habitats and ecosystems. Target 11 is being met both by MPAs, as defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity and where the primary objective is conservation of biodiversity, and OECMs, where biodiversity outcomes are achieved, but the areas are not designated formally as protected and may include areas protected by indigenous peoples and local communities, areas that are not otherwise reported, private protected areas or sector-based measures that protect *in-situ* biodiversity. Marine and coastal environments have particular ecological and jurisdictional characteristics that should be taken into account when setting objectives for, designing, managing, monitoring and enforcing protected areas. Concerns remain about the strength of protection in many of the areas being reported and claimed as protected, through MPAs or OECMs, and more work needs to be done to set clear standards and simplify reporting mechanisms through which effectiveness can be measured. Effective protection elements include design issues relating to both individual sites and

protected area systems; adequacy and appropriateness of management systems and processes; and delivery of protected area objectives, including conservation of values. Gaps exist in reporting on effective protection, accepted indicators for equity of protected area measures, connectivity, climate change mitigation as well as indicators to assess how MPAs and OECMs are integrated into the broader seascape. For existing and new MPAs and OECMs, qualitative and quantitative measures of effectiveness must be a focus going forward, with a commitment to strengthening protection in order to stem the tide of marine and coastal biodiversity loss and maintain and restore ecosystem services.

B. SUMMARIES OF PRESENTATIONS UNDER AGENDA ITEM 4

Marine Protected Areas System in Brazil (*by Ms. Ana Paula Leite Prates, Brazil*)

Ms. Prates presented a summary of the status of Brazil's national MPAs in relation to the various elements of Aichi Target 11. In regard to coverage and representativeness, she highlighted that 22.8 per cent of Brazil's territorial waters are currently protected, with high representativeness of different types of ecosystems. In contrast, only 1.5 per cent of the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) is protected. Regarding equity, she explained that "extractive reserves" are a type of MPA designed to promote a bottom-up approach to management, whereby responsibility is assigned to traditional fisherfolk. Regarding financial resources she mentioned both an important GEF project to support the creation of MPAs and the launch of the Blue Initiative, a platform designed to foster initiatives to increase implementation and fundraising capacity. Finally, she announced that public hearings are taking place for the creation of two new large MPAs, covering almost 1 million square kilometres. Together, these areas would bring coverage of the EEZ to 25 per cent. Both of these areas overlap with described EBSAs and national priority areas for conservation and were included in the Brazilian voluntary commitment put forward at the UN Oceans Conference in June 2017. Although Brazil has not yet achieved all the elements of Target 11 for the marine environment, the creation of these new protected areas represents a new possibility of integrated management between the Brazil's environmental and defence/Navy sectors.

Canada's Experiences on the Development and Management of Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (*by Ms. Liisa Peramaki, Canada*)

Ms. Peramaki informed participants that Canada has an interim domestic target of 5 per cent protection of marine and coastal areas by 2017. As of 31 December 2017, Canada had protected 7.75 per cent through MPAs and other effective area-based conservation measures. MPAs, established under the *Oceans Act*, are established through a rigorous five-step process supported by science, local knowledge, other sources of information, and extensive consultation. She explained that Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) developed operational guidance for identifying marine "other measures." This operational guidance was based on peer-reviewed science advice (Canadian Science Advisory Secretariat Science Advisory Report 2016/022), as well as emerging guidance from the IUCN and Canadian Council on Ecological Areas. The guidance provides five criteria that a measure must meet in order to be considered an "other measure": geographic location, presence of ecological components of interest, conservation or stock management objectives, long-term duration, and effectively conserved from existing and foreseeable pressures. DFO found that approximately 50 fisheries closures met the criteria of an "other measure." In addition to continued establishment and management of MPAs and "other measures," Canada is advancing MPA Network development in five priority bioregions. This network development takes into consideration the contribution of other measures and will help to identify to priority areas for future protection.

Experience of France on Marine Protected Areas (*by Mr. Thierry Canteri, France*)

Mr. Canteri informed participants that France is fully involved in international discussions on marine biodiversity protection: debate on the high seas and implementation of regional seas conventions follow from initiatives taken in its own waters. Management of the marine environment must take into account its changing, open and dynamic nature. On an international level, France supports the efforts of the CBD to develop a worldwide MPA network and actively contributes to work pertaining to the regional seas conventions. In this context, MPAs have an important role to play, helping to protect biodiversity and encouraging the development of original governance models. Depending on the situation, their

implementation can correspond to an integrated approach in which protection and sustainable development co-exist, or a philosophy based strongly on protection. The French strategy for the creation and management of MPAs follows a first national strategy adopted in 2007 which focused on the waters of mainland France. In 2018, more than 20 per cent of French waters are covered by MPAs.

The 2011 Marine Biodiversity Conservation Strategy in Japan (by Mr. Joji Morishita, Japan)

Mr. Morishita explained that Japan and its surrounding waters are extremely rich in biodiversity. He noted that the Japanese Archipelago has been inhabited since the Stone Age and the interaction between nature and humankind has produced a unique relationship over its long history: the concepts of Satoyama and Satoumi. Reflecting on this, Mr. Morishita noted that Japan's basic policy regarding biodiversity is "conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, thereby conserving rich biodiversity, and to aim at realizing a society in coexistence with nature where human beings can continue enjoying benefits therefrom in the future and to contribute to conserving the global environment (Basic Act on Biodiversity, Act No. 58 of June 6, 2008)." In addition, he noted that the marine ecosystem and environment are diverse, dynamic and ever-changing and that any conservation and management measures, including area-based measures, have to be responsive, flexible, adaptive and versatile. Japan's area-based measures are established in accordance with this recognition and its Marine Biodiversity Conservation Strategy utilizes existing diverse legal/regulatory systems and tools by national and prefectural governments and local communities.

Advances in the Achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in Mexico (by Mr. David Gutiérrez Carbonell, Mexico)

Mr. Gutiérrez explained that Mexico started prioritizing biodiversity conservation 20 years ago. Experts identified 104 ecoregions, selected by their endemic species, species richness, oceanic processes, economic aspects like tourism, fisheries and oil production as well as the threats they faced. Today, there are 37 marine and almost 70 marine and coastal protected areas. Mexico's Exclusive Economic Zone measures 3,149,920 square kilometres and achieved the marine portion of Target 11 by the year 2016; he noted that Mexico has protected 22.05 per cent, thanks to the declaration of three large MPAs. Today, Mexico has two large protected areas extending more than 100,000 square kilometres. The January 2018 report of the Environmental Performance Index, produced by Yale and Columbia universities, rates Mexico as one of the best-performing countries in marine conservation. Having surpassed the quantitative aspect of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, Mexico's next steps for marine conservation must consider effectiveness, connectivity and representativeness. For that reason, Mexico has adopted an evaluation system that considers 12 variables to build an index of management effectiveness.

The Philippines's MPAs and MPA Networks: Experience and Lessons Learned (by Ms. Desiree Eve Maano, Philippines)

Ms. Maano introduced the Philippines, situated at the Apex of the Coral Triangle Region, as the global epicentre of marine biodiversity. She explained that to protect these resources, various conservation activities and investments have been undertaken both by the national and local governments, as well as non-governmental organizations, including the establishment of MPAs and MPA networks. While 80 per cent of MPAs in the Philippines are locally established and managed, and about 33 are national MPAs, there are also ongoing efforts to expand and diversify the country's protected area system through national recognition of indigenous and local community conserved areas and territories. The importance of MPAs in the Philippines is well recognized, however, there are still issues and gaps that need to be addressed in order to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. As one of the measures to accelerate conservation outcomes and meet global commitments, MPA networks are being used as a strategy to improve and strengthen the management effectiveness of individual MPAs and advance the areas of critical habitats placed under protection.

South Africa's experiences and lessons learned in the development of ecologically representative MPAs and other effective area-based conservation measures (by Mr. Alan Boyd, South Africa)

Mr. Boyd highlighted the importance of having an overall objective, legislation and a strategy. In this regard, Mr. Boyd recounted that South Africa introduced MPAs as part of legislation for the management of marine resources in 1998, aligned with the country's new constitution. In 2008 South Africa approved its National Protected Area Expansion Strategy, and in 2010 the country supported the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In 2014 South Africa launched Operation Phakisa, which included a proposal for a viable Marine Protected Area Representative Network that would: protect the marine biodiversity of South Africa, taking mainland sea area protection from 0.4 per cent to 5 per cent; and facilitate its sustainable use by fisheries and not block appropriate use and development by other sectors, including oil and gas exploration. In February 2016 the Minister of Environmental Affairs proposed 22 new/expanded MPAs. Mr. Boyd also noted the importance of a well-set out information base on biodiversity (such as the National Biodiversity Assessment of 2011 and the EBSA process of 2010-2014) as well as the importance of follow-up research on benthic biodiversity and migratory species. Mr. Boyd noted that whilst progress has been good, difficulties were experienced because offshore industries like oil and gas exploration have allocated rights covering 98 per cent of South Africa's Exclusive Economic Zone. Also co-ordination of MPAs and "other effective means" is not a simple matter now that the protected area legislation is with the Department of Environmental Affairs and "other effective means" largely lie with the department responsible for fisheries. Mr. Boyd noted the importance of taking a longer term approach to expanding area-based biodiversity protection, as well as to move forward with proposed MPAs. In conclusion, Mr. Boyd noted that, in carrying out these activities, we need to emphasise that our approach is holistic and not biased against developmental sectors.

Management of the National MPA System and Assessment of Conservation Measures: Experience of Ukraine (by Mr. Borys Aleksandrov, Ukraine)

Mr. Aleksandrov outlined Ukraine's three main achievements in marine protection over the past decade. First, he noted that Ukraine, together with other Black Sea countries, produced the Guidelines for the Establishment of Marine Protected Areas in the Black Sea in 2008. Second, Ukraine clarified the boundaries of MPAs in the Black Sea in the context of activities of the Secretariat of the Black Sea Commission. The total area of MPAs in the Black Sea amounts to 755 840 ha, 88% of which is in Ukraine. At present, the Ukrainian Black Sea MPAs (excluding unprotected Ramsar - listed wetlands) cover almost 11 per cent of the national marine area (609 070 ha), which is much more than in the other Black Sea countries. In this respect, it is fair to say that Ukraine has fulfilled its commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity Aichi Target 11. Third, Mr. Aleksandrov described the development of a new methodology for the integrated assessment of the biological value of marine waters. This method makes it possible to justify the creation of new reserves, expand their area or change their protection status. Mr. Aleksandrov concluded by noting that, as a result of the expert work, and taking into account the new national and European principles of forming ecological networks, as well as new approaches for determining the ecological value of marine areas, it is presently proposed to include 12 new national marine protected areas in the existing Ukrainian MPA network. These sites have a combined area of 104 300 ha, which represents 17 per cent of the current total area of Ukrainian MPAs in the Black Sea.

Transatlantic Partnership among Marine Protected Areas (by Ms. Purificació Canals, Mediterranean Network of Protected Areas – MedPan)

Ms. Canals introduced the Transatlantic Partnership of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) as an EU-funded two-year project to promote cooperation between managers of MPAs in countries and territories around the Atlantic Ocean. She explained that over the course of the project, and through the three twinning projects developed—on MPA managers networks, resilience and marine mammal conservation—the project reached out to MPA managers and stakeholders around the Atlantic, and hosted workshops for up to 73 participants from 31 countries. These include 27 MPA managers, seven representatives of MPA regional networks, 23 from MPA national networks or systems, five Regional Seas conventions/institutions, ten research institutions, six funding bodies and ten non-governmental organizations. The project demonstrated the richness of management experiences in the Atlantic basin and how those experiences can match existing needs and respond to common challenges that managers face across the Atlantic; it also

showed the relevance of transatlantic cooperation at the management level. The partnership enabled MPA managers' networks to draft a strategy for a continued partnership and issue a Call for Joint Action at IMPAC4 in Chile in September 2017, following joint statements at the United Nations Conference to Support the Implementation of Sustainable Development Goal 14 in June 2017. Further cooperation between regional and national networks would enable them to improve their advocacy impacts, boost MPA managers' effectiveness through the sharing of tools, information and good practices; and pool advice and efforts to improve fundraising. The exchanges demonstrated that by networking it is possible to accelerate progress to achieve Aichi Target 11 using a cost-effective solution.

Defining the qualitative elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 with regard to the marine and coastal environment-Key findings and issues (by Mr. David Johnson, GOBI)

Mr. Johnson recalled an earlier technical meeting on Aichi Target 11, co-convened by the Secretariat of the CBD and the Global Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI) in February 2016 and reflected in the Background Document on Defining the Qualitative Elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 with Regard to the Marine and Coastal Environment, available as an information document for this workshop (CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/2). His presentation covered the qualitative elements of Aichi Target 11 (qualifiers), exploring their meaning and offering a view on interpretation. Mr. Johnson indicated that the qualifiers for both MPAs and OECMs are that networks should be: ecologically representative; areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services; managed equitably and effectively; well-connected; and integrated into wider landscapes and seascapes. He noted that it is critical to meet these qualifiers in addition to the quantitative targets in order to achieve Target 11. He noted that representativeness is not currently being achieved in most regions, most notably across eco-regions, over different depths and for the High Seas, and that regional biogeographies are being developed to lead to greater representativeness. The CBD's EBSA process has described areas of high value for biodiversity. This information can help focus appropriate management measures. At a broad scale, ecosystem services and biodiversity are aligned, but at a fine scale ecosystem service benefits are often user-specific, site-specific and value laden, with complex links to biodiversity. Procedures for evaluating management effectiveness for MPAs and OECMs can be linked to design issues, adequacy and appropriateness of management systems, and delivery of objectives. He noted that there are divergent views on equity that can make any assessment complicated. For example, at what point does equitable management reduce the potential for effective management? Connectivity describes the extent to which populations in different parts of a species range are linked by the exchange of eggs, larvae, recruits or other propagules, juveniles or adults. Key questions include information needs and scale(s) of assessment. Finally, he noted that in terms of integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes, there are several marine planning processes underway. A simple test or evaluation system is needed to consider how MPAs and OECMs can enhance wider marine plans and vice versa.

Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures: Fisheries (by Mr. Serge Garcia and Mr. Jake Rice (IUCN-CEM Fisheries Expert Group))

Mr. Rice and Mr. Garcia explained that area-based fisheries measures are typically used to optimize the exploitation of the target species, as complements to other fishery measures controlling input and output, and economic incentives. They aim to protect features such as specific life stages, depleted stocks or parts of stocks during rebuilding programmes, genetic reservoirs, habitats critical to fishery sustainability, and reserves of food. They may also be used to allocate space and resources, and to deliver broader conservation. Area-based fisheries measures vary in space (from 0 to 100% of an EEZ), time (from seasonal to permanent), and degree of exclusion of fisheries (from single to all gears), making the typology of fisheries complex. Moreover, the performance of any specific type of measure can be significantly affected by oceanographic, ecological, fishery history, socio-economic and governance factors present in the place(s) where the measure is applied. As a consequence, evaluations of the effectiveness of an area-based fisheries measure must be case-specific. Based on an extensive literature review of outcomes of area-based fisheries measures, several criteria were proposed for consideration in the evaluation: addressing species that have been depleted and communities that have been disturbed by past pressures,

with regard to the extent to which the area-based fisheries measures promotes recovery; for healthy populations and communities the extent to which it maintains the population and manages pressures; and for priority species or habitats, the extent of protection offered by the area-based fisheries measure. Moreover, the case-by-case evaluations must consider the context in which the measure is applied, including: the use of the ecosystem approach and precautionary approach in developing and implementing the measure; use of the best scientific information and knowledge systems available; the degree to which the area-based fisheries measure integrates fisheries and biodiversity outcomes and are compatible with management of fisheries outside the area and with management of other threats in the area; and the consultation and governance of the area. Information needs for such an evaluation were suggested.

MPAs and other effective area-based (marine) conservation measures: Delivering outcomes towards the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 (by Nic Bax, Australia)

Mr. Bax prefaced his presentation with some recent data analyses showing that the distribution of global marine protected areas tends to avoid areas of manageable pressures (including pelagic and artisanal fishing), and are instead associated with pressures that are not reduced by spatial management (including pollution). A separate analysis showed that 33 per cent of the global ocean area was required to provide a similar level of protection for selected seafloor fauna when avoiding manageable pressures as would be protected by 10 per cent of the ocean selected without avoidance. Together, these analyses indicate the potential importance of OECMs in achieving the full objectives of Aichi Target 11. He then summarized the *Background Document on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (in Non-fisheries Marine Sectors) – Delivering Outcomes towards the Achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11* (CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/3), prepared by the Australian National Centre for Ocean Resources and Security and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation of Australia, as well as the University of Woollongong, noting that while the definition of an OECM might vary depending on the sector, the outcomes should remain similar and meet agreed CBD criteria. Mr. Bax provided examples of submarine cable and pipeline protection zones, particularly sensitive sea areas (PSSAs) and traditional use areas to illustrate how OECMs could support Aichi Target 11. He raised the following concerns: does the level of protection compensate for any damage caused by the use? Would additional objectives or measures relevant to conservation interests be required? Would additional level(s) of recognition be required, for example to give confidence that the measures have longevity? and what level of additional monitoring and evaluation would be required and would this be appropriate in all situations (for example culturally sensitive areas)? Mr. Bax suggested additional potential OECMs worthy of consideration could include wreck sites and marine war graves, areas restricted for military or security purposes, protection zones around offshore energy installations such as wind farms, and spatially defined restrictions on land-based pollution and run-off. An important point when considering OECMs is that although they may be capable of conserving biodiversity, this is typically not their primary purpose and therefore greater emphasis would be needed for monitoring any outcomes. If positive biodiversity outcomes can be demonstrated, then less emphasis would be required on which, or under which conditions, OECMs would support progress towards Target 11. Finally, Mr. Bax noted the positive value that OECMs could provide to existing MPA networks by increasing their representativeness and even raising the accepted standard for demonstrating that existing MPAs have a positive impact on biodiversity and thus contribute effectively towards the full definition of Aichi Target 11.

Annex III

**SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL APPROACHES TO ACCELERATE PROGRESS IN
ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 11 IN MARINE AND COASTAL AREAS,
FOCUSING ON QUALITATIVE ASPECTS**

1. Through the background information documents and theme presentations, it was highlighted that marine and coastal areas require special consideration in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, particularly with regard to the following characteristics. The above-noted background materials for the workshop (referred to in paragraph 11 of the main body of the report) and the workshop discussions identified a number of these unique aspects, which include the following:

- The three-dimensional nature of the marine environment (with maximum depth of almost 11 km in deep ocean), which is heavily influenced by changes in physicochemical properties, including pressure, salinity and light;
- Dynamic nature of the marine environment, which is influenced by, for example, currents and tides, and facilitates connectivity among ecosystems and habitats;
- Nature of habitat fragmentation and connectivity in the marine environment;
- Lack of visibility and/or remoteness of the features being conserved;
- Primary production in the marine environment is often limited to the coastal zone for habitat forming species with phytoplankton distributed through the pelagic photic zone, while the standing stock in terrestrial environments is widespread and structural. There is also a higher turnover in the primary production of the marine environment, which varies with annual cycles, tied to temperature and currents;
- In terrestrial environments, the atmosphere is well mixed at a much broader scale, whereas mixing in marine environments can change within significantly smaller scales;
- Climate change impacts will affect marine and terrestrial areas much differently, as coastal areas are subject to erosion and storm surge, and protection efforts can be lost as a result of one large weather event. The pervasive impact of ocean acidification can impact the entire standing stock of primary productivity in one marine area, having knock-on effects throughout the food web;
- Differences in resilience and recovery rates of biodiversity and ecosystems;
- Differences in approaches and challenges in monitoring and data collection;
- Potentially different legal regimes for different portions of the same marine areas (e.g., seabed and water column in marine areas beyond national jurisdiction);
- Frequent lack of clear ownership of specific areas in the marine environment, with multiple users and stakeholders, often with overlapping and sometimes competing interests;
- Frequent occurrence of multiple regulatory authorities with competence in a given area;
- Expectation of resource-based “outcomes”: from an economic perspective, area-based conservation measures in the marine environment are expected, in many cases, to improve fishery resources and restore productivity. In terrestrial environments, the focus is largely on protecting animals without the expectation that they can be harvested once populations increase.

2. The workshop discussions, as well as the workshop background documents and theme presentations, discussed the following issues with regard to the qualitative aspects of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11:

- a. Ecological representativeness is often characterized as having the full range of biodiversity is protected worldwide. This includes the species, genes and higher taxa, as well as evolutionary

patterns, distinct communities and ecological processes that sustain global biodiversity. It is generally recognized that representativeness is not being achieved, most notably across different eco-regions, different depth levels, and in open ocean and deep-sea areas.

- b. Areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services: At a broad scale, many ecosystem services and biodiversity are aligned. However, at a finer scale, identification of areas where ecosystem benefits are realised are user-specific, site-specific and value-laden, with complex links to biodiversity.
- c. Effective management: Effective protection elements can include design issues relating to both individual sites and protected area systems; adequacy and appropriateness of management systems and processes; and delivery of conservation objectives.
- d. Equitable management: Equity is the fair distribution of benefits and costs between individuals and/or groups of people. However, there are many views on practical considerations regarding equity (e.g., what is “fair”, what are “benefits” and “costs”), how it influences conservation outcomes and how equitable management can underpin management decisions.
- e. Well connected: Connectivity describes the extent to which populations in different parts of a species range are linked by the exchange of eggs, larvae, recruits or other propagules, juveniles or adults, as well as how ecosystem functions are connected (e.g., predator/prey relationships, sources and sinks of nutrients). Issues and considerations in achieving and assessing connectivity include empirical and modelling studies, transboundary connectivity, and understanding how best to include connectivity in conservation management.
- f. Integration into the wider landscapes and seascapes: This indicates that : (i) the functional integrity and health of marine ecosystems within areas area-based conservation measures is dependent not only on the protection provided, but also on the ecological interactions with surrounding areas and (ii) that management outside of the area does not undermine, and, where possible, complements the management inside the areas. Boundaries of area-based conservation measures are permeable and therefore represent an open system. Several marine spatial planning and integrated coastal zone management processes are underway, and there is a need to consider how MPAs and OECMs can enhance wider marine spatial plans and vice versa.

3. Through a breakout group session, the workshop participants highlighted the following approaches to accelerate national progress in achieving Aichi Target 11 in marine and coastal areas, in particular with regard to the qualitative aspects of Target 11, recognizing that these are not exhaustive and that there are other sources of guidance on these issues.

a. With regard to providing an adequate base of information:

- Identify the information that is needed to address qualitative elements, including information on biodiversity, ecosystems and biogeography as well as information on current threats to biodiversity and potential threats from new and emerging pressures;
- Synthesize and harmonize various types of information, with the free, prior and informed consent of knowledge-holders, including information on ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs), Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs), vulnerable marine ecosystems (VMEs), Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas (PSSAs), Important Marine Mammal Areas (IMMAs);
- Develop and/or improve mechanism(s) for standardizing, exchanging and integrating information (e.g., clearing-house mechanisms, the Global Ocean Observing System and other monitoring systems).

b. With regard to stakeholder engagement:

- Identify relevant stakeholders, considering livelihoods, cultural and spiritual specificities at various scales;
- Develop and foster communities of practice and stakeholder networks that will facilitate mutual learning and exchange and also support governance, monitoring, enforcement, reporting and assessment;

- Build a common understanding across stakeholders of the objectives and expected outcomes;
- Foster and support strong social and communication skills in managers and practitioners of marine protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures.

c. With regard to governance, monitoring and enforcement:

- Identify the policies and management measures in place, including those outside of the protected/conserved areas;
- Make better use of new developments in open source data (e.g., satellite information);
- Build and/or strengthen global monitoring mechanisms and partnerships to reduce the overall costs of monitoring;
- Engage indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as respected local leaders, in monitoring and enforcement, and enhance the capacity of local communities to conduct monitoring;
- Enhance the capacity of scientists to use indigenous and local knowledge, respecting the appropriate cultural contexts;
- Build the capacities of managers and practitioners;
- Facilitate collaboration, communication and exchange of best practices among managers and practitioners;
- Identify gaps and barriers to effective governance and compliance;
- Make use of existing standards and indicators, and improve the visibility and uptake of various global and regional standards to facilitate common approaches across different scales;
- Recognize and support the role of indigenous peoples and local communities in governance, monitoring and enforcement.

d. With regard to assessing and reporting progress in achieving the qualitative aspects of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11:

Assessment

- Ensure the appropriate conditions are in place to facilitate assessment and analysis (e.g., legal basis, policies, conservation objectives and expertise);
- Develop a common understanding of what effectiveness means across stakeholder groups, in line with the objectives of the protected/conserved areas;
- Develop clear, reliable and measurable indicators for assessing the effectiveness of the protected/conserved areas in achieving their objectives;
- Develop standardized approaches for assessment across mechanisms/processes;
- Assess protected/conserved areas at the network scale and at the level of individual areas;
- Develop and foster communities of practice to support assessment;

Reporting

- Improve the frequency and accuracy of reporting, including by maximizing the use of existing reporting mechanisms (e.g., CBD national reports, IPBES reports, European Union reports);
- Enhance the visibility of reporting to encourage analysis by a range of experts across disciplines;
- Ensure that management is effectively informed by reporting and analysis through appropriate feedback mechanisms in order to facilitate adaptive management;
- Build the capacity of developing countries to undertake reporting and management effectiveness analyses;
- Build the political will to support timely and effective reporting, including through specific government commitments for regular and adequate reporting;
- Engage indigenous peoples and local communities in reporting and assessment;
- Develop standardized approaches to reporting across mechanisms/processes;

- Develop and foster communities of practice to support reporting.

4. Through a breakout group session, the workshop participants highlighted the following approaches to accelerate national progress in achieving Aichi Target 11 in marine and coastal areas, in particular with regard to ensuring the effective integration of MPAs and/or OECMs into wider landscapes and seascapes, recognizing that these are not exhaustive and that there are other sources of guidance on these issues:

- Identify how MPAs and/or OECMs fit into and enhance landscape and seascape planning frameworks, including marine spatial planning, integrated coastal management, and systematic conservation planning, and build on progress made using integrated approaches;
- Assess what information is needed and identify the best scale(s) for collecting information, including on:
 - Existing legal and policy frameworks;
 - Ecological and biological features, and areas of specific conservation interest;
 - Uses and activities in the wider landscape and seascape and in specific areas of conservation interest, and potential interactions among human uses;
 - Relevant stakeholders active in or with interest in the wider landscape and seascape;
 - Cumulative impacts across a range of spatial scales, and resilience/vulnerability of systems to increasing human use and natural forces;
 - Connectivity (i.e., ecological and/or socioeconomic) within and outside the landscape and seascape;
 - Responses of systems to increasing human use and natural forces;
- Identify available sources of data and information (including traditional and local knowledge), identify information gaps and compile available data, models and other relevant information;
- Develop and/or improve user-friendly, open-source, efficient and transparent tools for data visualization, integration and sharing;
- Engage expertise across the range of relevant disciplines;
- Recognize and understand diverse value systems, including those of indigenous peoples and local communities, within and among human communities in the landscape and seascape, and within MPAs and/or OECMs;
- Understand and articulate benefits (environmental, social and/or economic) of integration of MPAs and/or OECMs into the wider landscape and seascape;
- Develop a common understanding among stakeholders regarding the objectives of integrating MPAs and/or OECMs into the wider landscape and seascape;
- Ensure the full and effective engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities;
- Ensure that all activities are accountable for their impacts, both within and outside of MPAs and/or OECMs, incorporating the “duty of care” concept;
- Develop clear, reliable, and measurable indicators for assessing the effectiveness of the MPAs and/or OECMs in achieving their objectives, and for assessing the status of the wider landscape and seascape;
- Refer to examples and case studies of effective integration of MPAs and/or OECMs into wider landscapes and seascapes; and
- Utilize available tools and guidance on mainstreaming biodiversity into relevant sectoral activities.

5. Through breakout group discussions, the workshop participants highlighted the following approaches to manage the wider landscape and seascape to ensure that MPAs and/or OECMs are effective, recognizing that these are not exhaustive and that there are other sources of guidance on these issues:

- Develop and/or enhance integrated governance and management to support landscape and seascape planning;
- Develop and/or refine decision-support tools for landscape and seascape planning;
- Ensure that relevant legislation is in place and enforced;

- Understand and assess the status of use and management of the wider landscape and seascape and identify areas in need of enhanced protection;
- Coordinate planning, objective-setting, and governance across geographic scales;
- Conduct threat assessments, and use a mitigation hierarchy;
- Evaluate the relative compatibility and/or incompatibility of existing and proposed uses, as well as the interactions and impacts of broader environmental change (e.g., climate change);
- Understand conflicts and displacement of livelihoods and identify relevant approaches to provide alternative livelihoods and compensation;
- Communicate with and involve relevant stakeholders across the wider landscape and seascape in an accessible, effective and appropriate manner;
- Ensure that planning and management is in line with the range of cultures and value systems in the wider landscape and seascape;
- Identify and engage local/national leaders and champions; and
- Build and/or enhance capacity to support wider landscape and seascape planning.

Annex IV

CONCLUSIONS OF THE TECHNICAL EXPERT WORKSHOPS ON I) OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES FOR ACHIEVING TARGET 11 AND II) MARINE PROTECTED AREAS AND OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES FOR ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 11 IN MARINE AND COASTAL AREAS REGARDING “OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES”

At its tenth meeting, in October 2010, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets under five strategic goals. Strategic Goal C, on improving the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity, includes Target 11, which states that: *By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.*

In paragraph 10(b) of decision XIII/2, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to organize a technical expert workshop or workshops to provide scientific and technical advice on definition, management approaches and identification of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) and their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Accordingly, the workshops were held in Montreal, Canada from 6-9 February 2018. The conclusions of the workshops with respect to OECMs are as follows:

This guidance provides general principles that should be applied in a flexible way and on a case-by-case basis.

I. DEFINITION

“Other effective area-based conservation measure” means “A geographically defined area other than a Protected Area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity,⁵ with associated ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values”.

II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Guiding general principles should be applied in a flexible way and on a case-by-case basis.

(a) Other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) have a biodiversity value, which is the basis for their consideration to achieve Target 11 of Strategic Goal C of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 and 2020;

(b) OECMs reflect an opportunity to provide in situ conservation of biodiversity over the long term. They may allow for sustainable human activity while offering a clear benefit to biodiversity conservation and avoiding negative impacts on biodiversity. By recognizing an area, there is an incentive for sustaining existing biodiversity values and improving biodiversity conservation outcomes;

(c) OECMs deliver biodiversity outcomes that are comparable with and complementary to those of protected areas;

(d) OECMs demonstrate positive biodiversity outcomes by preventing, reducing or eliminating existing, or reasonably anticipated main threats, and strengthening existing protections. OECM management is consistent with the ecosystem approach and the precautionary principle, providing the

⁵ As defined by Article 2 of the Convention on Biological Diversity and in line with the provisions of the Convention.

ability to adapt to achieve biodiversity outcomes, including long-term outcomes, and including the ability to manage a new threat;

(e) OECMs help deliver greater representativeness and connectivity in protected area systems and thus may help address larger and pervasive threats and enhance resilience, including with regard to climate change;

(f) Definition and criteria for identification of OECMs is applicable across all ecosystems, and identification should be on case-by-case basis;

(g) Recognition of OECMs in areas within the territories of indigenous peoples and local communities should be on the basis of self-identification and require their free, prior and informed consent;

(h) Recognition of OECMs should follow appropriate consultation with relevant governance authorities, stakeholders and the public;

(i) Areas conserved for cultural and spiritual values, and governance and management that respect and are informed by cultural and spiritual values, often result in positive biodiversity outcomes;

(j) OECMs recognize, promote and make visible the roles of different governance systems and actors in biodiversity conservation;

(k) Incentives to ensure effectiveness can include a range of social and ecological benefits, including empowerment of indigenous peoples and local communities;

(l) The best available scientific information, including indigenous and local knowledge, should be used for recognizing OECMs, delimiting their location and size, informing management approaches and measuring performance.

III. CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFICATION

Criterion A: Area is not currently recognized as a protected area	
Not a protected area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is not currently recognized or reported as a protected area or part of a protected area; it may have been established for another purpose.
Criterion B: Area is governed and managed	
Geographically defined space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Size and area are described, including in three dimensions where necessary. Boundaries are described.
Legitimate governance authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance has legitimate authority and is appropriate for achieving in situ conservation of biodiversity within the area. Governance by indigenous peoples and local communities is self-identified and peer reviewed. Governance reflects the equity considerations adopted in the Convention. Governance may be by a single authority or through collaboration among relevant authorities and provides the ability to address threats collectively.
Managed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant authorities are identified and involved in management and responsible authorities are identified. A management system is in place that contributes to sustaining the in situ conservation of biodiversity. Management is consistent with the ecosystem approach with the ability to adapt to achieve biodiversity outcomes, including long-term outcomes, and including the ability to manage a new threat.
Criterion C: Achieves sustained and effective contribution to in situ conservation of biodiversity	

Effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area achieves, or is expected to achieve, positive and sustained outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity. • Current threats are well understood. • Significant threats are addressed effectively. • Mechanisms, such as policy frameworks and regulations, are in place to recognize and respond to new threats. • To the extent possible, management inside and outside the OECM is integrated.
Sustained over long term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OECM is in place for the long term or is likely to be. • “Sustained” pertains to the continuity of governance and management and “long term” pertains to the outcome.
Information and monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of an OECM should, to the extent possible, document the known biodiversity attributes, including cultural and/or spiritual values, of the area and the governance and management in place as a baseline for assessing effectiveness. • A monitoring system informs management measures with respect to biodiversity. • Processes should be in place to evaluate the effectiveness of governance and management, including with respect to equity.
Criterion D: Associated ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values	
Ecosystem services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecosystem services are supported, particularly those of importance to indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account interactions and trade-offs among ecosystem services, with a view to ensuring positive biodiversity outcomes and equity.
Cultural and spiritual values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and management measures identify, respect and uphold the cultural and spiritual significance and values of the area. • Governance and management measures respect and uphold the knowledge, practices and institutions that are fundamental for the in situ conservation of biodiversity.

IV. FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. Management approaches

(a) OECMs are diverse in terms of purpose, design, governance, participants and management, especially as they consider associated cultural and spiritual values. Accordingly, management approaches for OECMs are and will be diverse;

(b) Some OECMs are established, recognized or managed to intentionally sustain in situ conservation of biodiversity. This purpose is either the primary management objective, or part of a set of intended management objectives;

(c) Some OECMs may be established, recognized or managed primarily for purposes other than in situ conservation of biodiversity. Thus their contribution to in situ conservation of biodiversity is a co-benefit to their primary intended management objective or purpose. However, where a contribution to in situ conservation of biodiversity is incidental to the primary stated purpose of the OECM, it is desirable that this contribution become a recognized objective of the management of the OECM;

(d) In all cases where in situ conservation of biodiversity is recognized as a management objective, specific management measures should be defined and enabled.

2. Role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11

(a) By definition, OECMs contribute to both quantitative (i.e. the 17% and 10% coverage elements) and qualitative elements (i.e. representativity, coverage of areas important for biodiversity,

connectivity and integration in wider landscapes and seascapes, management effectiveness and equity) of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11;

(b) Since OECMs are diverse in terms of purpose, design, governance, and management, they will often also contribute to other Aichi Biodiversity Targets, targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the objectives or targets of other multilateral environmental agreements.⁶

3. Additional guidance

(a) Further screening and evaluation tools need to be developed in the light of experiences acquired as a result of the application of this guidance;

(b) Monitoring the effectiveness of OECMs needs more guidance, information sharing, networking and sharing of available tools, and development of new tools where necessary. This guidance could include: (i) baseline data, such as documentation of the biodiversity values and elements; (ii) ongoing community-based monitoring and incorporation of traditional knowledge; (iii) monitoring over the long term, including how to sustain biodiversity and improve in situ conservation; and (iv) monitoring of governance and management systems that contribute to the biodiversity outcomes;

(c) Manuals for reporting in the World Database on Protected Areas, the registry of territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities maintained by the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre, and other guidance documents of the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, sectoral agencies provide useful guidance for reporting OECMs;

(d) While the contribution of OECMs to the quantitative elements of Target 11 are relatively straightforward to assess, further studies and guidance are needed to better understand and communicate how their contribution to qualitative elements of Target 11 can be enhanced;

(e) Further studies to better understand and communicate the full range of OECM contributions to other targets, and engagement with other sectors;

(f) Further guidance is needed concerning the size of individual areas, and areas that are part of networks, needed to achieve biodiversity outcomes;

(g) Further guidance is needed on how OECMs of indigenous people and local communities are recognized and supported.

V. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STEPS

Participants of the workshop suggested that:

- The Conference of the Parties should consider adopting the guidance.
- Capacity-building will be necessary to enable the application of the guidance, and thus governments and relevant organizations should be encouraged to facilitate such capacity-building
- Parties should be encouraged to submit case studies and examples of OECM management approaches, including through application of the guidance, for dissemination through the clearing-house mechanism.

⁶ CBD/PA/EM/2018/1/INF/4 provides many examples of these contributions.